

History

Advanced GCE A2 7835

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3835

Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Units

January 2006

3835/7835/MS/R/06J

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (7835)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (3873)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Marking Instructions	1
*	Generic Mark Schemes Units 2580-2591	
2580	Document Studies 871 – 1099	21
2581	Document Studies 1450 – 1693	29
2582	Document Studies 1774 – 1945	41
2583	English History 1042 – 1660	61
2584	English History 1780 – 1964	93
2585	European History 1046 – 1718	115
2586	European and World History 1789 - 1989	147
2587	Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	173
2588	Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	181
2589	Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	195
2590	Themes in History 1066 – 1796	219
2591	Themes in History 1763 – 1996	253

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	286
*	Grade Thresholds	291
2580 - 2582	Document Studies	293
2583 – 2584	English History	307
2585 – 2586	European and World History	319
2587 – 2589	Historical Investigations	325
2590 – 2591	Themes in History	335
2592 - 2593	Independent Investigations	344

**Marking Instructions
&
Generic Markschemes
January 2006**

AS/A2 HISTORY SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Examiners should refer to OCR's *Instructions for Examiners* for more detailed guidance.

1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

All candidates must meet the Assessment Objectives set for History by the QCA. Although these Objectives are expressed and weighted separately, the assessment seeks to secure coherence and unity in the candidates' understanding and interpretation of History as a discipline. The Objectives are thus not disaggregated when marking, and AO1 pervades AO2.

2 THE ASSESSMENT OF SCRIPTS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BANDS

Every answer should be marked bearing in mind the AOs and the following explanatory criteria:

- (a) the **relevance**, accuracy and quantity of factual knowledge;
- (b) evidence of the exercise of **informed historical judgement** and **awareness of historical context**;
- (c) **effectiveness of presentation**: the ability to communicate arguments and knowledge in a clear, orderly fashion with maximum relevance to the question set. All Units require responses in continuous prose, and therefore include the assessment of quality of written communication (including clarity of expression, structure of arguments, presentation of ideas, grammar, punctuation and spelling). Candidates' quality of written communication is not assessed separately but pervades AO1.

The proper application of the AOs and the explanatory criteria will mean, for example, that a long answer crammed with detailed knowledge will not be rewarded highly if the knowledge is not effectively applied and the answer shows a lack of historical judgement. Conversely a convincingly argued, highly relevant and perceptive answer may be well rewarded although based on less overtly expressed knowledge.

Examiners should seek the advice of Team Leaders about unusual approaches to a question.

3 GENERIC MARK BANDS

The generic Bands are the most important guide for examiners and apply to all answers. Examiners assess which Band best reflects most of each answer. No answer is required to demonstrate all the descriptions in any level to qualify for a Band. Examiners are looking for 'best fit', not 'perfect fit'.

Units 2580-2582: For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.

Units 2583-2586: Provisionally award the middle mark and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Units 2587-2589: For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer. For answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer.

Units 2590-2591: Provisionally award the top mark and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Units 2592-2593: Provisionally award the middle mark of the Band and then moderate up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer.

Mark each answer individually. Do not be swayed by impressions gained from marking other answers in the script or other candidates from the same or scripts from another Centre.

Units 2580-2586

Examiners will remember that they are assessing AS Level (not A Level), usually the work of 17 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably four other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

Units 2587-2593

Examiners will remember that they are assessing A2 Level, usually the work of 18 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably two other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

Units 2592 & 2593 are coursework. Candidates have considerably more time in which to prepare, with constant access to resources. For Unit 2592, they also have considerably more time in which to write.

4 QUESTION-SPECIFIC MARK SCHEMES

Question-specific mark schemes are secondary, supporting the Generics. They do not specify the 'correct' answer required for individual questions. Rather, they indicate possible points that candidates might make. They offer a broad guide to what may be encountered and are therefore the guide for moderating the actual generic mark up or down within the appropriate Band or (if the history is particularly strong or weak) into the next generic Band up or down. When appropriate, suggestions are made about Bands for different approaches; in some cases, limits are indicated. Examiners must use their judgement but, **if in doubt about a particular answer, they must consult their TL. The most important principle for examiners is the primacy of the Generics.**

Answers need not be long to merit high marks. Reward answers that are direct but concise. Reward selection of relevant material and appropriate comment rather than paraphrases. Quotations should only be rewarded if used to substantiate relevant points made in the candidate's own words.

5 ASSESSING STRUCTURED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS GIVEN IN NOTE-FORM

Answers are marked individually. Questions in Units 2580-82 & 2587-89 have sub-parts; each must be marked individually, without reference to the others.

Answers which are very largely in continuous prose but which are completed by significant notes may be awarded marks in one Band lower than that normally awarded. Purely note-form answers which show sound relevance, structure, understanding and sufficient knowledge can be awarded marks up to the top of Band III. In every case, examiners must make a note both at the end of the answer and on the front page of the script.

6 POSITIVE MARKING

Examiners must be positive in marking what is written, without being influenced too much by omissions. Marks must represent what a candidate has accomplished, not what her/she has failed to do. Even the most successful answers may have omissions which could have been rectified had more time been allowed. **Examiners must not 'penalise'** (i.e. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (e.g. for accuracy and relevance).

Question-specific mark schemes alone indicate any omissions that will affect marks awarded or any ceilings to be applied. Mark positively by rewarding what has been written. When things go wrong, it is usually because an undue severity creeps in when omissions and errors are looked for (marking negatively).

7 USE OF THE FULL RAW MARK RANGE

Examiners use the full mark range to reward work appropriately, to enable candidates to be ranked in order of merit and avoid bunching, and to ensure that raw marks convert appropriately to UMS after grading. This is an invitation neither to be generous at the top nor to under-mark at the bottom.

8 MARKING SCRIPTS

All mark must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'Ref' written in the margin indicates there is some significant irrelevance;
- 'N' or 'D' in the margin indicates an excessively narrative or descriptive section;
- Occasional brief notes in the margin should indicate sound points or knowledge;
- Ticks are of little value, and can seriously mislead. They should be avoided.

Each page should indicate that it has been read. Good practice will avoid a sequence of pages with nothing but ticks (or crosses).

A brief comment summarising the main qualities of an answer should be written at the end, together with the Band and the mark. The best way to do that is to quote briefly from the appropriate Band.

The Mark Band and the appropriate numerical mark should be recorded at the end of each answer (e.g. Band IV – 45). The total marks for answers should be ringed in the right-hand margin at the end of each question. All marks for sub-questions should be recorded un-ringed in the right-hand margin. They should be repeated at the end and the total shown as a ringed mark in the right-hand margin at the end of the question (e.g. 5 + 15 + 45 = 65, with 65 in a circle).

Do not alter a mark other than by crossing it out, inserting the correct mark and initialling it.

Comments on scripts

The comment at the end of an answer should reflect its qualities as defined by the Mark Bands so quote from it. Comments help you to arrive at a fair mark and indicate to senior examiners how your mind has been working. Marks and comments must be substantiated unequivocally from scripts.

Examiners should use a professional, business-like and straightforward style. Always use:

- reference to the assessment objectives and/or Mark Bands;
- reference to creditable points and major gaps which affect assessment;
- reference to 'the answer' or the third person, not 'You...'

Always avoid:

- derogatory terms e.g. 'rubbish', 'shoddy', even though examiners may consider such terms to be justified;
- humour, interjections or jokes.

Ignore poor handwriting. If it is illegible, send the script to your TL. Candidates must not be marked down.

It may be appropriate to make general comments about matters such as:

- use of time and/or length of answers;
- presentation and use of language;
- rubric infringements.

Do **not** make:

- comments on how you perceive teaching may have been carried out;
- reference to answers by other candidates, e.g. 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, e.g. 'should have revised more fully'.

9 RUBRIC INFRINGEMENTS AND INCLUSIONS FROM CENTRES

If a candidate answers more questions than the specified number, all answers must be marked. The highest marks for the number of questions allowed must be used to constitute the script's total mark. The marks of the surplus answers should then be reduced to 0 and an explanation written on the script's front page.

If a candidate fails to answer sufficient questions, write an explanatory note on the front of the script. If several candidates from one Centre infringe rubrics, the PE and Subject Officer should be informed.

Centres are responsible for requesting special consideration for individual candidates. Such cases are dealt with directly between the Centre and OCR. Requests for special treatment sent with scripts must be ignored in your marking and forwarded directly to OCR.

Notes such as 'Out of time' written on scripts (by invigilators or candidates) must be ignored.

10 OVERALL

Mark consistently, periodically refreshing yourself via the standardisation scripts and the Generics.

Pace your marking, follow a regular timetable and avoiding the need to mark many scripts in limited time or when fatigued. If difficulties arise, inform your TL at once so alternative arrangements can be made.

Return mark sheets and scripts promptly. Failure to do so will jeopardise the issuing of results.

Contact OCR with admin problems and your TL on marking issues. Examiners must never contact a Centre.

**Our secondary educational system is built around external assessment.
Students, parents, teachers, FE and employers all depend on volunteers to mark the exams.**

Thank you very much for being an examiner.

Units 2580-2582: GENERIC MARK BANDS
STUDIES

AS DOCUMENT

with Glosses & Revised Mark Allocations used Summer 2005 onwards

- 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 Marking Instructions #5].
 - Remember that you are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see 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.
 - Glosses in [] have been added to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme” (*Code of Practice* 2005, #4.17).

Question (a)**BAND/20: Explanation**

- I (18-20) There is a convincing and relevant explanation of the key issues relating to the reference, with some clear linkage to the Source from where it comes. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

['clear linkage' means that the key issue is linked to the Source via context and/or tone and/or contribution to the argument. Without an attempt to discuss this, an answer would not be placed in Bands I–III]

- II (15-17) The response contains some valid explanatory comments but the points are not fully supported or else linkage to the Source from where the reference comes will be limited. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (12-14) The response attempts to analyse the internal aspects of the reference but the comments miss some explanatory points and it makes little linkage to the Source. The organisation of the answer is uneven but there is sustained commentary. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- IV (9-11) The response offers some comments on the reference but does not offer appropriate contextual support and misses key aspects of explanation. The answer may well be descriptive. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (6-8) The response provides a very basic answer to the question. There are comments about what the reference says, but explanatory points are brief or very general, not fully integrated, coherent or supported by the candidate's own knowledge. The writing shows some frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- VI (3-5) The response is a simplistic paraphrase or commentary without a genuine attempt to explain the reference. The answer may be marred by considerable irrelevance. The writing shows significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-2) The response is a simplistic paraphrase or commentary without any attempt to explain the reference. The answer is irrelevant. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Question (b)**BAND/40: Comparison**

NB Contextual knowledge is NOT required for (b), but credit should be given for any which is used relevantly and effectively.

- I (36-40) 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.

[‘genuine comparison and/or contrast’ means both content (area of agreement and/or disagreement) and provenance. The list of qualities is not exhaustive & they do not all need to be discussed. A judgment ‘as evidence’ or on the relative extent of support is expected]

- II (30-35) 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.

[‘internal evidence’ means appropriate references to both content and provenance (the introductions and/or attributions)]

- III (24-29) 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.

[‘limited links with the Sources’ means either too much focus on content or on provenance so the comparison is uneven. Where ‘the organization’ is uneven, the comparison will be confined to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph]

- IV (17-23) 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.

[Sequencing prevents comparison. Band IV is to be used if there is some element of sequencing but there are a few points of internal analysis (comparative provenance) and/or a few comments on the similarity/difference of content]

- V (11-16)** 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.

['very basic answer' means sequencing is especially prevalent. The answer will, however, identify one or more very basic points of comparative content or provenance, even if only implicitly]

- VI (6-10)** 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 (0-5)** 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 (c)

BAND/60: Context

- **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 (53-60)** 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 Band I.

[Band I answers are likely to use their own knowledge to extend and enrich the quality of source evaluation]

- II (45-52)** 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.

[‘own’ knowledge should be focused on the key issue of the question]

- III (37-44) 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.

[‘attempts to address the Sources’ means Sources are largely used for reference and illustration of an argument rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument (the characteristics of Bands I and II)]

- IV (29-36) 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.

*[‘clear imbalance’ does **not** mean completely unbalanced between use of Sources and own knowledge. It means **more** imbalance than in Band III. Sources discussed sequentially are unlikely to establish a sense of different views, but ‘grouping’ might coincide with Source order (A and B v. C and D) - examiners are to watch if this is the case]*

- V (20-28) 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.

*[There is likely to be a clear imbalance here between Sources and own knowledge. Although there will be little comment on the context of the key issue there will be **some**, just as there will be some awareness and evidence of the key issue. Sources will largely be used for reference and illustration of an argument (i.e. rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument). Judgement will be skeletal if present at all]*

- VI (11-19) 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 (0-10) 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.

Units 2583-2586: GENERIC MARK BANDS

AS PERIOD STUDIES

Examiners are reminded that

- for answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer;
- for answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer;
- they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5];
- they are marking out of 45. OCR's computer will apply the right multiplier to the raw mark when candidates are graded so that the paper is out of 90 UMS.
- 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 (e.g. evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II instead of William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award to the top of Band VI.

ESSAY**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).

Time is limited so candidates may begin their answer directly, without an introduction.

- I (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 the 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.

- II (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 will 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 of the Band, 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.

- III (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 where the question demands it* 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 linkages *and any necessary* explanation of most important will be slight and undeveloped. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- IV (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 careless errors.

- V (18-22)** The response discusses some key issues in the question but only at a very basic level. The answer shows some adequacy in its level of understanding and is descriptive or narrative in approach. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is limited but is mostly communicated in a competent manner. The organisation is uneven. 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.

- VI (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 an incompetent manner. The organisation of the answer is very poor. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- VII (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.

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 (i)

NB

- 'Own knowledge' is **not** required, but if material extraneous to the Passages is used pertinently to clarify points of **comparison made about the views expressed** it is to be given credit.

BANDS I-VII/15: Comparison of Content of Two Passages

- I (12–15) The response correctly identifies the substance of the comparison between the two Passages in a direct point by point comparison, and shows **clear understanding** of the different interpretations offered. The answer is **successful in establishing a full and complete comparison** between the interpretations in the two Passages referring to both similarities and differences where appropriate. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (11) The response correctly identifies the substance of the comparison between the two Passages in a direct point by point comparison, and shows a **reasonable understanding** of the different interpretations of historical events offered. The answer is **mostly successful in establishing a thorough comparison** between the arguments or ideas in the two Passages. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- III (9–10) The response correctly identifies most of the substance of the comparison between the two Passages, and shows a **fairly reasonable understanding** of the different interpretations of historical events offered. The answer is **fairly successful in establishing a comparison** between the arguments or ideas in the two Passages but is not entirely full. There may be a tendency **to list points** from each Passage separately **without making an explicit comparison** or to confine comparison to a sentence or sentences only at the end. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.
- IV (8) The response correctly identifies some of the substance of the comparison between the two Passages, and shows a **limited understanding** of the different interpretations offered. The comparison may, in places, be of the Passages in general and/or of their provenances and **not of the interpretations** the Passages offer so that the answer misses some points and **tends to list** them rather than compare them. There may be excessive use of extraneous material at the expense of the Passages. 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 (6–7) The response provides a **very basic answer** to the question. It identifies only some of the substance of the comparison between the two Passages, and shows only **the most basic understanding** of the different interpretations offered. However, **it misses major items** of the comparison and may compare the factual material in the Passages and not the interpretations the Passages offer. **There may be paraphrase** of the Passages and of the introductory steers to them. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (4–5) The response may be a **simplistic reference** to the two Passages with no attempt to compare them or the answer **may well be uncertain what the substance of the comparison is**. The answer may be marred by **considerable irrelevance**. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-3) The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to understand the Passages. 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.

PASSAGES QUESTION (ii)

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.
- 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/30: Contextual Evaluation

- I (24–30) 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 (21–23) 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 (18–20) 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 (15–17) 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 (12–14)** 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 (7–11)** 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 (0–6)** 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.

UNITS 2590-2591: GENERIC MARK BANDS

THEMES IN HISTORY

NB

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Generic Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- For all answers, examiners should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down according to the particular qualities of the answer [see General Marking Instructions #5]
- Candidates who do not address most of the 100 or so-year period required may not be given a mark in Band I for that essay, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The quality of English is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

The topics are based on Themes covering an extended period of at least a hundred years (unless an individual question specifies a slightly shorter period) with the emphasis on continuity, development and change over time (ie. on breadth of understanding rather than on depth of knowledge). The emphasis is on links and comparisons between different aspects of the topics studied, rather than on detailed analysis.

To support the emphasis on breadth and over-view (rather than depth), candidates are given in the exam a factual chronology for their Theme.

BANDS I-VII/60: Essay

I (48–60) *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions. There may be some unevenness, but the demands of the question (e.g. causation, evaluation, change and/or continuity over time) are fully addressed.* The answer demonstrates a **high level of ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. The approach is **consistently analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. The **argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. Ideas are expressed fluently and clearly. At the lower end of the Band, there *may be some weaker sections but* the overall quality nonetheless shows **the candidate is in control of the argument**. The answer is fully relevant. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

II (42–47) The answer demonstrates clearly the **ability to synthesise** elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **good awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question, but** there is **some unevenness**. The approach is **mostly analytical or explanatory** rather than descriptive or narrative. **Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported** by very appropriate factual material. The answer is fully relevant. *The impression*

is that a good solid answer has been provided. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- III (36–41) The answer demonstrates clearly an **attempt to synthesise some elements** to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **reasonable awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument supported** by appropriate factual material. The approach **mostly contains analysis or explanation but may lack balance and** there may be **some** heavily **descriptive/narrative** passages **and/or** the answer may be **somewhat lacking in appropriate supporting factual material**. The answer is mostly relevant. The writing is generally fluent and usually uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.
- IV (30–35) The answer demonstrates an **uneven attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is an **adequate awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly, but the structure of the argument is poor**. The approach **depends more on heavily descriptive or narrative** passages than on analysis or explanation (which may be limited to introductions and conclusions). Factual material, sometimes very full, is used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly the requirements of the question**. 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 (24–29) The answer demonstrates a **limited attempt to synthesise** some elements to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is a **limited awareness of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer but the approach lacks analysis or explanation and** there is **little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question**. The structure of the answer shows **weaknesses in organisation** and the treatment of topics is **seriously unbalanced**. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (12–23) The answer demonstrates an **unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails to reflect the synoptic nature of the Module. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. The **answer is not focused** on the requirements of the question and may be of **very limited relevance**. Any **argument** offered may be **fragmentary and incoherent**, and any **assertions** made may be **unsupported** by factual material. There may be serious irrelevance and/or serious weaknesses in knowledge. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

VII (0-11) The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt to synthesise** any elements and fails completely to reflect the synoptic nature of the Unit. There is **no understanding of change and/or continuity** and/or development over the necessary extended period. 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.

**Mark Scheme 2580
January 2006**

Unit 2580/01

JANUARY 2006

1 The Reign of Alfred the Great**(a) Study Source D**

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘his establishment of a school’((lines 18-19). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of the topic.

Here is a reference to the palace school created by Alfred, probably in the 880s, during the period of general peace, to educate the sons of noblemen amongst others. This was possibly modelled on earlier ideas (Carolingian). There is some debate about the nature and role of this school but its existence can be accepted and it provided the location for teaching and learning, both high priorities for Alfred. The Source indicates the political and religious functions that devolved upon this school, staffed by learned men. The Source contextualises its role and importance.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for Alfred’s concern to reform the Church. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Source B shows Alfred’s desire to improve learning and the emphasis he placed upon such; he sought learned men, of whom Grimbold and John were but two; the language used to describe them is of note (‘very respected’, ‘extremely learned’, ‘virtuous behaviour’, ‘of most acute intelligence’). Source A, in turn and with some contrast, provides an external dimension, showing that Alfred looked overseas for such men; Grimbold is mentioned here too and is praised; reasons for this search and need are suggested (‘onslaught of Vikings’, ‘carelessness’, ‘ignorance’). The two Sources harmonise as to Alfred’s concerns for ecclesiastical learning and the importance of good teaching and the importance of this as a route to reform and improve the contemporary Church. Source B refers to ‘ecclesiastical doctrine’ and ‘Holy Scriptures’; A mentions the Church ‘needs reform’.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred's concern for religion was driven more by the need for effective government than by religious zeal. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

The Sources emphasise religious and spiritual needs and interests: good teaching, good learning, fulfilling spiritual duties. Sources A and B fit together and link to Source D. In turn, Sources C and D have overlaps. Source D mentions 'worldly power' and 'religious authority', reminding us of wider (political, governmental) purpose in approaching education. This can be linked to Source C. Sources A and B mention the search on the Continent for learned men; contextual knowledge could refer to Grimbold and John, the search's scale and the contacts fostered. In Source C, Asser outlines how he came from Wales. He refers to training important men (ealdormen and thegns), emphasising a breadth of purposes. This links to Source D on the scope of Alfred's educational interests. This can be linked to the methods and style of Alfred's government, particularly as the reign developed and more control was exerted; relations with the political elites is touched on. Knowledge could supply points about the make-up and nature of the Alfredian governmental system. 'Own' knowledge can supply further details, e.g.: the roles of the Mercian Plegmund and Werfeth. Other prominent churchmen could be exemplified. There is plenty on Alfred's religious activities, including founding monasteries and endowing churches; he promoted learning and higher standards. He was a religious ruler as well as a warrior king. He promoted what may be viewed as an 'Alfredian Renaissance'. Some may link to wider military and political perspectives, including the goal of a more educated and responsible layer of ealdormen and thegns able to govern well and dispense good justice. Alfred was an 'all-rounder' king.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

2 The Normans in England 1066-87

(a) Study Source B

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘received great revenues and fiefs in England..’(lines 9-10). [20

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of the topic.

A reference to both the great wealth accessible in England (taxes, rents, trade, etc) and the distribution and feudalisation of lands, essentially done in the early 1070s after the quashing of severe unrest. ‘Fiefs’ were those lands held of the king by the great nobles and in turn held of them by their vassals, all in return for homage and fealty and the performance of various services, especially military at this time. Candidates might comment upon the feudal system or the context of this feudalisation. The figure of 60,000 mentioned in the text is undoubtedly an exaggeration, the likely figure being far lower. (Of course, even at this early stage, no matter sub-infeudation, mercenaries were hired to provide a key element in royal operations.)

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources C and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for Norman responses to unrest in England. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Source D reflects the harshness of William's responses to severe unrest while Source C is that more measured in tone; Source D stresses harshness throughout, a spirit of vengeance, while Source C appears to make some distinction between suppressing risings in the South and harrying the North, perhaps because of the presence of Danes (referred to in C). Source C demonstrates the widespread nature of the unrest as well as the responses, including the use of the 'men of Winchester, London and Salisbury' (local militia, the *fyrð*) as well as the roles of powerful barons. William I is to the fore here, above all in his tough response to the major unrest in the North. The comment on the level of cruelty is noteworthy. Source D links with this and can be compared directly with C, referring to Norman tactical advantages, adaptability, 'defence in depth' and endurance well as to the 'unbridled savagery' meted out by William I. In both Sources, there is little doubt about the severity of responses to unrest in this period. The tone of Source C might be commented upon as above.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Norman control over England depended solely upon William I's forceful leadership. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

William's forceful personality comes through in Source A, where he is said to have dominated the battle, and in Sources B and D in the savagery of his reactions to unrest. Source C does refer to William's delegation of authority and control to local magnates, including Bishop Geoffrey, and this shows that there was not complete dependence on William himself; others played a role. This could be supported from

knowledge of the actions of such as Bishop Geoffrey, Bishop Odo of Bayeux and William fitzOsbern, for example. In Source B, William is in control of the distributions of lands and wealth; this was an important phase in control, consolidation and feudalisation. Own knowledge could refer to the major land-holding changes initiated by the end of unrest c.1070; hitherto, there had been more restrained redistribution of English lands. Source A reminds us of the importance of victory at Hastings as well as its manner. Sources C and D reflect, or reflect upon, aspects of deliberate policy actions. Own knowledge can support and extend analysis, for example: on the nature of the unrest (widespread, regionalised, localised but usually lacking coordination), the problems of William's opponents (in leadership, tactics, unity levels), the role of castles, the role of his supporters and their troops, the uses of the Anglo-Saxon *fyrð* (suggesting native loyalty), the use of the developing feudal system and the unanimity of purpose shown by the invaders and colonisers (at least until 1075 and the rebellion of the Norman-French Earls). Reference can be made to key events of these years, including outcomes of both Hastings and the c.1070-72 major redistribution of lands in a massive tenurial and territorial upheaval.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3 The First Crusade and its Origins 1073-99

(a) Study Source C

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'they fulfilled their religious vows at the Holy Sepulchre' (lines 18-19). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

Here is a reference to a key location in Jerusalem and a key objective of the Crusade. The Holy Sepulchre was the site of Christ's burial and resurrection and of the Church of the Resurrection, the most holy of sites. Its importance was to make it the obvious target of any crusading endeavours. It features in much of the contemporary literature and it is associated with the purpose of the crusading

movement to free the Holy Land of the infidel pagans. The fulfilling of religious vows was the arrival at Jerusalem and its capture and recovery for the Christian faith, freeing it from the control of the infidel. These vows were taken prior to going on crusade and were linked to penitential thinking and practice.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources B and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for the importance of Muslim divisions during the First Crusade. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

The Sources indicate obvious problems for the Muslims and can be taken as a pair. Source B suggests inherent, incipient alliance between different Muslim groups but also points to the disruptive effects of Kerbuqa's leadership; this is amplified in Source D, where it is stated that any attempts at alliances and unity were doomed by severe differences. Source B points to Kerbuqa's alienation of important elements by his high handed behaviour ('his pride and ill-treatment') while Source D stresses the depths of internal division and disunity experienced by those trying to oppose the Crusaders ('lack of cohesive leadership', 'lack of mutual support', 'chronic political, ethnic and religious divisions'). This made the latter's task a little easier. The provenances matter here. Source B is important for its critical tone, coming from a Muslim source; Source D is, of course, more measured as objective analysis.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources.

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the success of the First Crusade is best explained by the military skills of the Crusaders. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

Military skills are touched on in Source A and, more indirectly, in Source C. The notion of heroic resistance and valiant fighting skills and determination are conveyed. Own knowledge could be used to highlight important tactics, e.g.: use of cavalry; use of dismounted forces; skilled use of archers; ability to withstand Muslim charges and break-up advances; successful siege techniques. Source B points up Muslim weaknesses that helped at Antioch and Source D reinforces this as a factor, developing some features. Source A touches on crusade leaders. Sources A and C highlight religious inspiration and zeal. Source C makes much of fulfilling crusading vows and Source A reflects a sense of divine intervention and inspiration. These Sources can be linked to evidence of religious fervour and inspiration during the Crusade, at Antioch (the Holy Lance episode) and Jerusalem (procession outside the city). Candidates might comment on the tone of some Sources, not least A and C. 'Own' knowledge can support military strategy and tactics, ranging from the early success at Doryleum to the successful sieges of Antioch and Jerusalem. Such knowledge can also supply detail on leadership, above all secular, no matter at times the sharp dissensions (e.g.: Bohemond of Taranto, Raymond of Toulouse, Godfrey of Bouillon) and on religious motivation and zeal. Limited Byzantine help, more so early on, might be considered, as might the weaknesses of opponents (Sources B and D). Candidates might, for example, refer to issues such as: Sunni-Shi'ite divisions, tensions between Aleppo and Damascus, Turks and Egyptians. Sources B and D testify to the depths of those tensions and divisions.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2581
January 2006**

Unit 2581/01**1 The Wars of the Roses 1450-85****(a) Study Source C**

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the favourites of the King and Queen’ (line 17). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of the topic.

The reference is to members of the Woodville family who had been appointed to important positions, e.g. Earl Rivers, Elizabeth Woodville’s father, as treasurer of the exchequer. As they came to dominate the court, they were blamed for heavy taxation. This was the grievance of the northern rebels who followed Robin of Redesdale in the rebellion of 1469. The Source suggests that the rebels looked to Warwick, who was of course the chief enemy of the Woodvilles, as their champion. Indeed the rebellion was almost certainly inspired by the Nevilles.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding. **Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for French influence in English affairs in the period 1467 to 1470. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Both Sources refer to the deterioration of relations between Louis and Edward and to the corresponding negotiations between Louis and Warwick. They refer, however, to different stages in the development of these relations. In 1467 (Source A), Edward made a secret understanding with Louis but at the same time was trying to make an alliance with Burgundy. Because of this, Louis is said to be talking of negotiations with Warwick to restore Henry VI, with Margaret of Anjou on the sidelines. This suggestion comes to fruition in Source D with a series of agreements between Warwick, Louis and Margaret. Thus Source B provides an explanation for what is described in Source D, while D explains some of the difficulties in bringing Warwick and Margaret together. The Sources are complementary. Both are reliable: the purpose of reports by the Milanese is to send home as accurate a picture as they can, and Source D, though we are told it was written to justify Warwick’s behaviour, is at this point simply conveying information.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Edward IV himself was mainly responsible for the crisis he faced in 1469-70.

[60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

The Sources provide information about the role of Edward himself and also of Warwick, Louis XI and Margaret of Anjou. All had some responsibility for the crisis and could be regarded as having the main responsibility. Edward caused discontent by the Woodville marriage (Sources A, B and C). He also provoked the hostility of Louis XI by his dealings with Burgundy (Source A). Warwick, upset by the marriage and the advancement of the Woodvilles (Source B) and by the failure of his attempt to arrange an Anglo-French alliance (own knowledge), eventually conspired with Louis and Margaret to restore Henry VI (Source D). Louis played the key role in bring in Warwick and Margaret together (Source D) as part of his diplomacy against Burgundy. Margaret's aim throughout was to restore Henry and thus ensure the succession of her son (Source D plus own knowledge). None of the Sources actually gives an opinion about who was responsible, but they provide the evidence on which a verdict could be formed.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of

context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

2 The German Reformation 1517-30

(a) Study Source A

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the building of St. Peter’s at Rome’ (lines 1-2). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of the topic.

St Peter’s was the central Church in Roman Catholicism and its rebuilding was a priority for Pope Leo X – the Source refers to the building being in a poor state (lines 4-5). However, the expense of this was only manageable through the distribution of indulgences (as the Source says in line 1). For own knowledge, some may explain that St. Peter was regarded as the first ‘pope’, with direct authority from Christ, and that this authority was handed down directly to successive popes – hence the need for a magnificent mother church of Catholicism where the bones of St Peter lay (as line 5 states); others might note the unpopularity in Germany of contributing to the building of an Italian church and point up the importance of nationalist feeling in promoting Luther’s message. [NB candidates are not expected to have knowledge of the origins of the belief and practice of indulgences, but they rested on the idea of penance and divine grace that was available through priests. However, some candidates may develop an answer on these lines]

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to indulgences. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Source B tells us that indulgences were popular and even honoured by a wide section of the populace. Candidates are told that Myconius was a reformer but the sharp comment in the penultimate sentence (‘Even God himself...’) does not invalidate the judgement that he is describing a widespread belief. The rest of the

Source describes indulgences as being popular; Tetzel was honoured as an indulgence preacher by the authorities. The Source was written in 1519, but this does not make it unreliable as an account of Tetzel and indulgences in 1517. Source C is written by a humanist the same year and offers a balanced viewpoint. There is some praise for Luther, but most of the extract criticises Luther's extreme dismissal of indulgences, for two reasons. Indulgences were authorised by Popes and Zasius cannot accept Luther's denial of papal authority. Secondly, although Zasius has some misgivings about indulgences, he sees a solution coming from official channels (the convening of a church council), not in Luther's personal denunciations. Source B makes clear the nationalist sentiment in Germany, but Source C makes no reference to this.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Luther's opposition to indulgences was the main reason for the rapid spread of his ideas. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

Many answers may agree with the claim, but Source B can be used to deny the claim and Source C contains a cautionary note. There is no need to doubt the claim in Source B that indulgences were popular and revered, although this did not prevent Luther's Theses receiving an enthusiastic response. Sources A and D show Luther and Erasmus agreeing in their criticism of indulgences and Source C makes clear that they were controversial. Answers might take up and develop one or more of the references in the Sources themselves (perhaps using own knowledge too) to consider alternatives for the 'main reason': the contributions of anti-foreign feeling and the impact of German nationalism (clear in Source B), the use of new printing techniques (hinted at in Source C line 23), the problems with the clergy and monasteries (Source D lines 27-28). Own knowledge may be used to consider the rapid and widespread response to the 95 Theses. The Church's response showed its alarm. Eck interpreted the attack on indulgences as an attack on a central plank of papal authority. Answers might also discuss the reluctance of German secular authorities to take action in the early days when Luther might easily have been stopped – especially Luther's own prince, Frederick of Saxony. Answers might also show how action at the highest secular level was delayed by the Imperial election of 1519 and Emperor Charles' absence in Spain. Equally, of course, some may argue that Luther's message seemed to strike a chord and proved to be very popular in

many places.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3 Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58

(a) Study Source D

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'the coup in favour of Lady Jane Grey' (lines 20-21). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

The reference is to the attempt in July 1553, with the connivance of the late king, Edward VI, to divert the succession from his half-sister Mary to his cousin Lady Jane Grey, probably with a view to preserving the Edwardian reformation of religion, but also to safeguard the political ascendancy of the Duke of Northumberland, who was Jane's father-in-law. Mary rallied support effectively. Within days the coup had collapsed and Mary's accession to the throne was secured.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for English attitudes towards the Spanish in 1554. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Both Sources reveal antipathy: hatred in Source A, fear in Source B. Both are uncomfortable about the consequences of the Spanish match: Philip's commitments beyond England are resented in Source A, and both he and Mary will favour foreigners in Source B. Source B also indicates an association between the match and the return of Catholicism, which may be implicit in Source A, in the rough treatment of the friars, but it is not spelt out. Both are foreigners in England, but A (a Spanish courtier) is more directly affected by English attitudes.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Mary Tudor achieved her major objectives in the face of strong opposition. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

Each of the Sources offered material on 'strong opposition' although its nature varies considerably, from hostility to the Spanish (Sources A and B) to rivalries among councillors (Sources C and D). Additionally she faced problems in her Parliaments and the major scare of Wyatt's Rebellion in 1554. More controversial is the notion that she 'achieved her major objectives': certainly the acquisition of the throne, and retaining it in the face of opposition (Sources C and D); the return of Catholicism (Source C); the Spanish Match (notwithstanding the difficulties highlighted in Sources A and B); tackling (though how effectively?) the divisions among her councillors (Sources C and D). Yet Source C suggests that the successful restoration of Catholicism is skin deep; while Source D indicates the difficulties of her later years, and the political dominance of her husband. Faced with these rival viewpoints, it is up to candidates to argue a case.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and

reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

4 The English Civil War 1637-49

(a) Study Source D

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'We do not fear the dissolving of this Parliament' (lines 24-25). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

Charles I had abruptly dissolved the Short Parliament in May 1640 (line 22) when it had become critical of his policies and failed to vote subsidies for him; this time, as the Source D explains, the king had effectively lost this power, in the short-term at least, since the Scottish army needed paying and MPs would not do this until reforming legislation had been enacted. The clear implication is the king cannot pay for the Scottish army out of his own pocket and so cannot afford to dissolve Parliament. [Candidates are not expected to refer to Source A, but reference to it may be made to support the explanation].

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the priorities of MPs in the Short Parliament. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Both Sources are contemporary accounts by MPs, one a speech, the other a summary of two other speeches. Source B emphasises the importance of proceeding 'cautiously and moderately' to ensure a successful parliament (and, by implication, more parliaments in the future). Source C, on the other hand, is a robust presentation of grievances (indeed, Pym 'left nothing untouched'), suggesting that Parliament's chief task was to settle the complaints of the people. In fact, Source B does acknowledge the need to secure redress of grievances, it does so as a part of an exchange, of money for the King. Source C, though, says nothing about the King's needs.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that that main reason for all Charles I's political difficulties in 1640 was his lack of money. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

As Sources A and D make clear, Charles I was short of money in 1640 and needed Parliamentary support. However, all four sources indicate the widespread unpopularity of the Personal Rule: opposition to taxes of dubious legality such as Ship-Money, certainly, but also opposition to Laudianism, the invasion of liberties, the courts of High Commission and Star Chamber, the infrequent Parliaments (which is why a triennial bill is being proposed, as mentioned in Source D). So Charles' financial difficulties in themselves don't fully explain the opposition he faced in the Short and Long Parliaments of 1640. Moreover, Charles' desperate need for money was a result of the decision to fight the Scots in 1640; without the Scottish Wars, the Personal Rule would have surely survived into the 1640s. So was the root of all his troubles the quarrel with the covenanters? Charles I's long-standing difficulties in

working successfully with Parliament (Source B) provides another angle to explore. Faced with these rival viewpoints, it is up to candidates to argue a case.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

5 Louis XIV's France 1661-1693

(a) Study Source A

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'he does not shrink from work' (lines 6-7). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

The Source provides plenty of material that can be used to explain in context the claim that Louis XIV worked hard as a monarch, e.g.: working regularly each day, holding Council meetings. Other knowledge might include the King's insistence that he governed alone or with a small group of advisers whom he dominated. Even his relaxations were seen as part of his work as king as he enforced a rigid court etiquette – the Court and all that went on there was seen as contributing to the prestige of the king and provided a backdrop for the king to display his power and magnificence. Some answers might use the Source [e.g. working only three afternoons per week, not normally working after 5pm] and/or own knowledge to question the validity of the assertion – that is fine as long as such material does not take up too much of the answer because candidates are not asked to assess the validity of the claim.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV**, while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources B and D

How far does Source D support Source B as evidence for the reputation of Louis XIV among his subjects? [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Sources B and D come from very different backgrounds: Source B was written by a courtier whereas Source D was written by an obvious critic. The interest of the writers offer some contrasts. Source B records an individual case whereas Source B generalizes about the broad situation. Source B may come from a courtier, but he reports the hostile reaction of many to the woman’s treatment by Louis. Source D’s claim that “All freedom is lost, even that of speaking and complaining” (lines 21-22) could be sustained by use of the treatment of the woman in Source B. On the other hand, Source B reports “a general outbreak of anger and indignation” (line 15) which is hardly the sign of a kingdom with no freedom. There is, however, no hint in Source B of the call for the overthrow of the king’s regime that is the basis of the sustained critique in Source D – although Source B, of course, comes from a courtier.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that, to 1693, Louis XIV used his absolute power within France for the benefit of his subjects. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

Source A supports the claim, seeing Louis XIV as hard-working, a trait that can be supported by candidates’ own knowledge. Source C supports this view and the fact that it is written by an English traveller who might not be expected to be sympathetic might be seen as adding weight to the description. However, Veryard in Source C

sees the population as 'brainwashed' by the clergy. Sources B and D offer different views of Louis' use of his absolute power and their value can be assessed by candidates. Examiners should note that the question is about power 'within' France - answers are not expected to have knowledge and understanding of the use of absolutism to promote foreign policy. Louis' absolutism gave France a long period of internal peace. Most answers may argue that Louis was mostly popular to 1693. On the other hand, some may argue that Louis governed for his own benefit, rather than in the interests of his subjects. Conditions were harsh for many, for example in Louis' many fiscal exactions (hinted at in the references to tax demands and the request for exemption in Source B lines 10-11). Own knowledge might be combined with Source D to consider the impact and 'benefit' of Louis' religious policies: the author is a Huguenot suffering exile after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) but against that might be set contemporary ideas about the danger to a state of dissent so a king who rooted out 'heresy' was serving his people well.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2582
January 2006**

Unit 2582/01

JANUARY 2006

The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-92**1(a) Study Source B**

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘the treasonous and revolutionary movements which had occurred in the Estates General’ (lines 10-11). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of the topic.

The quote is not from Necker: he is reporting reactionary sentiments by the Minister of War justifying troop movements. The growing independence of the Third Estate, the demands that credentials be established in joint session, the declaration of a National Assembly (17 June) and the Tennis Court Oath (20 June) worried conservatives. On 27 June, after initially resisting the idea in a special session (*séance royale*), the King gave way and allowed the National Assembly to go ahead and vote by head and not by order. Necker had recommended the special session which ended in considerable concessions. However, to some ministers and courtiers, moves to reduce the crown’s authority and assert independence in any way was treason and revolution – something far from the minds of most delegates in 1789 but brought about by fears of counter-revolution.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding. **Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and C

Compare these sources as evidence about attitudes to the Estates General in 1789. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Source A sees the advantages of working with the Third Estate. C remembers views that the Third Estate should be sent away. Source C sees a threat to royal power – that the Third Estate would ruin everything. Source A sees a way to revive credit through public confidence and to calm the public. The dissolution recommended by the Parlement, apparently would not be possible in the opinion of Source A because there is not a reliable army. Also in Source C is the king’s own attitude, which seems closer to Source A than that of his adviser Barentin and the Queen’s circle (Source C) He is prepared to see the Third Estate as his children and agree to reducing privilege – this would accord with the aims of Saint Priest (Source A) in reviving credit and confidence. Both Sources deal with government and court opinion. In Source A, Saint Priest is writing at the time, a concerned and conscientious minister aware of

the need for reform. Barentin (Source C) sees reform as too dangerous. The recollection some time after of the advice of the circle of royal friends could be clouded by knowledge of the subsequent events which is not open to the author of Source A. The two sources are quite different in nature – one a letter of advice, the other a memoir written with hindsight and hostility towards the revolution.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the loss of royal authority in 1789 was mainly the fault of the King himself. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

The discussion is whether a well-intentioned king, torn between conflicting views in a totally unprecedented situation could have avoided losing control of events or whether foolish errors and indecisive behaviour lost Louis all the kudos of calling the Estates General and brought about suspicion and distrust which allowed the situation to get out of hand. Could Louis have done anything better or did he swing between concession and disapproval of change, thereby getting the worst of both worlds – having to make change without getting the credit for it? Source A might show that there was good advice available and that the King had a chance to make the Third Estate work – as Louis himself thought according to Source C. Source D confirms the possibility of ‘creative partnership’. However this is to ignore the growing radicalism, fuelled by economic and social problems and the constraints of the king’s whole background. Source B shows the king losing control of the situation but Necker is writing with a degree of ‘special pleading’ – implicit is the view that if only his advice had been followed, but the royal session held on his advice did not yield a very good outcome in June. The weakness in government however is supported by other evidence and seems typical. Source C shows a stronger Louis, resisting the doom and gloom of Barentin, the Parlement and the Queen and her friends. The trouble was that by June it was too late: the chances of the King taking the lead in working with the Estates General had been lost by the vacillations of May and June over procedures, and the King showed himself indecisive in June. This is the view in Source D which alludes to the disappointments following the first meetings of the Estates General and the failure either to dominate or to work with an increasingly confident National Assembly. Fears of repression led to the events of July – the Storming of the Bastille referred to in the last line of Source D. Answers might set other factors – e.g. the rise in revolutionary ideas, the high prices, rural discontent,

the power of the Paris mob, the failure of the state to control open discussion and criticism – against the narrower factor of Louis’s weakness given in the question.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only ‘own knowledge’ will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

The Condition of England 1832-53

2(a) Study Source D

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘The rigours of the 1834 system’ (lines 25-26). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of the topic.

Principles of the New Poor Law system included indoor relief at the expense of outdoor, extension of the workhouse system to effect indoor relief by applying rules of less eligibility to ensure conditions were below those in employment, a centralisation needed to implement this. The distinction made between the able bodied poor where ‘rigour’ was to be applied and the deserving or impotent poor was an important part of this. Other aspects can be credited if the focus is on ‘rigours’ of the new system. Such a change was controversial. The historian refers to ‘rigours’, implying a critical judgement on its practice – the workhouse seen as a new Bastille for the poor with stress on the moral and psychological effects this had; answers may refer to these (e.g. separation of families, diets, work routines).

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding. **Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to the Old Poor Law. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Both Sources are critical of the Old Poor Law, but their criticisms are made from different perspectives: Cobbett's (Source A) from a radical one, Everett (Source B) from an official, Benthamite stance that Cobbett despised. Differences arise both from this and from whom they blame. Cobbett (Source A) accuses two groups of sabotaging what for him is an otherwise reasonable 18th century welfare system – the idle able bodied poor (whom Everett also blames in Source B) and corrupt local officials and their contractors (publicans, corn suppliers, small farmers using the system to subsidise wages and authorities who invent useless jobs for them to do). In contrast, Everett in Source B accuses the poor and the Old Poor Law itself which he argues pauperises them into dole dependency via high birth rates, all encouraged by the Speenhamland system. The key difference lies in how they view rich and poor. For Cobbett in Source A, the poor are mainly victims, exploited by the rich who unjustly force their wages down. For Everett (Source B), the poor have been morally undermined by the old system and become intimidating in their demand for relief. Both Sources comment on increased poor rates and growing dependence on relief. Both Sources use the same language and tone and regret the decline in the condition of the labouring classes. Their agreement on some issues is revealing given the provenance, a radical journalist and an Assistant Commissioner whose findings were included in the 1834 Report. Some may note that both generalise and judge, Everett in B attacking the poor, Cobbett more concerned to attack corruption. Both Sources exhibit preconceived ideas but, as such, they offer useful evidence.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using **all** these Sources **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that changes to the Poor Laws were driven by moral judgements about the poor rather than concern for their economic and social problems. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

Candidates will need to distinguish between moral judgements (a belief that the condition of 'Pauperism' was spreading and this was a moral evil – dole dependency, aggression from the poor, large families etc) and economic and social concerns (the former being employment issues, rural and industrial problems, wage levels; the latter focusing on age, disability, lack of education, housing, disease etc.) Candidates are likely to conclude that **moral** judgements were the more important. Sources A, B and C (all contemporary Sources and pro-change) stress moral judgements from different angles (Cobbett's radical, pro-poor stance in Source A; Everett in Source B and the auditor in Source C taking an anti-poor stance). The historian in Source D confirms that Pauper repression, the view of B and C, was the main priority of social policy. None of the Sources came from the poor themselves, a potential weakness as a set. Sources A, B and C all pass moral judgement on the able bodied poor who are seen to be the core of pauperism, given to laziness and drink and aggressive in their attitudes (e.g. riot, undue pressure on overseers). However, they also point to **economic** concerns. Cobbett in Source A stresses low wages in creating poverty, Everett in Source B the cost of the rates and its impact in distorting employment whilst the auditor (Source C) refers to change in 1834 as providing a stimulus to industry. He is of the opinion that a free labour market has been achieved and lazy surplus labour absorbed (although he admits this is true only for his area and candidates could question whether military enlistment counts as proper employment). 'Own knowledge' could point out the persistence of the settlement laws which continued to impede a free labour market. Such a free market could also depress wages (Cobbett's point in A) and thus keep many in poverty. Sources B and C, from an 'official' angle are largely concerned with cost and in effecting Source C's 'moral reform' as the solution to poverty. The historian (Source D) points to long standing **social** problems being ignored. These could be developed via own knowledge, although the historian is keen to stress that Chadwick's original proposals intended to tackle them through separate institutions. Clearly cost (much in evidence in Sources B, C and D) defeated it. Moral judgements ensured that all the poor were subjected to conditions devised only for 'punishing' and 'deterring' the able bodied. Candidates may well briefly discuss workhouse practice and its appropriateness. From the evidence provided here only Chadwick addresses social issues and Cobbett economic ones. Everett and the Auditor see these only through their moral judgements on the poor. It was their views which drove change and the 1834 Act.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Italian Unification 1848-70

(a) Study Source B

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'the humiliating memories of 1848-49' (line 14). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

Depending on how the phrase is interpreted, some may focus on Piedmont but others may consider the revolutions throughout Italy. Mention of war between Piedmont and Austria can be expected if used to explain the defeat of the revolutions in Lombardy and Venetia and how Austria's victory paved the way for her to recover her position in the Central Duchies. Given references to 'exiles' (line 10) and to 'crushed' revolutions (line 11), French intervention to restore the pope in the Papal States might be mentioned. The way Ferdinand regained control in Naples and Sicily might be covered. Some might prefer to focus on more general reasons for the defeat of these revolutions rather than the events themselves. The Source makes clear that exiles in Piedmont were middle class and of the intelligentsia, and the failure of ordinary Italians, especially rural, to respond compounded Italian humiliation. They now looked to foreign support. The Source reports exiles in parliament and the army and as holding 'influence' in the papers (lines 11-12).

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and D

Compare these Sources as evidence for the position of Piedmont after the revolutions of 1848-49. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Both agree that Piedmont offered hope for the future. This is expressed in the first sentence of Source D. The author of Source A emphasises his support for Piedmont by declaring himself to be a Piedmontese and a monarchist even though he was a Lombard and, previously at least, a republican. Both are specific in highlighting the constitution (the *Statuto*) as a positive attribute but share the view that it was a limited measure. The independence of Piedmont is also stressed. They differ on the strength of Piedmont's armed forces. Source D alludes to the superiority of Austria's army to that of Piedmont in 1848-49 whereas Source A has great faith in Piedmontese forces. Comments on the nature of the Sources would help explain the views expressed in each. Source D is clearly analytical and matter of fact in its assessment of the events. More astute candidates will focus on the style and tone of this Source to illustrate its quality whereas weaker candidates are likely to hide behind the stock evaluation that an historian is objective and/or, as an Englishman, the author is detached. It could be argued that the historian has the benefit of hindsight and his mention of the need for an ally is based on the fact that France did ally with Piedmont in 1858. They might identify with the introductory comment about the historian's perspective on unification. Source A is clearly more subjective and idealistic, understandably from someone involved in the revolution in Lombardy and committed to the Italian national cause. Written in the first person the views expressed represent the opinion of, at heart, a romantic Mazzinian. Piedmont's support for the Italian cause in 1848-49 might explain the author's praise of all things Piedmontese.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that, as a result of the revolutions of 1848-49, Italians in the 1850s believed the expulsion of Austria could only be achieved with foreign support.[60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

Sources B and D argue that foreign support was necessary to expel Austria. Source B is specific about the preference in Piedmont for an alliance with France and envisages joint military action to secure Lombardy. Victor Emmanuel's views could be explained further by referring to his later support for the alliance made at Plombières and details of the agreement would be instructive. As described, it appears Piedmontese ambitions were limited to gaining Lombardy but the Source makes it clear that exiles in Piedmont had broader aims to liberate other states too. Some may point out the problem posed by French occupation of the Papal States. Source D makes the case for foreign support by describing *Italia fara da se* as ridiculous. It also highlights the inadequacy of Piedmontese forces from the point of Austria's recovery in 1848-49 and is explicit in stating that an ally was needed. Knowledge about the wars of 1848-49, specific battles and Radetsky's actions could be mentioned. Source D does not specify a particular ally and knowledge of the sympathy of France and England to Italian nationalism might be mentioned as could later events involving participation in the Crimean War and French help in 1859. Sources A and C deny the need for foreign support. Source A is unequivocally in favour of Italians sorting out their own problems. The author accepts a reliance on the Piedmontese army but also national sentiment, implying that one without the other would not be enough to gain independence. Candidates may well assess Italian nationalism as being weaker than the author allows, hence the humiliation of 1848-49, whilst recognising the establishment of the National Society in 1857. Similarly, it is perfectly proper for candidates to look ahead to the events of 1859 and show how weak Piedmontese forces were in the battles of Custoza and Solferino. It is clear that Source C advocates diplomacy and negotiation with Austria to gain Lombardy rather than reliance on external powers to expel Austria. Piedmont's condition could be examined with reference perhaps to Cavour's reforms and the need to modernise Piedmont as confirmation that war with Austria was not practical or realistic as the author claims. Similarly, Piedmontese independence, presented as a strength by the author, was regarded as symbolic of their defiance and candidates may refer to the way many Mazzinians and Garibaldians pledged themselves to Piedmont in the 1850's. However, Source C acknowledges some believed French and English help was desirable. Answers might refer to Piedmontese involvement in the Crimea and the objectives of that action, even suggesting the Peace of Paris might be interpreted as contradicting the case outlined in Source C for non-involvement abroad.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of

context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

The Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61

4(a) Study Source C

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'strictly Federal in its character' (lines 20-21). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

The given reference is to the view that the states which formed the United States were independent states which had come together for certain common purposes, such as foreign affairs and defence, but which remained independent states. The Source contrasts this with the view (a 'different and opposing idea') that the United States was a nation and that the states were therefore not independent states with the right to withdraw (secede) from the Union. Although Stephens was a southerner, the source gives a neutral and balanced statement of the two views.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding. **Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for views about the right of secession. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

The two Sources represent the two different views identified in the answer to sub-question (a). The key contrast is between 'the right to secede' (Source A) and 'maintain its territorial integrity' (Source B). The references in Source A to independence and sovereignty find no reflection in Source B, which places the stress on majority rights as determined by an election. The provenance of the two Sources explains their opposed views. Source A is a typical example of the Southern view that the Northern states have conducted a mounting campaign against the 'rights' of the Southern states, culminating in refusal to implement the Fugitive Slave Act. On the other hand, Lincoln is explaining in Source B why he opposes the 'right to secede' that is claimed by Floyd County, Georgia in Source A. An important

difference is that Source A makes much of the slavery issue, while Source B makes no mention of it.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the main issue which led to war was the determination of the Southern States to preserve state rights.

[60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

The crux of the matter is, did the Southern States secede to preserve their rights as sovereign states or to preserve slavery? Was slavery the real issue or merely the catalyst for a war about the nature of the Union? Source C supports the latter view explicitly, while Source D argues that the 'state rights position' was 'a shield' to protect slavery against federal interference. Both these argue from hindsight, though in the case of Source C only a few years after the war. The provenance of Source C is also important. Source A at first sight appears to support Source C, arguing that Georgia is a sovereign state with the right to secede. But this assertion of state rights, it says, has been provoked by hostile acts against slavery in the North, suggesting that this is the real reason. Source B provides support for the last point in Source D, that the assertion of state rights by the South provoked a northern backlash in the form of support for the 'national character of the Union'. For Lincoln the issue appears to be simply preservation of the Union against the state rights position, but contextual knowledge can be used to show why his election as President led to Southern fears for slavery. Candidates should have little difficulty in selecting from their knowledge of disputes of the 1850s evidence to show how important the slavery issue was to the South.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93

5(a) Study Source A

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to ‘such an agitation as that which took place in Ireland in 1879 and 1880’ (lines 1-2). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source’s content and the events of the topic.

The Source refers to Parnell heading the agitation. The essential nature of 1879-1880’s events was the link between Parnell’s political demands for Home Rule and the Land League’s demands for agrarian reforms. The dangerous and revolutionary situation created was a new departure. Though Parnell distanced himself from violence, nevertheless rural depression and bad conditions led to ‘outrages’, secret rural meetings, rent strikes, attacks on landlords. Answers should discuss the significance of Parnell referring to this period of acute unrest – disavowing a repeat of the Land League but warning of the consequences if his move to more peaceful political agitation fails. Though he did not link himself to unrest in the way that he had in 1879-80, he is still making use of it to pressure the government.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources B and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for connections between agrarian unrest and the campaign for Home Rule. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

In terms of content, Source B says that Parnell will use his parliamentary skills, of which there is no mention in Source C, to point out that the government cannot deal with unrest and link agrarian unrest to Home Rule – i.e. blame agrarian unrest on the failure of home rule. Source C sees Parnell in a secret meeting with the radicals – he must not be seen to be openly associated with them by 1886 as overt connection between the Home Rule MPs and the radicals will injure his credibility. Here, Parnell is shown as giving a measure of support to rural unrest that is not apparent in Source B, but the same link is there implicitly – rural unrest can be used. In terms of the nature of the sources, Morley (Source B) is in a position to know about Ireland and this is a letter not a public utterance. It is contemporary with events. Source C is looking back, but is a first hand account by someone also in a position to know and even more involved in events. In terms of reliability, there is supporting evidence for Morley's view in Source B: Parnell had showed mastery of parliament since 1877, making the Home Rule Party an effective parliamentary force and using agrarian unrest consistently in the way Morley describes in Source B. Source C might also be seen, despite the time gap, as typical of Parnell's ambiguous relationship with rural unrest since 1879.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Parnell's main skill as a politician was his ability to make use of agrarian unrest. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

One element of Parnell's political impact was certainly his alliance with rural radicalism in the New Departure, referred to by him in Source A. This gave the edge to political demands that had not existed when Butt ran the Home Rule Party. However, there were other important elements in his leadership, for example his greater manipulation of the House of Commons; his cultivation of an international 'image' in the USA; his manipulation of the parliamentary position of the Home Rulers in negotiations with Salisbury and Gladstone and his perception in making links with the Liberals. His rhetoric and his gravitas as a political leader (at least until the O'Shea affair) could be set against the cooperation with the Land Leaguers; also his ability to change his stance to maximize support. Source A refers to this early

radicalism and his ability to revive the threats of agrarian unrest to persuade British opinion that unless concessions are made then he will not be able to control it. Source B reflects the success of Parnell's image as moderating influence, and the cleverness in using the revived radicalism of the Plan of Campaign. Source C shows Parnell's extreme caution in dealing with the agrarian radicals – the foggy meeting at Greenwich – and his 'double game' of keeping the agitation going, but not extending it too much and keeping the radicals within the party. Source D obviously uses this and analyses how by not condemning the Plan, but waiting for it to fail he is hoping to strengthen his own role. Some candidates may know that government policies of conciliation and coercion were quite effective in undermining this radicalism, and answers may be able to add more about the contrast between the more open radicalism of Parnell in 1879 (when he was seeking to make an impact) and the more cautious approach when he needed the Liberal alliance and was aware of the hostility that radicalism could provoke after the 1882 Phoenix Park murders.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

England in a New Century 1900-18

6(a) Study Source D

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'while the activities of the Pankhursts drew attention to the cause' (line 18). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

The reference is to the militant protests of the Suffragettes, led by Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst, and her daughters Christabel and Sylvia. Brief examples of the kinds of activities undertaken and protest made might be given in answers. Although the overall effect of this militancy remains debatable. These activities drew attention to the cause, but perhaps turned more against the Suffragettes while promoting both the Suffragists and opponents of votes for women. The growth of Fawcett's non-

militant NUWSS and its increasing political influence is stressed (lines 20-22) – answers might consider that as a possible consequence of Pankhurst activities.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding. **Band VI** will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for differing attitudes towards women being involved in politics during this period. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

Source A is against giving women the vote whereas Source B is pro-women’s suffrage. Source A defends the status quo on several grounds, including the idea that women are by nature unsuited to political activity. In Source B, by contrast, this view is reversed to argue that it is because women are different that they should play a part in politics. Source A fears future change whereas Source B points to recent developments which now require a female contribution in parliament. In terms of provenance, authorship is quite important: Cremer (Source A) might be seen as a ‘typical’ Edwardian male and MP whereas Fawcett (Source B) is the dedicated leader of one wing of the suffrage movement. Cremer is speaking in the House of Commons, where he would receive a sympathetic hearing from most MPs. Fawcett, by contrast, is writing in a magazine for women where opinions would be mixed. That said, both are campaigning to win more support for their standpoint in the great argument on votes for women. The dates might also explain differences: 1906 is fairly early on in the general debate about women’s suffrage whereas by 1909 attitudes on both sides had hardened.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using **all** these Sources **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that before the First World War the arguments for women's suffrage were gaining ground.

[60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

A starting point for some answers might be the views of the modern historian in Source D: Pugh suggests that although as early as 1906 'the argument for women's suffrage was largely won' (line 15), many politicians still had to be persuaded that it was a cause worthy of their attention and parliamentary time (lines 16-18). Certainly Source A reminds that plenty of MPs were opposed to women's suffrage at the start of the period, and Source C (the cartoon) shows that as late as 1912 there were still elements in society that equated campaigning for the vote with the neglect of traditional (female) domestic responsibilities – and, by inference, women getting involved in politics once they had the vote; and such elements campaigned against female suffrage (the poster comes from the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage). However, Fawcett (Source B) argues that women's issues were becoming increasingly important concerns of government, and there were politicians (the Labour party as well as some Liberals) who were responsive to these developments and arguments. Source D take that up, outlining the major growth in NUWSS membership and the progress made in winning political support from Liberals as well as the Labour party. There is plenty of 'own knowledge' that answers can use, whether about the Liberal governments, the Suffragettes, the Suffragists, attempts to introduce legislation in parliament – all of which can be used to support whichever side of the argument a candidate wishes to take.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Nazi Germany 1933-45**7(a) Study Source D.**

From this Source and your own knowledge, explain the reference to 'He then left the details to Himmler' (line 28). [20]

Focus: Explanation of a reference.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to explain this reference in the context of both the Source's content and the events of the topic.

The reference reflects the view that whilst Hitler provided the overall policy line, it was down to Himmler to implement the policy. Himmler had proved himself to Hitler as a loyal and effective servant, and as head of the SS had set himself up as guardian of the purity of the Aryan race in the 1930s. The concentration camp system had been under SS control since 1934 and the demise of the SA. The expertise of running such camps, and furthering the terror tactics which underpinned the regime's success, gave Himmler the ideal platform in Hitler's eyes for the implementation of the Final Solution. Some answers might point out that until Heydrich's assassination in 1942, Himmler delegated details to him. The reference to 'extermination out of desperation' (line 25) could be used to reinforce the importance of implementation, and thus Himmler's central role in the Final Solution.

Answers that demonstrate broad understanding and contextual knowledge will warrant **Band III and above**, but answers are supposed to be short and even for 20 marks need not be more than one short paragraph (good candidates write effective answers in only about four sentences).

Additional knowledge, understanding and linkage to the Source will deserve **Band II**, but there will be some unevenness.

Band I will be appropriate for a clear and fairly full treatment of the phrase and its implications.

Relevant but descriptive accounts which may not offer contextual support will merit **Band IV** while **Band V** answers will show only a basic knowledge and understanding.

Band VI will see little or simplistic explanation with **Band VII** lacking relevance.

(b) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for anti-Semitism in Germany from 1935 to 1938. [40]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

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.

The issues raised by the Sources concerning anti-Semitism in Germany 1935–38 are clear – the extent to which it was taken seriously by the German population and the impact of Nazi propaganda in extending it. The Sources are largely in agreement, despite talking of different events at different times (the legal discrimination of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935 in Source A and the violence of Kristallnacht in Berlin and other cities in 1938 in Source B). The Sopade Reports (Source A) agree that most Germans did not take it seriously, claiming as evidence shopping in Jewish stores and Jewish friends, although the number who had access to either outside the large cities limits such a comment. Maschmann (Source B) in part confirms this – she is shocked at smashed windows and shakes her head. On the issue of propaganda, again the Sopade Reports (Source A) agree that there is an impact on a significant number of Germans. The Sopade Reports (Source A) comment on those who have become 'fanatical' anti-semites whilst Maschmann in Source B confirms this by her own reaction and that of the policeman. Both Sources refer specifically to

propaganda, the policeman repeating the Nazi-controlled press, Maschmann internalising it as a warning to racial enemies. The quality of the evidence is enhanced by their agreement: the policeman Maschmann records in Source B confirms the observations of the socialist agent in Source A. The Sopade Reports (Source A) are reliable, commenting in this case in a balanced manner, despite the probable socialist sympathies towards the Jews. Maschmann (Source B) is especially valuable given her own change of heart post-war, in part prompted by the loss of a Jewish friend. Her reaction may well be typical – shock at the violence and damage, then acceptance of the State’s line – ‘the National soul boiled over’ (Source B lines 9-10). Nonetheless, there are limitations, e.g. the Sopade Reports (Source A) are very general whilst Maschmann in Source B comments only on Berlin. As evidence, both nonetheless provide valuable material on anti-semitism.

Band I answers will make a good comparative use of the Sources and their provenance to make balanced judgements, analysing areas of similarity and difference.

Band II will do most of this, but the comparison will lack some balance and be less complete in the range of comparative criteria used.

Band III answers will attempt genuine comparison, but with less assurance and balance, and perhaps with descriptive section.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may only be a paraphrase.

Answers in **Band V** will show only a basic understanding of the Sources with the identification of only a few points.

Band VI answers will paraphrase.

Band VII answers will lack any comparison or will use only one Source.

(c) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the decision to implement the Final Solution arose mainly from a long-standing and widespread hatred of the Jews. [60]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all four 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.

The issue here revolved around the debate that the decision to exterminate all Jews was long standing and based on the widespread support, implicit or otherwise, of the German people. An alternative view would be that it evolved and had more to do with wartime circumstances in the East. The Sources provide little direct evidence for any long standing desire to exterminate, either by the regime or through popular prejudice. The Socialist agent (Source A) and Maschmann (Source B) do refer to significant numbers and Maschmann to legitimate violence and something ‘terrible’, but this is nothing tangible. ‘Own knowledge’ could provide examples, both of popular anti-Semitism and of Hitler’s own long standing personal hatred (*Mein Kampf* and especially the January 1939 speech to the Reichstag). However, on the issue of widespread hatred of the Jews the Sopade Reports (Source A) and Maschmann (Source B) do to an extent, demonstrate this but do not comment on whether this was a reason for the decision to exterminate. Their conclusion is that a significant minority hated the Jews and own knowledge could point to the power that it wielded. Their value as Sources (Socialist and Nazi) can be demonstrated and their language is significant: the socialists’ use of the word ‘fanatical’ (line 4) and their speculation that Jews may be ‘abandoned’ by the German people at some point in the future (line 7), whilst Maschmann abandons ‘critical reflection’ (line 11). Sources C and D

provide implicit evidence of Nazi long standing hatred and shed some light on the decision itself. Clearly this was not one taken by the German people themselves. Hoess' evidence (Source C) is indirect - he is merely taking orders and clearly provides nothing on the decision being pre-meditated or the reason behind it. As a Source, C is conditioned by the circumstances of the Nuremberg Trial, where Hoess was defending himself as someone who only took orders from others. The blame will lie at Hitler's door and Hoess is clear that Hitler took the decision: 'The Führer has ordered' (line 16). No record survives of Hitler's reasoning, but 'own knowledge' can certainly point to his beliefs. Farmer (Source D) does suggest that policy was evolutionary and that a decision was more sudden and short term, citing earlier preferred policies (segregation, emigration, ghettos) and especially the military difficulties of the 1941 autumn campaign against the Russians, combined with the acquisition of millions more Jews. He does not mention longstanding and widespread hatred. However better candidates might spot that Farmer (Source D) refers to the 'initiation' of a decision in the autumn, 'out of desperation' (line 25), whereas Hoess (Source C) is quite clear that he was informed of it in 'the summer of 1941' (line 15), before matters could go wrong in the USSR. It could be explained as a euphoric reaction to victory over 'Jewish-Bolshevism'. Such a disagreement prompts questions about Sources C and D but, given the lack of precise evidence and the secrecy that ensured this, answers could certainly conclude that hatred of the Jews could not be assumed in the majority of the German population, nor was it a cause of extermination - although Farmer (Source D lines 23-24) talks of Russian anti-semitism assisting extermination in the East.

Answers in **Band I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all the Sources, possibly with their limitations, and own knowledge and advance an informed and reasoned judgement on the question. Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the major issues, offer a range of contextual points and set the Sources alongside them should reach **at least Band III**. Answers limited to use of the Sources will have a **ceiling of Band III**. Answers using only 'own knowledge' will have a **ceiling of Band IV**.

Band I answers must address directly the assertion in the question and will be well balanced.

Band II answers will demonstrate similar qualities, but with less assurance, possibly omitting use of one Source.

Band III answers will be somewhat unbalanced between Sources and own knowledge, but will still demonstrate some understanding of the major issues in the question. The Sources may often be used for reference rather than analysis.

Band IV answers will show an evident imbalance between analysis of the Sources and contextual knowledge, being confined largely to rehearsals of the Sources or of context with little attempt at cross-reference or evaluation. There may be sequential discussion of the Sources.

Answers in **Band V** will attempt an answer, but will offer only the most basic response, with much that is likely to be implicit.

Band VI answers will be weak, missing the main thrust of the question.

Band VII answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2583
January 2006**

UNIT 2583**England 1042-1100****1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066**

(a) Assess the claim that Edward the Confessor's personality was the most important cause of his problems as king.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a ruler's problems.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It might be said that Edward the Confessor lacked the strong qualities to make an effective king. His piety and artistic interests were admired but for his ideals rather than for their practical relevance to kingship. He could also be unwise and rash in his judgements. Among other problems that might be considered are his foreign associations; he did not have a firm basis of support among the Anglo-Saxon nobility. There were problems that followed from his continuing patronage of Normans. There were foreign dangers, especially from Scandinavia. A king's powers were limited and he needed to be able to implement whatever authority he possessed. He had to deal with strong families, especially the Godwins. Candidates might examine the problem of succession.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far was the English Church in need of reform by 1066?

Focus: Assessment of the condition of the Church at a specific point.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How far...?' means that candidates should consider the issue of the need of reform but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the need of reform. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on the Church's problems. The Norman victory in 1066 helped to shape a view of a weak and corrupt Anglo-Saxon Church but candidates might challenge this. Although not particularly zealous, the Church was not in dire need of reform. Relations were maintained with the papacy. There were close relations between Church and State. Bishops helped in administration. Their general quality was adequate (if not up to the standard of Lanfranc and Anselm). Candidates might make assessments of Archbishop Stigand. Candidates might examine the cultural state of the Church, including the comparatively modest buildings, but this would not necessarily lead to the conclusion that reform was necessary. Some

candidates might use their knowledge of the Anglo-Norman Church to compare it with the Anglo-Saxon. This will not necessarily be irrelevant but it needs to be kept within limits.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072

(a) Assess Harold's problems in his attempt to secure the English throne.

Focus: Assessment of the problems of an aspirant to kingship.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Harold became head of the Godwin family in 1053 but the period to 1066 showed his problems in maintaining his primacy among the nobility. Others, for example Aelfgar of Mercia, were influential. Although Aelfgar 'died' in 1062 (he disappears from the records), Harold's position in England was never completely secure. Candidates will surely consider and assess the problem of William of Normandy. The better answers will look more widely than the 1066 invasion to explain why William's claim was already a problem to Harold. There were other challengers such as Harold Hardrada and Tostig. The claim of Edgar Aetheling was not a serious problem for Harold. The near simultaneous challenges from William and from Harold Hardrada and Tostig did not give Harold time to secure himself on the throne. Candidates can be expected to deal with the battle of Hastings, including the pressures on Harold from the moment that William invaded. Examiners can expect analyses of the rival military strengths of the armies at Hastings.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How easily did William I suppress rebellions against his rule after the battle of Hastings (1066)? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of a king's suppression of rebellion.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - some might argue that William's success was easy, others was that it was difficult. No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might refer to the opposition to William I immediately after his victory at Hastings until he was crowned but it hardly amounted to a rebellion. The new king could rely on the fact that his main rivals were dead and that other important Anglo-Saxon nobles from Mercia and Northumberland promised allegiance. There was disorder until 1071, for example in Kent, Northumbria, the south-west and the Welsh Marches. However, the risings were mostly localised and usually arose from local grievances rather than dissatisfaction with William I's rule. They lacked leadership. Candidates might refer to the problem at Exeter, which was more serious, but order was restored after a siege. In 1069, there was trouble for William in the north with intervention from Scotland and Scandinavia. Although this was more dangerous, William enjoyed a clear military advantage and used ruthless devastation to put down the rebellion. In East Anglia, Hereward the Wake presented a brief but not too serious problem. Castles were used as means of defence, as well as being centres of administration. William's army was superior to any force that rebels could gather.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3 Norman England 1066-1100

(a) How far did William II continue the methods of government of William I? (Do not discuss the Church in your answer.)

Focus: Comparison of two king's methods of government.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How far..?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor of continuity but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of continuity. This will affect the balance of the question but, **for a mark in Band III, answers will normally require** an adequate paragraph on elements of continuity. On the whole, William II continued the methods of his predecessor. He consolidated the power of the crown, insisting on his rights against those of the nobility. He extended royal

justice and financial impositions. William II took charge of wardships and confiscated fiefs when he had the excuse. A change might be in the development of officials such as Ranulf Flambard. There was no exact equivalent under William I. Ranulf acted for the King in executing legal and financial affairs. It has been claimed that royal administration was extended because of the financial needs of William II. The reputation of William II was different from that of William I but probably the methods that he employed were mostly the same.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why Anselm had more problems than Lanfranc as archbishop of Canterbury.

Focus: Comparative assessment of the problems of two archbishops of Canterbury.

The question may be agreed with or rejected; a variety of reasons might be suggested. No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. William II agreed reluctantly to the appointment of Anselm; Anselm was reluctant to accept - not a promising start to their relationship. William II was not a friend of the Church, suspicious of any slight to his authority. He kept appointments vacant. Anselm's request to go to Rome to receive the pallium infuriated William II. There was a dispute over Canterbury's supply of knights to the King. Anselm also had problems in handling the hierarchy of the Church. The tensions were such that Anselm left the country. Lanfranc's background was similar to that Anselm's but he faced far fewer problems. He worked in harmony with William I who saw the reform of the Church as integral to his control of England. After the early part of his reign, William I was wary of papal power. Lanfranc recognised the political necessities of working with William I. (There were danger signals for Lanfranc soon after the accession of William II but the absence of discussion of Lanfranc and William II should not be regarded as a gap.)

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than

explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042-1100

(a) How far did England's social structure change during the period from 1066 to the end of the eleventh century?

Focus: Assessment of the extent of social change.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How far...?' means that candidates should consider the stated factor of change but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of change. Some answers might emphasise change whilst others might argue the case for continuity. This will affect the balance of the question but, **for a mark in Band III, answers will normally require** an adequate paragraph on change. The relationship between king and nobility changed. Candidates might consider the extent to which England became a 'feudal' country, indeed whether 'feudal' has any significant meaning as a description. The number of foreign nobles was not great in this period but they came to dominate society. By 1086, only two Anglo-Saxons held land directly from the King. Towns were little changed in social structure although there was a divergence between some that prospered and others that declined in prosperity. The structure of the peasantry was largely unchanged in this period although there was some simplification of the differences between peasant groups such as *villani* and *cotarii*. This might well have begun before the Conquest.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why some towns became prosperous during the last half of the eleventh century.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for urban prosperity in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question states that 'some towns' became prosperous but it does not require a comparative approach. Candidates might explain that some did not benefit but the point should be made quickly. New towns developed, especially under Norman patronage. They might be close to a

castle which provided opportunities to the local population. Some towns benefited as centres of administration. The importance of London was confirmed. William I confirmed its customs. Additional credit should be given when other examples are mentioned to support the argument.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

England 1450-1509

5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450–1470

(a) How successfully did Edward IV deal with the nobility during his first reign as king (to 1470)?

Focus: Assessment of the success of an important king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some nobles presented considerable problems to Edward IV. The Lancastrians enjoyed much support especially in the north. The King had to be dependent on some powerful nobles such as Warwick. He tried to win over opponents by conciliation, for example Somerset and Percy, but this did not work. Both Somerset and Percy continued in rebellion. Candidates might perhaps judge that Warwick, who took his role as 'Kingmaker' very seriously, was to present the most serious problem. Warwick believed that he was relegated in importance when others were given favours from Edward IV. The King's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville was politically unwise because it set Edward against Warwick and other important nobles. Clarence, Edward's brother, joined Warwick in a marriage alliance. This guidance does not exclude Edward's degree of success. He did win support from certain groups in the nobility that candidates can consider and assess. He provided a government that many thought fair and effective. The defeat of Edward and the Readeption of Henry VI (1470) might be considered a direct result of Edward's lack of success in handling the nobility.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than

explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Which was more important in government in the mid-fifteenth century: the council or parliament? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the comparative importance of two governmental institutions.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In order to provide the necessary comparison, candidates should give a broadly balanced treatment to council and parliament. The weight of the argument can be in favour of which institution is judged to have been the more important but 60:40 can merit any mark band whereas 70:30 might normally lead to the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given.

Band V will require an adequate understanding of one institution. Most answers are likely to claim that the council was more important but answers in **Bands I and II** might normally be expected to understand some of the strengths as well as the relative weaknesses of parliament. It is probable that most answers might be organised sequentially and this approach should not be undervalued as long as the answer includes some comparison. The council represented the formal link between king and nobles. High churchmen also played a role. Its powers were undefined but the advice available from the council was important. Strong kings were usually able to master their councils whereas weaker rulers lost this predominance. Some have claimed that Edward IV reformed the council to include members of the gentry, ending the monopoly of nobles and churchmen but this claim can be taken too far. However, he controlled it more successfully than Henry VI. Parliament was also an advisory body but it had other functions, especially in consenting to taxation. It might present petitions to the king. Parliament could also play a political role through acts of attainder. Candidates might refer to specific parliaments such as the 'Parliament of Devils' (1459) which proceeded against the Yorkists. The dates of the Study Topic in the Specification are 1450-1470. This give some guidance to what is meant in the question by the mid-fifteenth century but examiners should give some latitude to effective arguments.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

6 The End of the Yorkists 1471–1485

(a) 'The belief that Richard III had seized the throne illegally was the most important reason for opposition to him after he became king.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about the opposition to a king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How far...?' means that candidates should consider the reason stated in the quotation but also examine alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. This will affect the balance of the question but, **for a mark in Band III, answers will normally require** an adequate paragraph on the stated factor. The alleged illegality of Richard's accession gives the opportunity to deal fully with 1483 but it is unlikely that answers that consider only the 'illegal seizure' of the throne will be able to merit a high Band. Some answers might claim that Richard did not seize the throne illegally and this can form the basis of an effective answer (The question mentions the seizure as a 'belief'; it does assert the seizure was a fact). Most candidates may agree with the claim in the question but a tendency in some previous answers on Richard III has been to include too much unnecessary detail about the events tied up with the Princes in the Tower and Richard's accession and to be relatively lightweight on the rest of the reign. Richard's support was spread unevenly through England, more in the north than the south. Richard's plans to marry Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV, after the suspicious death of his wife, Anne Neville, made him unpopular. Some powerful nobles such as Buckingham and Northumberland opposed him either for real or imagined slights. By 1485 he was imposing heavier taxes in the forms of loans and benevolences. The Lancastrians remained implacable and found a champion in Henry Tudor.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why Henry Tudor became the most dangerous enemy of Richard III.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important political development.

Henry Tudor did become Richard III's most dangerous enemy. However, candidates can consider a series of reasons and no set answer is looked for. However, candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might turn the question into one on Richard's unpopularity: a variation of Question 6(a). Certainly this is relevant, but the focus should be on Henry Tudor. Richard's rule provided the context but answers should not then jump to the conclusion that Henry was the most dangerous threat. Henry enjoyed support abroad that helped to protect him when he

was in danger and provided assistance for his invasion. Charles VIII of France might be referred to. Henry's mother, Margaret of Beaufort, was a powerful influence especially after her marriage to Lord Stanley. The role of the Stanleys at Bosworth might be thought to have been crucial. Henry Tudor had a claim to the throne inherited from John of Gaunt, but it is doubtful whether this did more than provide a theoretical justification for his revolt against Richard. The invasion of 1485 showed Henry to be cautious, learning from the failure of an earlier expedition in 1483. After his march from Milford Haven, he had gathered enough troops to confront Richard at Bosworth (but still smaller than Richard's force).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485–1509

(a) 'Henry VII's character was the most important reason why he succeeded in securing the Tudor dynasty by 1509.' How far do you agree with this claim?

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about a ruler's success.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might disagree about the prior importance of Henry VII's character; their answers can devote more space to other factors. However, one would normally expect a reasonable explanation (at least an adequate paragraph) of the stated factor to merit **at least Band III**. Among other factors, the Specification mentions 'relations with the nobility, the restoration or order, finance and the law' and also the King's handling of Yorkist plots and the Pretenders. Therefore the range of possible material is wide and examiners should not look for gaps before assessing what is explained and some factors can be considered very briefly in the time that is available in the examination. The focus should be to link factors with securing the dynasty. Henry was diligent and careful, willing to take trouble over the details of government. However, his austere nature can be exaggerated. Money was spent on the court and on expensive buildings. He could be decisive and was realistic. Marriage to Elizabeth of York was a shrewd move; other marriages were also seen as a means of securing the dynasty. He dealt with Yorkist plots and the Pretenders effectively using a combination of 'carrot and stick'. On the whole he avoided dangerous foreign policies but was determined to put an end to Scottish support for rivals.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the claim that Henry VII was more a ‘medieval’ than a ‘modern’ ruler.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about a ruler’s characteristics.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In considering Henry VII as a medieval king, candidates are not expected to have detailed understanding and knowledge of kingship before 1485 (the beginning of the Study Topic). Change and continuity can be considered within the context of his reign. As a ‘medieval’ king, Henry VII claimed the throne by inheritance. He stressed continuity through the ceremonial of the court. He tended not to inaugurate new institutions. For example, the greater use of the Chamber at the expense of the Exchequer took previous trends further. As a ‘modern’ king, Henry exercised more personal control and improved the bureaucracy. There was less reliance on the nobles. He gave England a greater degree of stability than kings had managed for a long time. Some might claim that the Council Learned in the Law was different. The reorganisation of existing courts (for example Requests and Star Chamber) represented more change than continuity. Local administration saw the roles of the existing sheriffs and JPs transformed.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509

(a) Examine the most important characteristics of ‘bastard feudalism’.

Focus: Examination of a description of a characteristic of medieval history.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Land was still the most important basis of society, with its system of hierarchies and obedience ultimately to the king. But it

was breaking down by the middle of the fifteenth century. Nobles surrounded themselves with larger groups of retainers who were in effect private armies. The patronage of great families such as those of Lancaster, York or Warwick rivalled the control exercised by kings, especially weak kings. 'Bastard feudalism' can be linked directly to the over mighty subjects who were a characteristic of the period. The growth of a money economy also meant that kings were more willing to accept funds rather than money to serve their purposes. This led to a weakening of some of the bonds between kings and powerful nobles. Candidates might explain the importance of livery and maintenance. The civil unrest (Wars of the Roses) was a cause and effect of bastard feudalism. Particular reference might be made to the rule of Henry VI and to aspects of the reigns of Edward IV and Richard III.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How did economic changes affect the 'middle classes' in the period from 1450 to 1509?

Focus: Assessment of the social effects of economic change.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question is based on the second Key Issue in the Study Topic, 'What were the most important changes for other [i.e. non-noble] groups? The middle orders in the mid-fifteenth century, changes by the early sixteenth century'. The focus should be on the links between the economy and the middle classes. It is not a comparative question; candidates might comment whether the middle classes were affected more or less than other social groups but this is not required for any mark and the point should be made very briefly if at all. The rural middle classes - lesser knights and gentry - tended to gain by their ownership of land but the change should not be exaggerated. Urban middle classes gained through the expansion of trade and commerce. Some became very wealthy. However, the extent of the changes was again limited. Overall, the position of the middle classes was confirmed rather than transformed.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less

effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

England 1509-1558

9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509-1529

(a) How far did Wolsey achieve his aims in foreign policy from 1515 to 1529?

Focus: Assessment of an important minister's success in foreign policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How far...?' means that candidates should consider some achievements but also examine the alternative of failures. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of either success or failure throughout the period. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require adequate paragraphs on some aspects of both success and failure. It is difficult to argue that Wolsey was never successful. However, Wolsey's ultimate failure cannot be denied because it was tied closely to his fall. A discriminating factor will be the explanation of Wolsey's aims. Limited answers might assume them and concentrate on uncritical surveys of a series of events. Wolsey sought to serve the interests of Henry VIII, enabling the King to appear as the successful and expansionist monarch, especially arisen France. He tried to take advantage of the rivalry between Habsburgs (especially Charles V) and the Valois King Francis I. He wanted to keep on good terms with the papacy although his personal papal ambitions are debatable. He sought to preserve a balance of power in Europe. Some of these aims were contradictory and much depended on others. Among successes were the Treaty of London (1518), an ambitious alliance between European powers against the Ottomans but it soon fell apart. The Field of the Cloth of Gold (1520) provided Henry VIII with a splendid stage but the effects were short-lived. Charles' victory at Pavia (1525) represented a setback for Wolsey's role as a leader of European diplomacy; Charles V was now in the driving seat. Attempts to build a closer alliance with France led to the Treaty of Cognac (1526) but it was a limited success. The divorce worsened relations with Charles V.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why the Divorce issue brought about the fall of Wolsey.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important political and religious development.

An assessment requires candidates to explain and weigh factors. The claim that the Divorce led to Wolsey's fall cannot be denied but there will be differences in the judgements about the importance of this and other factors - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. From about 1527, Henry's priority was to the end of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon and a new marriage to Anne Boleyn. Wolsey's joint role in Church and State meant that he was inevitably in the middle of the issue. None of the ways in which he tried to resolve of the problem worked - probably they could not have worked. But other factors contributed to Wolsey's fall. Henry VIII was notoriously impatient of ministers who seemed to have failed him. Wolsey had offended powerful groups among the nobles and courtiers. Anne Boleyn and her faction became an increasingly important factor. Wolsey's power depended on the King.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529-1558**(a) Assess the effects of the factions at court during the last part of the reign of Henry VIII (from 1540) to the death of Edward VI (1553).**

Focus: Assessment of the effects of faction in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected when applied to the importance of factions - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question is based on the third Key Issue and associated Content, 'How far did factions threaten the stability of the throne? Problems of faction at court (especially the Seymour and Howard families), their impact on the throne.' The Seymour faction benefited from its link to Jane Seymour, mother of Edward VI. Edward Seymour (later Duke of Somerset) allied himself to the more Protestant groups at court, including Crammer but his influence varied in the last years of Henry VIII's reign. The Seymours gained power early in the reign of Edward VI and also lost it. The Howards proved more lasting in their influence during this period. Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, survived as a leading figure in the reign of Henry VIII, supporting the religious change but more conservative than Cranmer and Cromwell. He narrowly survived Henry's wrath in the final weeks of Henry VIII's reign. The reign of Edward VI saw Norfolk and the Howards taking a back seat, but their influence was restored under Mary I.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the claim that Mary I was more successful in governing England than Somerset and Northumberland.

(Do not discuss religion in your answer.)

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about comparative success in governing.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should note the prohibition in the question. (There is a separate Study Topic on Church and State and this condition prevents overlap in questions.) Some might argue that the three were equally unsuccessful, a valid line of argument although one would **normally expect more discrimination for Band I**. There might be two common approaches to the question. Some might devote about a half of their answers to Mary and a half to Somerset and Northumberland combined. Others might give about a third of their time to each. Both approaches will be equally valid. Mary's accession was well-received especially after the abortive attempt to replace her with Lady Jane Grey. Her reign was not long but she escaped the violent ends of Somerset and Northumberland. The significance of the Wyatt rebellion (1554) can be assessed. She got on reasonably well - but not without some problems - with Parliament. She tried to introduce some modest economic/financial reforms. Her marriage to Philip of Spain will be relevant. It proved very unpopular especially when it involved England in an unsuccessful war with France. Somerset's personal style of government as Protector proved unpopular with colleagues. His economic and social policies were resisted by powerful forces. His foreign policies involving Scotland and France were largely failures. Northumberland adopted a different style of government but his ruthlessness did not win him friends. His downfall came quickly as he sought to prevent the accession of the Catholic Mary Tudor.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there

will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

11 Church and State 1529-1558

(a) How extensively did Henry VIII attack Catholic practices and beliefs during the years from 1529 to the Six Articles (1539)?

Focus: Assessment of a controversial religious policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How extensively...?' means that candidates should consider the extent of change and continuity. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of 'attack'. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on the stated factor. A frequent characteristic of weaker candidates is that they are unsure about chronology. Whilst examiners should be open to alternative explanations, material after 1539 should not be given credit. (Examiners are unlikely to read long accounts of the period before 1529; introductions about previous developments can be relevant to begin the answers.) The Act of Supremacy (1534) was the climax to a series of anti-papal measures that began with the meeting of the Reformation Parliament in 1529. The Act of Succession (1534) displaced Mary's claim to the throne in favour of Elizabeth. The dissolution of the monasteries (1536-39) saw the end of important Catholic institutions with their particular practices and beliefs. However, the King avoided the introduction of radical Protestant practices and beliefs. The organisation of the Church remained largely unchanged. The Ten Articles (1536) were moderate, confirming many Catholic features. The Bishops Book (1537) was moderate. An English Bible was authorised (1539) and Catholic practices were attacked in 1538, perhaps more for foreign than domestic reasons and promoted particularly by Thomas Cromwell. There was a reaction in 1539 with the Six Articles. These represented a major shift towards Catholic practices and beliefs. Overall, the picture can be interpreted as one of moderate change or of a cautious and uncertain course of action and policy. By 1539, the major reformed Protestant establishment was still in place but doctrine and many practices showed few differences.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the claim that the most important reason why Mary I's religious policies aroused opposition was her marriage to Philip of Spain.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about the impact of religious policies.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Mary I married Philip of Spain (1554) and the outcome was the Wyatt rebellion. This was a marriage into one of the most Catholic countries in Europe. And Spain was one of the most powerful countries, which led England into an unpopular war. Mary was advised against the match by most of her council. To that point, it can be argued that Mary's religious policies had not aroused undue opposition. Much of England was still temperamentally Catholic in 1553 and the circumstances of the Queen's accession won her sympathy. Her first Parliament agreed to repeal the legislation of Edward VI's reign but it was clear that monasteries could not be restored because of the problem over land. The issue of the restoration on papal power was more divisive. The ejection of clergy, usually because they were married, was unpopular. Pole's influence encouraged Mary. A treason law was introduced and heresy laws were revived. The extreme persecutions and executions increased from 1555, causing more opposition to Mary's religious policies; those who suffered were widely seen as martyrs. Candidates might discuss issues such as these and the best answers should assess their importance and provide some priorities of importance. A valid alternative argument might be that Mary's religion did not cause widespread opposition and, therefore, candidates might challenge the question.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

12 Social and Economic Issues 1509-1558

(a) Assess the claim that private charity did more than government legislation to help the poor during the period from 1509 to 1558?

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about the treatment of the poor in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Private charity was important and accepted as a means by which the rich would discharge their Christian and public duties by alleviating the hardships of the poor. It tended to be more apparent in the towns than in the countryside. Candidates might refer to schemes in London and Norwich and perhaps to some other local examples. Government attempts to alleviate the problem of poverty were intermittent. Thomas Cromwell made some attempts (1536) as did Somerset and Northumberland. Mary's government addressed the problem but with little success. Various methods were envisaged. The usual policy was to differentiate between the deserving and undeserving poor. A

punitive Vagrancy Act (1547) was balanced by a bill in 1552 that allowed for the collection of rates to assist the poor. Legislation allowed public works to be founded at a local level; governments lacked the means to implement national action. More frequently, rulers encouraged private charity. This meant that the extent and effectiveness of provision for the poor was sporadic; much depended on the lucky combination of a person with wealth and the inclination to do something for the poor, often in the parish of his (occasionally her) origin, through the provision of alms houses, a water supply, hospital or school. Some might argue that government action hindered assistance to the poor when the monasteries were dissolved although the extent to which monastic houses carried out charitable works varied.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the claim that government policies made the problem of price inflation worse during the period from 1509 to 1558.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about an economic problem.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might disagree about the consequences of government policies and point to the greater importance of other factors in worsening inflation. In such cases, their answers can devote more space to other factors. However, one would normally expect a reasonable explanation of government policies to merit at least **Band III**. In addition, examiners should note that the question does not require a comparative approach. It only asks about the link between government policies and inflation and answers that focus on this can merit the highest mark. The causes of price inflation have been much debated but examiners will note that candidates are not expected to discuss the views of individual historians. Historiography is not an AS level assessment criterion although accurate references should be given credit. Inflation probably increased by about 50% during the specified period. Currency debasement was attractive to governments, especially those of Henry VIII, from the time of Wolsey, and Edward VI that were hard hit by rising prices. In the short term the policy made exports cheaper but the long term effect was to lower the value of the currency. Whilst Henry VII was parsimonious, Wolsey did not handle finance particularly well and Henry VIII was more extravagant. For example, his foreign policy was expensive. Somerset followed a similar policy. Some candidates might claim that nobody made the connection between debasement and inflation. This might be true of the reign of Henry VIII but the link was made by the middle of the century and Northumberland and Mary tried to remedy the problem. Attempts to remedy some factors that were thought to cause rising prices, such as enclosures, were sporadic and ineffective. Candidates might

argue that some causes of inflation were outside the control of governments, for example the growing population. There were years of famine. The influx of bullion from the New World during this period was not a major factor.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

England 1547–1603

13 Church and State 1547-1603

(a) Assess the main reasons why Roman Catholicism declined in England during the reign of Elizabeth I.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a religious phenomenon.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might consider a variety of reasons including Elizabeth's wish not to pursue religious policies that would divide the country. Reference might be made to the Settlement (1559) which retained some conservative features, especially in the communion service and vestments. However, firmer actions were also taken including measures against recusants although these were enforced unevenly. It might be argued that the loss of priests removed a central requirement to practising Catholics and that the missionary priests from the 1580s had little effect in spite of the government alarm at their threat. Persecution tended to be directed at a minority of Catholic enthusiasts and most could continue quietly in their beliefs. The Church of England was increasingly seen as the national Church and could accommodate conservatives. Specific developments such as the papal bull (1570) and the Armadas might well have lessened the enthusiasm of some Catholics.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted

range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How important were Elizabeth I's archbishops of Canterbury (Parker, Grindal and Whitgift) in dealing with the problem of Puritanism?

Focus: Assessment of the contribution of archbishops of Canterbury to anti-Puritan policies.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How important...?' should lead candidates to consider a variety of factors with the most successful answers putting them into some order of priority. Candidates might approach this question in two ways. They might argue that factors other than the archbishops were most important and therefore give them little attention or they might focus on their roles whilst still considering other factors. Both might be valid lines of argument but the second is more likely to achieve high results. When adopting the first approach, the answers should still demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the archbishops. Parker was archbishop from 1559 and very involved with the settlement. He supported a moderate line which suited the Queen but was willing to take a firm line to resist some Puritan demands, for example over vestments. He was influential in the Elizabethan Prayer Book, the 39 Articles and the Advertisements which established Anglican orthodoxy and became the foundation of a Church that managed to resist the more extreme Puritan demands. Grindal was made archbishop in 1575 in the hope that he could bridge a gap between moderate Puritans and more orthodox Anglicans. However, his sympathies led to his suspension and answers may argue that it is thus difficult to make a case for his importance in dealing with Puritanism. Whitgift, archbishop for the rest of the reign, was a much more positive leader. He took a very firm stance against unorthodoxy and pressed his bishops to follow. Ecclesiastical courts and Star Chamber were used. He was behind some very determined prosecutions of radical Puritans. The other factors that candidates might consider include the Queen's own policies, the use of legislation and intervention in parliament, and divisions within Puritanism with the development of separatist groups. The question does not ask candidates to assess how successful were the measures against Puritanism but a brief assessment would not be irrelevant. More significant will be the awareness of the methods that were used.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

14 Foreign Affairs 1547-1587**(a) Assess the reasons why Mary, Queen of Scots, was important in Elizabeth I's foreign policy to 1587.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important political problem.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Mary was the direct descendant of Henry VII and could claim to be the legitimate Catholic heir to the throne on the death of Mary I. This was immediately important to Elizabeth I for two reasons. Mary, Queen of Scots, was the legitimate ruler of Scotland, to the north of England and for long a problem for England. Secondly, she was married to Francis II of France (1559-60). On her widowhood, she was a very good match. The Calvinist rebellion against Mary presented an immediate problem in foreign policy to Elizabeth I. This was linked to Mary's connections with France. Mary's flight to England (1568) raised other problems of foreign policy. France would normally support her. Other Catholic powers might have been expected to have favoured her but Philip II of Spain was cautious. He saw little advantage in replacing Elizabeth by a Queen who might be close to France. There was some but limited support for plots to put Mary on the throne. De Spes, the ambassador, was more enthusiastic. A problem for Elizabeth was how far to proceed against Mary because any policy would have significant implications for foreign policy, involving the two most powerful countries in Europe. Candidates should end their arguments in 1587 but might summarise the position then; it was not a coincidence that the Spanish Armada followed a year later.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why England maintained mostly good relations with Spain from 1554 to 1568.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a pattern in foreign relations.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. This is a Unit on English history and candidates are not expected to have a detailed understanding and knowledge of Spanish history. A general understanding of Spanish policy will be sufficient especially because the question is focused on the reasons why England mostly maintained good relations with Spain. Relations during Mary's reign were dominated by the Queen's priority to restore Catholicism, linked to her marriage with Spain. Some candidates might distinguish between Mary's good relations with Spain and the growing hostility of many of her subjects. At her accession, Elizabeth I was concerned not to alienate such a powerful country. This would avoid her being entangled in continental rivalries. Trade, especially with the Netherlands, was also a

factor. Marriage might be referred to. Elizabeth handled Philip's offer reasonably tactfully.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558-1603

(a) How well did Elizabeth I's government handle its financial problems to 1603?

Focus: Assessment of a government's success in dealing with financial problems.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might argue that Elizabeth I was very successful to 1588 and reasonably successful overall. Others might claim that Elizabeth was too conservative and allowed financial problems to worsen because she was reluctant to increase taxes and left a large debt to her successor. Elizabeth was generally parsimonious with public money (and with her own - much of her personal display resulted from gifts). Few at court received financial favours although monopolies were to prove troublesome in later years. Crown land was sold: a short-term gain but dangerous in the long-term. Elizabeth generally avoided expensive foreign loans. Many domestic loans, including forced loans, were raised without interest being payable. She might be criticised for her reluctance to ask for higher rates of taxes. Fewer were asked to pay subsidies and the rate of the subsidies did not keep in line with inflation. The costs of an active foreign policy were one reason for her reluctance to be drawn into expensive commitment on the continent. The 1590s saw the government's finances worsen because of the war with Spain. Even more expensive was the Irish Rebellion. She left a debt of about £350,000. (Some have seen this as large but it was not much larger than Elizabeth inherited and was considerably less than the debts of continental rulers.) Candidates might come to opposite conclusions. They might judge that her government was remarkably successful in handling its financial problems. Alternatively, they might conclude that it was successful in the short term but only at the cost of endangering the long-term prosperity of the crown and country.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Was Elizabeth I's gender more an advantage or a disadvantage in maintaining the power and prestige of the monarchy? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the effects of a personal characteristic of a ruler.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question arises from the fourth Key Issue and associated Content in the Specification, 'How successful was Elizabeth I in maintaining the power and prestige of the monarchy? The personality of the Queen, the defence of the royal prerogative.' The focus should be on the link between gender and power/prestige. The range of possible material is very wide and examiners should be very cautious before downgrading answers because of gaps. As always, the argument will be paramount whilst the supporting knowledge can be selective as long as it is accurate and appropriate. One might expect good answers, certainly those in **Band I**, to provide a clear argument and come to a justified conclusion. These should consider alternatives, looking at advantages and disadvantages. However, even the best answers are not required to give equal attention to each. This will depend on the argument. For example, an excellent answer might claim that Elizabeth's gender was always a disadvantage, as long as it considers briefly some possible advantages. It might be claimed that her gender was widely seen as a disadvantage at the time of her accession, given the unhappy precedent of Mary I (some might know of Matilda but this is not expected). It was doubtful whether women could carry out effectively the varied duties of a monarch. Marriage exposed Elizabeth to pressures probably greater than those on a king. Answers are not required to discuss why the Queen did not marry unless this is linked to the question. Elizabeth turned the argument on its head by proclaiming her marriage to the country and her virginity as a positive quality, for example the Armada speech. This continued into her old age, for example in the Golden Speech (1601). There is little evidence that, apart from the early years, her gender was thought to make her a weak ruler. There were problems in maintaining her power and prestige but many of these were not linked to her gender and lay outside this question. At her accession, her ministers and courtiers, including William Cecil/Burghley, were concerned about the prospect of a female ruler. They changed their minds and, although there were continuing problems with ministers, favourites and courtiers, her gender was not a central aspect in later years. Answers are not required to give a continuous survey of the reign but answers in **Band I** and most in **Band II** would normally be expected to be able to discuss the situations at the beginning and end of the reign, the key issue in an assessment of 'maintaining the power and prestige of the monarchy'.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well

organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

16 Social and Economic Issues 1547-1603

(a) Assess the effects of inflation during the period from 1547 to 1603 on any two of the following social groups: landowners, tenants, labourers, townspeople.

Focus: Assessment of the social effects of an economic problem.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Answers should be reasonably balanced between the two groups. 60:40 either way can merit any mark. 70:30 would normally lead to the award of one band lower than would otherwise be given. The question does not ask for a comparison. Answers can be structured into two separate parts but one would normally expect some brief cross-reference in answers at the top of **Band I**. **Band V** will require an adequate understanding of one social group. There is no need to explain the causes of inflation but it did not harm all social groups. Many landowners were hard hit because they could not increase their incomes to overcome the effects of inflation but others were more successful. Sometimes this was done by ruthless methods including enclosure. They exploited their land more intensively. Others were lucky or clever enough to be able to engage in new enterprises in trade or industry. Tenants usually suffered because their freedom of action was more limited. Larger tenants might improve their methods and might take advantage of the troubles of the smaller, less successful tenants. Much depended on individual conditions of tenancy. Those who held their land long-term might do reasonably well. Those who had shorter leases or wished to enter into new agreements were at a considerable disadvantage. Labourers had little protection against inflation. Although the extent of a money economy was limited, inflation hit everybody in some way and the labourers could not easily increase their incomes. Townspeople varied in their reactions. Some did well, especially those who were engaged in trade or who were employed by such merchants and traders. The poorest in towns did badly and these included vagrants who often went to towns to escape the extreme poverty of the countryside.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted

range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How successfully did governments, during the period from 1547 to 1603, try to solve the problem of poverty?

Focus: Explanation of government attempts to deal with a major social problem.

Candidates might take a variety of approaches - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There is no need to assess the extent of poverty. This can be summarised quickly but it was a major problem throughout this period. Nor is there need to examine the causes of poverty at length. Governments used a combination of 'carrot and stick' methods, using aid and deterrence. During the reign of Edward VI, Somerset believed that greedy landlords were largely responsible for wide-scale poverty and he supported attempts to limit enclosures. The Hales Commission might be referred to. Northumberland took a different line. Mary I attempted some economic reforms but had little time to address the problem of poverty. Elizabeth I's government introduced a series of measures, for example the Statute of Apprentices or Artificers (1563) and the late Acts of 1597 and 1601. Common themes of these enactments were that they tried to differentiate between the needy and the lazy and they devolved responsibility to parishes, especially through JPs. While the needy were to be provided with protection and the resources to maintain themselves, those who were able-bodied were to be punished. Central government lacked the means to do much itself except to state policies. Governments also relied on private charity. The question does not ask candidates to assess the success of government policies but it will not be irrelevant to point out that the need to repeat measures reflects the lack of success.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

England 1603-1660

17 Politics and Religion 1603-1629

(a) Assess the reasons why foreign policy caused problems between James I and his parliaments.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a problematic foreign policy

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some might claim that foreign policy was not a major cause of division between James I and his parliaments. Candidates might argue that there were two basic reasons for problems over foreign policy

although they were linked. Like his predecessors, James I believed that foreign policy was an essential part of royal prerogative whereas critics came to resist the claim, especially because Parliament had to vote the funds to sustain policy. Secondly, the practicalities of James's foreign policy proved unpopular. He preferred a peaceful pattern of policy but this seemed to one of appeasement of Catholic powers, even one of excessive sympathy. Peace with Spain, a warm tolerance of Gondomar, the Spanish Ambassador, and the pursuit of a Spanish marriage were balanced by the King with an alliance with the Protestant Henry IV of France and an alliance with the German Protestant Union. Critics viewed this balance as an unsafe and weak vacillation. The issue of intervention in the Thirty Years' War proved divisive. When examining such reasons, higher credit should be given to candidates who offer some sort of priorities.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far did religious divisions increase from 1603 to 1629?

Focus: Assessment of the religious developments in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is difficult to envisage a counter-argument that claims that religious divisions did not increase although such arguments should be read carefully as examples of an alternative approach. The question asks 'How far...?' However, there was not a consistent increase in the divisions. There were differences in 1603 although they were moderated in the first instance because of varied expectations of James I. Some might refer to the diverse views and strengths of orthodox Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics. There were hopes of conciliation between the King, orthodox Anglicans and Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference and it is possible that the extent of its failure has been exaggerated but Bancroft's Canons (1604) led to the ejection of Puritan clergy. The Gunpowder Plot (1605), although the work of a small minority, increased antipathy to Catholics in general. The rest of James I's reign saw ebbs and flows. For example, the appointment of Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury (1611) mollified Puritans but the Book of Sports (1618) alienated them. Foreign policy, including war, and marriage negotiations for Prince Charles proved divisive. Most candidates might agree that the divisions were to increase in the early years of Charles I's reign. Charles's religious views favoured Arminianism and even seemed close to Catholicism by his marriage to Henrietta Maria. Laws against Catholics were not harshly enforced. Laud's influence (but not yet as archbishop of Canterbury) was apparent. Some candidates might refer to other contentious issues between King and Parliament but these needed to be explained carefully to ensure that relevant

links are made.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629 - 1649

(a) Who was more responsible for the outbreak of civil war in 1642, Charles I or the parliamentary opposition? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the responsibility for the outbreak of civil war.

No set answer is looked for because candidates might argue a case for either Charles I or Parliament but candidates will need to address the question. However, 'more responsible' means that the answers should consider both. Examiners will not look for answers that are equally balanced. Candidates can spend more time on the more responsible element. It might be argued that the King's policies since his accession in 1625 (1625-29 is outside the Study Topic and candidates are expected to have only a general and background understanding of this period) and especially the period of personal rule (1629-40) made him widely unpopular. But civil war was not envisaged in 1640 and it is difficult to see answers that end in 1640 deserving **more than Band IV**. Charles I might be seen as responsible because of his failure to win trust, his negotiations with foreign Catholic powers, the attempt to gain support in Scotland and the failed arrest of the Five Members. The parliamentary opposition became more extreme. This gained more support for Charles I but the radicals took the initiative. Their opposition was not mollified by the execution of Stafford or by concessions over prerogative issues such as un-parliamentary taxes and the abolition of the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission. The Grand Remonstrance, which was passed narrowly, and anti-Anglican measures provoked further trouble. There were rumours of action against the Queen. The London mob was used to put pressure on Charles I.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there

will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the claim that the most important reason for the execution of Charles I (1649) was his unwillingness to compromise with his opponents from 1646.

Focus: Evaluation of a claim about the reasons for a very controversial development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might argue that other reasons were more important and the most successful answers should suggest some priorities. However, answers in **Bands I and II** should give a reasonable consideration to the stated claim about Charles I. There is no doubt that this judgement of the King's policies is valid. He played out negotiations in the hope that he could finally win the day or at least in the conviction that he would not surrender his powers. Finally, he embarked on another civil war with an alliance of convenience with the Scots. Other factors might include the roles of the army officers or grandees, the members of Parliament, the Scots and Oliver Cromwell's crucial importance. Some might refer to the Levellers although their importance in bringing about the execution of Charles I is arguable. Candidates should note that the starting point is 1646, the end of the First Civil War. The background to 1646 is relevant but answers should keep this in check and avoid extensive descriptions.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

19 The Interregnum 1649-1660

(a) Assess the problems that faced the Rump Parliament (1648-53) after the execution of Charles I in 1649.

Focus: Assessment of the problems of a particular government.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might consider the extent of support for the monarchy, especially after the execution of Charles I. This was followed by a political vacuum, or at least uncertainty, because there was no political settlement. Cromwell, the New Model Army and republican politicians looked to the Rump for such a settlement but political aspirations were very different. There were financial problems for the Rump. Royalists continued to present a threat in Scotland

and Ireland; in England they were alienated but did not present an active threat. Some candidates might consider foreign policy and the war with the Dutch, with its basis in commercial rivalry, although it can be argued that the war was a problem created by the Rump. Some candidates might consider allegations of corruption although this can be exaggerated. Increasingly, the disillusionment of Cromwell, who held real power, posed a major problem especially over the issue of elections. This ended in the dissolution of the Rump. The most successful answers should suggest some priorities of importance in the problems.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why republicans were unable to prevent the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important historical development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might consider the problems faced by republicans after the death of Oliver Cromwell. Nobody else could manage a non-monarchical regime as successfully as he. Some might attempt to argue the case for an inevitable restoration of the monarchy and focus on the period to 1658, with very slight regard for the next two years. This might merit up to **Band II** but it is difficult to see such answers deserving the highest Band. Richard Cromwell was too weak to handle powerful elements in the army (e.g. Lambert) and republican political movement (e.g. Rumpers). After his resignation as Protector, neither of these other groups could achieve a stable regime. Too powerful to prevent a restoration until 1660, they were too weak to assert their own authority. On the other hand, the appeal of the royalists is very relevant. Charles II had widespread support but could not return to power as long as the republican army effectively controlled security in England. Attempts to restore him (e.g. Booth's Rising) came to nothing until power was handed to Charles II by General Monck.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

20 Society and the Economy 1603 - 1660

(a) How far can the Civil War and Republic be considered a turning-point in the development of the English economy during the period from 1603 to 1660?

Focus: Assessment of a turning point in economic development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How far...?' means that answers should consider the stated factor of a turning point but also examine it against alternative explanations. They may, or may not, agree with the prior importance of the claim in the question. This will affect the balance of the question but **Band III** will normally require an adequate paragraph on the stated factor. Turning points signify important change. Candidates are not expected to deal with all aspects of the English economy because this would be unrealistic but the better answers will focus on the assessment of the period from about 1642 to 1660, putting it in the wider context of economic development from 1603 to 1660. Restrictions on manufacture and trade diminished and there were fewer restrictions on employers. There were large sales of Church, royal and royalists' land. New landowners were keen to maximise profits. Monopolies were abolished and the large trading companies found their privileges threatened. However, the companies managed to survive the threats and were almost as strong in 1660. Overseas trade saw the adoption of more protectionist policies, especially against the Dutch and the development of overseas settlements. However, it can be argued that many of these changes originated before 1640 or that changes had been advocated before 1640. It can also be argued that the economic systems that affected most people were little changed - except that taxes increased.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the importance of the royal Court for London in the reigns of James I and Charles I.

Focus: Assessment of the importance of the Court in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected - no set answer is looked for but

candidates will need to address the question. The question is based on the second Key Issue and associated Content in the Study Topic, 'Why did London play an increasingly important part in national affairs? The Court, fashion, the seat of parliament and law, commercial and financial activity, a centre of conspicuous consumption'. The court could provide offices and direct or indirect employment. It provided patronage that could benefit well-to-do provincials and Londoners. It was the centre of government and administration. In assessing how important was London, it can be pointed out that other factors were important to London. It handled a very considerable proportion of England's trade, both internally and externally. Many rich men lived in London who were not linked to the Court.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2584
January 2006**

Unit 2584

England 1780–1846

The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783–1830

1(a) How far do you agree that Pitt's success as a reformer, to 1793, was dependent upon royal support?

Focus: An evaluation of royal support in Pitt's success as a reformer.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to focus on the factors that enabled reform to be a success, assessing their relative importance. It is likely that they will see royal support as one of many but they must address the issue fully. George III frequently used his powers to appoint and dismiss ministers. Pitt was his choice in 1783 and was expected to operate with respect to royal prejudices. The King and his 'friends' could command support in Lords and Commons and put this at Pitt's disposal on financial, economic and much administrative reform, despite the erosion of royal patronage via the latter. Where Pitt found a limit to royal support for reform was on Irish issues, Parliamentary Reform in 1785 (his bill was defeated) and slavery. Nonetheless he equally found opposition to these issues to be widespread amongst MPs. To 1793, Pitt respected George's wishes on these, his dependence underlined by the 1st Regency Crisis of 1788-89 and having to work with the Lord Chancellor Thurlowe. Candidates will need to examine the importance of other factors in Pitt's success as a reformer (How far...?) – Pitt's own abilities, the accepted need to reform after the loss of the American colonies (1787 Free Ports agreement, rebuilding trade relations with the US and the Eden Treaty with France). Answers might also include the out-maneuvring of the Whigs, peace between 1783 and 1793 with a booming economy which enabled debts to be brought under control and well thought out moderate measures that were dropped if unpopular (taxes on shops, windows and servants). Parliaments could also limit Pitt's success – both Westminster and Dublin forced him to drop mutually reduced tariffs between Britain and Ireland.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

1(b) How repressive were Lord Liverpool's governments in the period from 1812 to 1822?

Focus: An assessment of Liverpool's governments reaction to radical threats.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some candidates may err towards seeing the government as many contemporaries did – exponents of ‘Black’ and ‘unfeeling’ repression, citing the rejection of handloom weavers’ petitions, 1812–14, the Corn Laws 1815 (high bread price for the poor), the suspension of Habeas Corpus and a Seditious Meetings Bill in 1817, the Peterloo Massacre and Six ‘Black’ Acts of 1819, execution of Cato St. conspirators in 1820, resistance to parliamentary reform and a harsh approach to Luddism. Candidates will need to put this into the context of what governments faced (the extent of economic and political radicalism) and what means they had to deal with it (no police force, local militias, JPs and Home Office spies). This could confirm government repression as the only means of tackling threats or lead to a view that sees a sensible and balanced use of the law – temporary suspension of key liberties, encouragement of local authorities given the lack of anything else, separating political radicalism (and focusing on this) from economic, targeting ring leaders, pointing to practical measures in the Six Acts (prohibiting private arms) and trying to control a radical press. They succeeded in maintaining law and order in very difficult years, economically and politically.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

War and Peace 1793–1841

2(a) How far did British foreign interests change during the period 1793-1841?

Focus: An assessment of Britain’s interests in the period 1793 to 1841

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to unpack British interests – strategic security, trade, the balance of power, opposition to the slave trade, preserving naval supremacy, dealing with France and Russia etc. Effective answers will then track these over the period assessing how far they change. This can be done thematically or by choosing a particular problem to illustrate change or continuity e.g. the Low Countries and British strategic security where Britain was prepared to go to war if their neutrality was threatened, as in 1793 and again in the 1830s, or slavery, where from 1809 Britain was prepared to use naval force to the annoyance of the US. Some issues like the balance of power may demonstrate continuity in that Britain sought consistently to uphold it, but change occurred in the form of the threat – from France 1793 to 1815 and then from Russia from 1815 to 1841 (a developing Eastern Question and the Holy Alliance.) Latin America was of importance up to 1823 once British interests there were secured. Trade could be included here and is a good example of change and geographical spread, China replacing Latin America as a focus of interest in the 1830s. Attitudes to alliances is another fruitful area – these became more binding

and specific during the French Wars, culminating in the Fifth Coalition, and continued into peace via the 'Congress System', but from 1817 Britain withdrew from such European commitments, making agreements only on a temporary and specific basis, over Greece for example.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

2(b) How important was the 'Congress System' to Castlereagh's diplomacy in the period from 1814 to 1822?

Focus: An evaluation of the Congress System 1814 to 1822.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many answers may stress its importance to Castlereagh's diplomacy particularly given the opposition of many contemporaries (Canning) and later historians. From Pitt's time there had been a feeling that the French Wars had been so extensive some guarantee for mutual security was necessary if any peace was to be secured. The war forced Britain into becoming a European power, a key part of coalition diplomacy, and Castlereagh arguably wished to continue to be at the centre of European affairs in 1815, hence Clause IV of the Treaty of Vienna. This was his achievement, although candidates could question whether he saw such involvement as permanent or merely as a temporary means of ensuring French rehabilitation into the norms of post Napoleonic Europe (which the first two Congresses achieved). Certainly, he withdrew from them after this, aware that Russia's Holy Alliance was via Congresses associating Britain with her and Austria's dominance of east and central Europe and the right for Russia to intervene. It could be argued that Castlereagh saw involvement via Congress as crucial to obtaining security in Europe, safeguarding overseas possessions and promoting trade generally. That he withdrew from the 'System' with reluctance after 1818 is well known. Candidates who wish to see the System as only one part of his diplomacy (just 1814-18) could stress the importance of his relationship with France (over the Polish/Saxon question, for example), with Metternich over Italy and the German States, and his continuing concern over slavery and Latin America. It could be noted that Britain's influence 1814-1822 was more to do with her lack of territorial ambition in Europe than with her involvement in Congresses, especially when the latter threatened these after 1817. The 1820 State Paper drew a line under the 'System' although the Greek crisis in 1821 saw Castlereagh working with Turkey, Austria and Russia to prevent war.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands**

III and below will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

The Age of Peel 1829–1846

3(a) How far do you agree that Peel tackled Irish issues during the years 1829-46 only because he was forced to do so by events?

Focus: An assessment of Peel's motives in Ireland.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates could easily take a mixed view on the issue. Those who argue for the pressure of events could cite a reluctant Peel moving on Catholic Emancipation in 1829 because of the impact of O'Connell's Catholic Association and the electoral strategy implicit in the Clare by-election, his disapproval of the Whigs for bowing to the Irish pressure in the 1830s, the need to tackle O'Connell's Repeal Association which aimed to abolish the Union, and the sudden need to deal with the Irish Famine in 1845-46. It can be argued that his Irish policies were designed not as a mere reaction but to deal positively and permanently with Irish disorder (criminal and political) and with the economic problems in Ireland. For example, emancipation in 1829 which saw the electoral punishment of the Irish freeholders, a Land and Church policy in the 1840s, which sought to undercut tenant and clerical support for the Repeal Association, and a famine policy that had to react to events. On the other hand candidates could point out that Peel need not have agreed to assist with emancipation, that he genuinely wanted to pursue unpopular land reform in the 1840s (the Devon Commission) and that he believed in pre-emptive action on law and order (the Irish police and the determination to stop sectarian division by some accommodation with the Catholic Church over the Maynooth Grant, another very unpopular policy within the Tory party). His famine policies were based on experience and were, by the standards of the time, appropriate.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted

range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3(b) Assess the reasons why the repeal of the Corn Laws (1846) caused divisions in British politics.

Focus: An evaluation of the Corn Laws.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to distinguish between the relative importance of a range of reasons for their divisive nature. Some may point out that in the period 1829-38, the Corn Laws were not as divisive as they originally were, neither Whigs nor Tories moving on the issue. However, from 1838 to 1846 they became very divisive. For many they symbolised a clash over Britain's future – industrial and urban (possibly unstable) or agricultural and landed (traditionally stable). This could transfer to politics and the constitution, seen by the Anti Corn Law League as too landed and corrupt. This division soon translated into party politics, Whigs v Tories (the 1841 election) and within Peel's government between the Tory pro-Corn Law majority and a Conservative minority who argued for Corn Law reduction or repeal. The League and its tactics were also divisive, prompting the formation of the Anti League. Economic issues and the vested interests behind them were also at stake – should Britain 'protect' its food supplies (the landed view) or open them to ensure freer trade, comparative advantage and cheaper food for the working class (the manufacturing view). Were such issues more divisive than the symbolic issues? Candidates could also usefully refer to Peel himself whose policies were seen as divisive by many – he could not initially persuade even his own Cabinet, Stanley resigning, nor could he persuade the bulk of his own party. Candidates can range widely as the Corn Laws were seen as touching many issues e.g. the Chartists were suspicious of a measure that might reduce wages.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

The Economy and Industrialisation 1780–1846

4(a) 'Canals were the most important change in transport in the period from 1780-1846.' How far do you agree?

Focus: A assessment of the role of canals in transport change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to compare the impact of canals on transport with road developments, coastal navigations (which were linked to canals), tramways, and railways from 1825 to 1846. They are likely to argue that until 1838 canals were the most important change as they solved the problem of bulk goods transport posed by the growth of trade from 1780, witness the canal mania of the 1790s. However, one could stress that much still had to go by road, especially given the pre-steam power location of some industries, and middle to upper class passengers still travelled by road for most of the period. Turnpike Trusts and their effectiveness would be a useful way of assessing the relative importance of canals and roads, just as the collapse of many canal companies in rural areas after 1800 could point to roads as the more effective means of transport there. One could also point to canals as merely serving to boost an existing sea and river navigation system. Few industrialists could back a new canal purely for their own purposes (as Wedgwood did with the Trent-Mersey Canal). Candidates will need to assess the impact of railways, especially the first 'mania' for building them after 1837. They can argue the case for the eclipse of canals on both goods and passengers but could equally show how they sought to hinder railways, undercutting them and maintaining a reasonable portion of market share even at the end of the period.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

4(b) 'The ineffectiveness of the popular response to economic change in the period from 1780 to 1846 was mainly due to the decline of the artisan class.'
How far do you agree?

Focus: An assessment of the reasons for an ineffective popular response to economic change.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to assess the role of artisans (small craftsmen, handloom weavers, framework knitters etc) in the popular response to industrial and agricultural change. (Candidates may refer to both, although a concentration on industry is to be expected), setting it alongside other factors (how far?). Artisan numbers had grown in the late 18th century, especially weavers and croppers but were vulnerable to new technology especially steam powered looms and other machines that took off between 1800 and 1830. Their reaction, Luddism, 1811-16, failed to preserve their skills (1813) and labour scarcity. They were frequently behind London radicalism in its more revolutionary form and later regional Chartism. As their jobs went so they became a weakened and less educated force, and the different phases of mechanisation spread the misery more evenly. Their ability to lead was conditioned

by their exclusiveness, although Trade Unionism in the 1820 and 1830s was attractive for skilled men. Popular leaders later in the period were factory owners like Owen and the Fieldens, or Tories like Oastler. Other factors that may be considered include: the variety of popular response (Owenism, Trade Unionism, Chartism, Luddism) dissipating energies, the dependency on economics and trade cycles, the opposition of employers who were able to tap more docile cheap labour using women and children, and governments who were determined to impede the growth of worker movements (Combination Laws, Stamp Acts, Riot Acts). Some might challenge the assertion of ineffectiveness, pointing to factory reform and northern opposition to the Poor Law.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Britain 1846–1906

Whigs and Liberals 1846-1874

5(a) Assess the claim that the most important aim of Gladstonian Liberalism to 1874 was to defend and extend Free Trade.

Focus: An assessment of the aims of Gladstonian Liberalism to 1874.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to examine the importance of Free Trade to Liberalism in the period. For Gladstone, it was of vital importance and he supported the Whigs over it after 1846, whilst his budgets of 1853, 1860 and 1861 and the Cobden–Chevalier Treaty of 1860 were designed as great set pieces to establish Liberal ascendancy over Disraeli's Conservatives, still linked with Protection and the compensation of those interests said to have suffered when it went. He ensured its electoral power (low taxation, expanding trade, retrenchment in expenditure) making the Whig – Liberals the most successful party of the period. Gladstone's Liberalism was to defend free trade from Palmerston's extravagance. Middle class radicals, the press and the Nonconformists were won over by fiscal rectitude. However, candidates will also need to examine the relative importance of other aims, linking laissez-faire to free trade, administrative competence (with moves towards merit in the Civil Service and Army), reform and an international stance that backed Italy, condemned the Opium Wars with China and rejected sabre rattling (over France for example) from Palmerston. All of these could be seen as most important aims, but free trade could be seen by some as the engine to all of these issues, at least until Ireland preoccupied him after 1869.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or

less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

5(b) Which domestic reforms in Gladstone's first ministry (1868-1874) had the most impact on the Liberal party? Explain your answer.

[Ireland may be included among 'domestic reforms']

Focus: An evaluation of the impact of Gladstone's domestic reform on the Liberal party.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some of the domestic reforms had a negative impact on the Liberal party. Forster's Education Act for example played an important role in providing education for working class children but it was an uneasy compromise between Anglicans and Nonconformists, creating class divisions and alienating the crucial Nonconformists as activists and voters in the 1874 election. It is certainly a contender as to the importance of its impact. Trade Union reform in 1871, whilst equalising the law between worker and employer stopped short of what skilled workers wanted – peaceful picketing and immunity from prosecution for strikes. Nonetheless, at that stage, working men with the vote were unlikely to vote Conservative. Administrative reforms of the Civil Service and Universities were welcomed by the Liberal party. The Secret Ballot Act had a huge long term impact, especially within Ireland but it divided radical from aristocratic Liberals. Irish legislation on the Church, Land and Universities failed to have the required impact – the issue of an alien Church united the Liberals but the Land Act alienated the Whigs and did not go far enough for the Catholic Church and the Radicals, whilst the University Bill failed and almost broke the Liberal party in 1873. The Whigs especially were alienated by Irish legislation. Licensing restrictions annoyed temperance groups and the working class.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted

range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

The Conservatives 1846–1880

6(a) How far do you agree that Conservative weakness in the period 1846-1866 was mainly due to the leadership of Derby and Disraeli?

Focus: The role of leadership in assessing Conservative weakness.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to examine leadership in the period 1846 to 1866. Derby had been a Whig who moved to Peel and became leader after the split. His relationship with Disraeli was one of mistrust, both having different views on how to oppose the Whig-Liberals. Derby frequently let the opposition survive because he saw it as a national interest issue. Disraeli was suspect over Protectionism, even beyond 1852, and as the assassin of Peel's reputation. Yet their ineffectiveness can be questioned – in the 1852 election, they regained 72 MPs and had 306 (to the Liberal 325) in 1859. They remained the clear opposition and formed three governments, 1852, 1858-9 and 1866-8, not without some distinction. Derby was a respected grandee, Disraeli more of an unknown, who was suspected of deliberately preventing a reunion with the Peelites, a key issue for resolving weakness. Candidates will also need to examine the role of the 1846 split and the relative damage done, the loss of the Peelite leaders (who kept the Conservatives out of power for most of the period), the strengths of the Whig- Liberal opposition, especially under Palmerston, and the growing prominence of an urban electorate attuned to moderate reform, Free Trade and Palmerston's stout defence of British interests.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

6(b) Assess the claim that the most important influence in explaining the 1867 Reform Act was a popular demand for the franchise.

Focus: An assessment of the causes of the Second Reform Act.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will have to address the question.

A case could be made that popular demand was the key reason, especially that of the skilled upper working class in the New Model Unions and the Reform League. Its agitation and that of the more moderate and northern middle class Reform Union, whose views had become more common-place, even in Tory ranks, (a Bill had been

proposed in the 1858 Derby Government), may have prompted Disraeli into adopting Tory Democracy as a future strategy for building Conservative strength (an aristocratic and working class alliance). The Hyde Park riots may well have triggered reform, and popular demand could have been the spur to the inclusion of all householders and lodgers, transforming the urban electorate. However, some may seek to minimise the impact of popular demand. British governments had a tradition of resisting populist demands and those of 1866-67 were not especially vociferous. The Hyde Park riots caused comment because of crowd control and there is little to link them to decisions on the Reform Bill. Whilst the Reform Union was satisfied (the price of Radical support in the Commons) the Reform League was not. Working men remained Liberal and there is little evidence of Tory Democracy in practice. Candidates may put more weight on Parliamentary manoeuvring (getting a majority for the Bill), hence the flexibility on clauses. Disraeli sought deals with all but Gladstone who was forced into trying rent/rates as a means of dealing with the potential numbers of universal household suffrage. Another motive for Disraeli was to secure the succession to Derby and to secure Conservative rural influence (there were few changes here and very little redistribution) from a would-be Liberal reform. 1866-67 produced an opportunity to redraw the political landscape in Tory interests for Disraeli and his party.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

7 Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846–1902

(a) Assess the most important issues for Britain in the Eastern Question in the period 1854-1878.

Focus: An assessment of the relative importance of the issues involved in the Eastern Question.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Most may argue that Russia replaced France as the most dangerous threat to Britain in the Eastern Question although Napoleon III was problematic. The Question itself was a struggle for supremacy in the Balkans between Russia, Austria and Balkan nationalism; the issues of the Straits, the most pressing in 1854-6 and 1875-78, and Egypt and the Middle East, more quiescent in this period. Russia clearly posed a threat to the Mediterranean by invasion of the Danubian principalities and an attack on the Ottomans, using the pretence of protecting Christian Holy Places. This occurred in both 1853 and 1854 during the Crimean War, in 1875 with the ensuing Eastern Crisis over Russia's championing of Bulgarian Christians. Another contender for most important issue was how best to deal with the Ottoman Empire – to prop it

up regardless as an economic and strategic investment (but at the cost of military and naval intervention), or encourage internal reform with tolerant policies towards ethnic and religious groups. Would this be by private ambassadorial pressure e.g. Stratford Canning, or a public use of the concert of Europe? Britain was aware of Ottoman manipulation for its own ends. Of vital importance to Britain was to close the Straits to Russian warships (achieved 1856-70). Here, the defence of India and trade to the East was felt to be at stake, especially at the end of this period when France again threatened more control over Egypt via the new Suez Canal. Some may comment that Britain herself was divided throughout the period over the Eastern Question (Aberdeen and Gladstone mistrusted Turkey, Palmerston and Russell unhesitatingly backed her in the Crimean War.) Similar divisions occurred in the Eastern Crisis of the 1870s, Disraeli indifferent to Turkish atrocities, Gladstone incensed, whilst Derby and Salisbury were also at odds with Disraeli over how to react to the Russo-Turkish War and how to reverse Russia's San Stefano Treaty. The role and relative importance of the press in the Eastern Question could also be usefully discussed.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

7(b) Were strategic or economic motives the more important factor in explaining Britain's involvement in Africa during the period 1868-1902? Explain your answer.

Focus: A comparison of the relative importance of factors explaining Britain's African involvement 1868 – 1902.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A focus on just one of the factors, however well done, will **not be able to gain more than Band III**. The importance of **strategic** factors could be stressed in relation to the need to protect Indian trade routes and to limit German involvement in East Africa and French involvement in North and West Africa. Indian trade routes would explain the involvement in South Africa, the East African coast and in protecting the new Suez Canal route post 1875 (controlling the shares, the acquisition of Egypt from 1882, involvement in the Sudan in 1885 and 1898, Zanzibar 1899 and the Fashoda incident with France in 1898 over the White Nile). Some might argue that it is difficult to distinguish between strategic and economic motives where North East, East and Southern Africa is concerned. One could point to **economic** factors as prevailing in these areas, especially in Eastern and Southern Africa. Pre-1886, the strategic interests of Lord Carnarvon in Disraeli's Second Government and Sir Bartle Frere were paramount but the discovery of gold and diamonds, clear economic interests, in

the Transvaal transformed the Southern African situation (Cecil Rhodes and the Second Boer War). Coffee and tea plantations in East Africa also became economically important in the later period, whilst Cecil Rhodes's Cape to Cairo railway was clearly for profit. Whether strategic or economic interests prevailed is largely a matter of area or region or of time (as in Southern Africa). Strategic issues were often determined by economic motives although even then there are exceptions (the Horn of Africa and British Somaliland 1884).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

8 Trade Union and Labour 1867–1906

(a) 'The Second and Third Reform Acts (1867 and 1884) were the most important reasons for the expansion of Trades Union influence and power during the period from 1867 to 1906.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for the expansion of Trades Union power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

When assessing the relative importance of the Reform Acts in expanding Union power candidates should give weight to their impact. The implication is that governments were acutely aware that working class voters were being included in the electorate, for whatever purpose, and legislation on Trade Unions and 'working' issues would follow. Certainly the Second Reform Act gave the vote to skilled workers (lodgers) and in many urban areas they would be in a majority. However, few Union or working class MPs were returned. The Third Reform Act doubled the electorate, extending the urban franchise to the rural areas. One could argue that its impact on Trade Unions was therefore negligible but it applied throughout Britain and, with the Redistribution of Seats Act, constituencies became smaller, consolidating working class constituencies that could be exploited by the beginning of Independent Labour (West Ham North). Nonetheless, 40% of adult males remained without the vote, and the impact on the New Unionism of the 1880s, reaching unskilled workers, was to alienate them from the political process. For them, the Reform Act did not encourage an expansion of influence and power; direct action and violence did. Candidates could argue that both Liberal and Conservative governments reacted positively to Union issues, protecting their funds, legally recognising Trade Unionism in the 1870s (a highpoint), addressing education, housing, pension and health issues in limited ways. The Unions themselves instituted the TUC in 1868 to examine overarching political and social issues. However it could be argued that this was Liberal and traditional, hardly representing the expected expansion of influence, hence the changes in the 1880s, with the push towards

Independent Labour politics, reactions to a slowing of the economy and to an legal onslaught by employers in the 1890s. Throughout the period candidates might stress that economic developments were of greater importance. Other factors that might be considered include: the consolidation of Trade Unions (although always a minority of workers), the learning curve of governmental and employer response, the development of socialism, the argument over tactics implied by New versus Model Unionism and the integration of Trade Unionism into working class communities (e.g. mining constituencies).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

8(b) Assess the main obstacles to the creation of a Labour party during the years 1886-1906.

Focus: an assessment of the obstacles to creating a Labour party to 1906

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

It invites a rank order to be established by effective argument and comparison. One very important obstacle was that Labour's target audience, the working class, lacked the vote. Over 40% of adult males had not been granted the franchise pre-1918 and there were over seven different ways of gaining the vote. The mid and lower working class rarely qualified, not least because of their mobility. They would also be the most difficult for any party to mobilise. This set a cap to Labour's limits. Another key obstacle was the Lib-Lab tradition. Most skilled working class men and the Trade Union movement leaders remained in the Liberal camp before 1906. On progressive issues such leaders backed the Liberals. The rank and file, voters or not, might support working class Toryism via patriotism and imperialism (the Boer War). This tendency was worsened by the timidity of most working class leaders, themselves divided over tactics and policy especially socialism - the ILP, the SDF and the more middle class Fabians, who opposed independent representation. None of these were particularly concerned to join with Trade Unionism as the key to progress. Additionally, in the later period, the Liberal party became aware of the potential threat posed and went out of its way to appear progressive taking more note of Unions' legal concerns. It also moved in 1903 to an electoral pact with Labour that compromised 'independence' and might absorb Labour in a new way. Leadership, it could be argued, was also problematic. Each organisation produced its own, not always particularly capable (Hyndman of the SDF). Only Hardie pressed for complete independence from Liberalism, whilst the creation of the LRC was more a reaction to the employer offensive than a leap of faith into independent socialism. Finance was another problem for a working class party, hence the need for the Trade Unions.

Once elections were fought, from 1900, this became even more serious, although the Taff Vale case helped.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Britain 1899–1964

9 Liberals and Labour 1899–1918

(a) Assess the claim that the Liberals won the 1906 election mainly because of the weakness of the Conservatives.

Focus: An assessment of why the Liberals won the 1906 election.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Conservative weakness was certainly in evidence in 1906. The Boer War had been divisive, allowing the Liberals to rally around Campbell Bannerman. ‘Methods of barbarism’ was followed by the scandal of Chinese slavery, something which unsettled working class Tories, already alienated by an employer attack to which the Conservative government seemed indifferent. Many candidates are likely to cite Chamberlain’s Fair Trade attack on Free Trade as the key Conservative mistake. It split the party into Free Fooders and Fair Traders, allowing the Liberals to pose as the party of the ‘big loaf.’ Chamberlain was unable to make much headway with his arguments for Britain’s financial and social policy to be tied up in an imperial protection scheme. It enabled the Liberals to rally around a traditional policy. Party organisation had also declined with 27 Liberals standing unopposed. With such a record of neglect, mistakes and controversy it is likely that most candidates will attribute Liberal victory in 1906 to Conservative weakness. However the Liberals had a good election. In contrast to the Conservatives they stood on safe and well tested policies – no food taxes, repeal of Conservative Education and Licensing Acts to appease core Liberal support and repeal of Taff Vale to appeal to workers. A few also pushed New Liberalism. In addition the Liberals were well prepared – an electoral pact had been made in 1903 to avoid splitting the progressive vote thus letting in Tories, and more Liberals turned out to vote in 1906 than in 1900. Why people voted can only be guesswork, but, given that the key issue was a Liberal one, Free Trade, it is probably more likely to be Conservative weakness that led to Liberal victory.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Which was the more serious Irish problem for British governments in the period from 1909 to 1916: the Home Rule Bill of 1912 or the Easter Rising of 1916? Explain your answer.

Focus: A comparison between the 1912 Home Rule Bill and the Easter Rising as the more serious problem for British governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A focus on just one of these problems cannot go beyond **Band III**. Candidates could point out that the Home Rule crisis continued beyond 1914 (Home Rule for whom, the powers to be devolved). Before 1914, Ulster was radicalised by the Solemn League and Covenant with the South following rapidly. In comparison the Easter Rising was a brief affair, quickly ended. Home Rule had a huge impact on Parliament and within Ireland, whilst the Easter Rising was largely confined to Dublin and the met with little support there. Home Rule polarised the British political parties and even threatened to divide the officer class in the Curragh Mutiny thanks to political mistakes by Seely at the War Office. The Easter Rising did none of this. The war suspended Home Rule but encouraged a few strands of revolutionary nationalism to take a stand in 1916. Home Rule, between 1914 and 1916, threatened civil war and loyalist rebellion in Ulster while the Conservative Party went a long way in backing such extremism (Bonar Law's Blenheim Palace speech). For the Liberals, it was a return to the 1880s as they owed much to Redmond's Irish despite technically being able to dispense with them. They had to balance the Irish crisis at the same time as the international one and it could be argued that Asquith made the situation worse. However, some may stress the significance of 1916 – the spilling of Irish blood, the declaration of independence, the mistakes made in putting the rising down and the ability of Sinn Fein to exploit this locally and electorally to undermine Redmond's hold. The reaction to it proved a turning point and led to very serious problems [NB candidates cannot be expected to know of events post-1916.]

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

10 Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918–1939

(a) How far do you agree that Lloyd George's fall from power (1922) was the result of his failure to please the Conservatives?

Focus: An evaluation of the fall of Lloyd George.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers should be aware in general terms of the electoral arithmetic of Lloyd George's coalition government (specifically: 382 Conservatives and 133 Lloyd George Liberals, technically split from the official 28 Liberals still led by Asquith). The Coalition Liberals were further depleted by schemes to merge them with the Tories in 1920 in an anti-socialist stance. This meant that Lloyd George was dependent on Tory willingness to back his leadership, in itself dependent on the PM's ability to attract votes (the Coupon had been used in this way in 1918). He could not win twice as the 'man who won the war'. Yet answers might point to his vision of transforming politics into a presidential system where the efficient of both sides would work for the national good. That this was not just naive could be demonstrated by the experiences of war and the magnetism Lloyd George exerted over the existing Tory leadership (initially Bonar Law, especially Austen Chamberlain, Balfour, Birkenhead and Curzon). He did not necessarily set out to please the Conservatives, especially the rank and file. Yet, for them, he was a useful populist and anti-socialist. Once he had created a peace settlement, he would divide: over Ireland, over the economy, over housing, over education ('waste' according to many Tories). Policy on Ireland particularly annoyed the Conservative rank and file, already put out at being blocked by Liberal promotion in the system (the derided 'stage army'). It could be argued that Lloyd George ignored such feelings, riding roughshod over Tory sensibilities, especially over honours. With a failure to integrate the Coalition he was powerless to ward off the Carlton Club rebellion once the backbenchers found a champion in Baldwin. The revolt was in part against their own leaders, especially Austen Chamberlain, too much under Lloyd George's spell and reluctant to end coalition. Chamberlain and Birkenhead's mishandling of their own party was as serious, if not more so, than Lloyd George's.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far was the success of the economic and employment policies of the National governments hindered by their failure to consider alternative solutions?

Focus: an evaluation of the economic and employment policies of the National Governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to evaluate the alternative options, especially Keynesian views on managing the economy. Globally, with low wages and interest rates, a deep and long standing depression was likely. Keynes argued that only government could increase investment and consumption; the opposite of traditional classical theory which demanded a balanced budget and cost cutting. His stress was on large scale public works schemes to create jobs and consumers. Although National Governments did some of this via a new regional policy in 1934, the public corporations (electricity, broadcasting, civil aviation) and investment in Cunard's Queen Mary, it was never on the scale of Germany or the US, even in their 'relief' forms. Treasury thinking on budget deficit prevailed given that Britain was less hard hit than any Europe or the US, Snowden's concern to maintain some welfare net, and a very strong laissez faire inheritance. Some may point out that Keynes did not develop his multiplier theory until 1936 and his ideas were linked to the Liberals and to Socialist thinking. Before this, his case for a budget deficit was a weak one. To expect governments to do more was unrealistic and unhistorical (the British budget was historically a low one – without something like a World War it would not increase easily as the late 1930s demonstrated). The National Governments were largely Conservative and opposed increased government intervention. Where radical measures were taken they were often forced (going off the Gold Standard which increased competitiveness and lowered interest rates). Other alternatives including Protectionism, a more likely option for Conservatives, were considered – a general tariff of 10% was imposed in 1931 and this did relieve those industries like steel facing European competition (portrayed as fair given that their markets were protected and linked to reorganisation), but Imperial Preference failed because it did not accord with the economic reality of the Dominions or of British protection of its own farmers. Candidates can argue that such options limited success but equally they can point to the unlikelihood of their full adoption. National Governments tended to reduce competition and stabilise prices but failed to tackle the underlying problems of old industry, inefficiency and too much capacity in a depressed world economy. There was some progress but a Keynesian managed economy or a protected self-sufficient Empire were unrealistic.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be

incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

11 Foreign Policy 1939–1963

(a) How important was Indian Independence (1947) in changing British attitudes to decolonisation during the period 1945-1960? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of reasons for changing attitudes to colonisation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Given that India had been seen as one of the most (if not the most) important imperial possessions, its loss and partition might be expected to focus minds firmly on decolonisation. It set a precedent for rapid departure. Certainly to 1947, Britain had hoped that a self-governing India would remain intact and contribute to defence of the Empire in manpower and military bases, and economically to the Sterling Area. However, 'independence' brought the realisation that India would not do this – it would be partitioned, it was in debt to the US and could bring no hard currency to the Sterling Area, there were disputes over partitioning Kashmir and it would not contribute to Commonwealth defence. India, despite staying in the Commonwealth, became the leader in the 1950s of the Non-Aligned movement and constantly criticised Britain. Some answers may point to the fact that Britain did not change her decolonisation policies but merely sought to achieve in Africa what she had failed to do in India. It could be argued that other factors were of much greater importance: e.g. the impact of the Second World War on Britain's political and economic status, US and Soviet pressure to de-colonise (and, in the case of the former, to end a closed imperial economy and the move to a free trade one). Britain was determined to use her overseas assets to assist her ailing economy and maintain her prestige in a world of two superpowers. The turning-point here was her dependence on US loans – in 1945 it was agreed that in 1947 Sterling would be freely convertible with dollars in 1947. Britain's only hope was that the US was not interested in Africa. All governments up to 1959 remained committed to the Empire. Here, Suez played an important role, as did scandals coming out of Kenya. Throughout the 1950s, it became clearer that the Empire was an obstacle rather than an asset in maintaining British influence, not least due to the problems of African nationalism and White nationalism. So, it could be argued that key changes occurred both before 1947 and after 1954, rather than as a result of Indian independence. In Asia, changes came even later, as the commitment to Malaya demonstrated.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far did Britain seek an independent role in the Cold War in the period from 1945 to 1953?

Focus: An evaluation of Britain's aims and role in the Cold War to 1953.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some might argue that Britain, as a wartime ally of the US, simply continued to act in this manner when the Allies fell out over the future of Poland and Eastern Europe at Potsdam in 1945. There are a lot of examples of co-operation up to 1953 (loans, agreement over Greece, NATO etc.). Such a view downplays hostility over Britain's Empire, her trade and Britain's role that emerged. Others might stress that wartime divisions easily carried on and that in a bi-polar world Britain needed to retain a measure of independence – a seat at the top table (UN) and control over her own nuclear capability. The question is 'How far...'? The latter was now crucial to the former. Britain had already been marginalized over the Manhattan project and in 1946 the McMahon Act stopped British involvement in continued research and development. The reaction was to produce a British Bomb, detonated in 1952. This could be interpreted as a bargaining point with the US, culminating in a successful Bevin -Truman understanding, rather than a challenge. Nonetheless, British aims and interests lay in certain areas and where these were hostile to the US a measure of independence had to be retained. Only economic power undermined this, as in Greece, Turkey, Persia and the Mediterranean, forcing Britain to handover the initiative to the US who included Greece and Turkey in Marshall Aid. However, Britain welcomed some US moves, especially Marshall Aid when she secured the largest share and a military commitment to the defence of Western Europe in the form of NATO. Unlike France, Britain did not commit to a purely European role in the countering of the USSR, but neither did she entirely trust every US move, as her involvement in Korea demonstrated and on other Asian issues like the recognition of China. The only certainty was the danger posed to Britain by the USSR, probably the vital factor in deciding Britain on the development of her own bomb (unlike the US, Britain was in range of Soviet bombers). Clearly Britain did seek an independent role but there were restraints, notably American.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

12 Post-War Britain 1945–1964

(a) How far was Labour's electoral defeat in 1951 the result of economic difficulties? Explain your answer.

Focus: An evaluation of the reason for Labour's defeat in the 1951 Election.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Certainly the background to the election was economic crisis and the continuation of wartime rigour to meet debt balance of payments crises and devaluation. This was the age of 'austerity'. It enabled the Conservative opposition to attack the government's financial reputation and affected its social spending. Arguably, the main economic difficulty was the ambitious rearmament programme for Korea announced in 1951. However, not all was gloom – some may point to the benefits that devaluation brought to the economy but this was difficult to perceive in 1951. Perhaps of more importance was the frustration felt by over a decade of economic restriction, rationing, shortages and state red-tape (the British Housewives' League). The nationalisation of the Iron and Steel Industry in 1951 was opposed by some in the Labour party. Candidates could also point to divisions within the Atlee government, the illness of key leaders like Bevin and Cripps and Bevan's resignation over charging for some prescriptions in the NHS. However they could also stress the importance of Conservative recovery. A rundown organisation was quickly rebuilt and restructured under Lord Woolton focusing on membership (3 million by 1951) and fundraising. There was a conscious attempt to appear democratic and youthful (Maxwell-Fyfe Report 1949). Under Butler, the Conservatives carefully rebuilt their policy, accepting the popularity of key Labour reforms (1949 'The Right Road for Britain') but shifting to property-owning democracy and enterprise. The 1947 Industrial Charter was a model of balance in its views on industry and could easily exploit Labour's later nationalisations. By stressing the need to reduce the State's role it struck a chord amongst an electorate that had endured too much (the promise of 300,000 new homes in free market conditions was very attractive). The Conservatives also stressed the Cold War which polarised views on capitalism and communism to the detriment of 'socialist' Labour. It lost the negative links of the 1930s. It was clearly doing well (the 1950 Election) and 1951 could be seen as a foregone conclusion, given Labour's lack of an effective majority (6) since 1950, although some might point to the narrowness of the Conservative majority (less than 20) that ensued and Labour's highest ever poll (14 million).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) 'Social change and the prosperity of the 1950s were the most important reasons for Conservative dominance from 1951 to 1964.' How far do you agree?

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for Conservative dominance 1951 to 1964.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Some may see social change (the consolidation of the middle and lower middle class, especially electorally as the working class were more tightly confined in smaller areas) and prosperity as the most important reason. The Conservatives won in 1951, 1955, 1959 and only lost by a narrow margin in 1964, although it could be argued that 1951 hardly saw a large majority. Prosperity made Labour disputes appear petty. The Conservatives were lucky that economic recovery was underway in the 1950s once Korea was over and this enabled them to dismantle the apparatus of austerity and gain the credit. Politics were devised to manage this by Butler, Maudling, Powell and MacLeod. A property owning democracy had more electoral appeal than Bevan's expanded public sector or Gaitskill's social democracy. The Conservatives were able to reduce taxes yet maintain and increase social expenditure, completing the promised and very popular '300,000 homes' ahead of schedule. Full employment spread the gain more widely and affluence became more marked at the end of the decade. Some may point to problems over the economy (Thorneycroft's resignation in 1958) but by the election of 1959 the boom had resumed. Indeed, the Conservatives timed elections well by design or luck, avoiding moments of potential disaster (Suez and Profumo). Other factors that could be considered are Labour divisions and weakness but these are unlikely to be the most important given that the elections were fought on taxation and the economy. Conservative leadership was another important factor, at least until Alec Douglas Hume in 1963-64 (Churchill's health problems were hidden from the public). Eden was popular pre-Suez and Macmillan was both modern and ruthless, exploiting the affluence very ably, securing a 100 plus majority in 1959. Organisation, until 1960, was also competent and even the gambles of 1962-63 showed an ability to fight and look to the future. However economic uncertainty returned in the early 1960s, confirming its importance in maintaining the Conservative governments.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2585
January 2006**

Unit 2585**Europe 1046-1250****1 The Reform of the Church 1046-1122****(a) Assess the reasons for the conflict between Gregory VII and Henry IV.**

Focus: evaluation of causal factors explaining conflict.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need a good sense of 'Assess ...' and to provide a range of reasons, preferably prioritising such. The sense of conflict needs to be conveyed and reference to events (e.g. Canossa) will be necessary. The candidates may range across some long-term causes dating back to 1046 and, more so, to short-term, above all associated with Gregory VII. That said, a sense of perspective is important and the answer needs to focus upon the Gregory VII-Henry IV disputes, with limited references to longer-term causes. Likely areas for consideration: a reform-minded Papacy, determined to overcome previous weaknesses, linked to a desire (even urge) to assert and further its (sense of) powers; Henry IV's minority and the gains made there by the Papacy; Henry's desire to re-assert his authority; Gregory's apparent agenda and the threats there to traditional German Imperial monarchy, especially over control of the church; the respective ideas of each as to their authority and claims to rights, centred, of course, upon lay investiture and its symbolism. There will be reward for those who handle the ideological dimension (e.g. the bases to the respective claims made, the tensions of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*) but candidates can score equally well by developing the context and the personal element, undoubtedly embedded in the conflict. Gregory's principal ideas were: paramount nature of *justitia*, sovereignty and so supremacy of Pope over Christian society, including bishops and kings; the necessity for 'suitability' of office holders in ordered society; illegitimacy of lay control over clerics. These ideas had powerful implications, not least political, above all in the attack on lay investiture and the idea of deposition of a ruler. There was a political context to events.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons for monastic reforms in the period from 1046 to 1122.

Focus: evaluation of causal factors explaining monastic reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to convey a good sense of 'Assess ...' and to set out a range of factors, preferably prioritising these. They will need to have a range of coverage

across the period and will need to convey an understanding of change as well as try to move beyond the obvious example area of the Cistercians. The use of other Orders as examples of the new wave of monasticism would be good. Context will be important as will an understanding of problems with the 'old' monasticism, specifically the Cluniacs, though this is not a question about the decline of the Cluniacs and answers so focused will need to set their responses in a wider context to go beyond **Band IV** at best. Similarly, answers which simply focus upon the rise of the Cistercians *per se* will not move much beyond high **Band III** or lower **Band II** unless they have a good sense of contextualisation and breadth in the monastic changes of the period. They might cite the Carthusians as one example of a developing new Order. Candidates are likely to consider such factors as: dissatisfaction with contemporary monasticism and the feeling that it was too 'comfortable' in its ways; links to lay desires for better spirituality and routes to salvation; more freedoms for monasteries from episcopal and lay controls; the better performance of the *Opus Dei* and the practice of truer, purer Benedictinism; the search for truer austerity and remoteness from the world (hermetical, ascetic, geographical, etc); membership of an exclusive elite; testing life to the full according to the highest of ideals; some importation of Eastern traditions; sanctity and other worldliness.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

2 France and the Empire 1152-1250

(a) Assess the reasons why Frederick Barbarossa came into conflict with the Papacy and the Lombard communes.

Focus: evaluation of causal factors explaining conflict.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need a good focus upon 'Assess ...' and will have a range of factors, prioritising wherever possible. They will see links between the positions of the Papacy and the Lombard Communes though they may well deal with each in turn and within the context of Barbarossa's ambitions and needs within Italy. Reasons will include practical politics, revenues and wealth, ideological-religious issues. Tensions grew between Frederick and a Papacy keen to assert its authority and power and between Frederick and North Italian (Lombard) Communes in turn growing in wealth, power and independence. Political and ideological issues were important as well as more material and practical factors. Imperial visions and goals, a desire for control, expectations in Italy should be assessed, in the context of determined Papal and Communal resistance. The origins and nature of such resistance, expressions, links, specific examples, references to phases and events will help.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How successful were the administrative and financial reforms of Philip Augustus? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of the success of certain reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should convey a good sense of 'How successful ...' and will argue according to the criteria they establish in adjudicating success levels. They may compare the situations at the start and the end of Philip's reign. They should be assessing levels of impact and importance. They are likely to conclude that Philip was successful, probably very successful, though no set conclusion is expected. Assessment will probably include such areas as, in administration, the developments of relations with and further close ties with towns, not only within the royal domain lands; developments of the offices of *seneschal*, *prévôt* and *bailli*; the extension and strong assertion of feudal (suzerain) rights; the better management of lands, assets and resources, swollen by the accretions after 1204. In finance, there was better administration and management of resources, higher tax yields (quite big developments), strong management of royal lands and the royal *fisc*, the development of a range of revenue sources. There would be relevance in references to legal developments, not least a common law code and feudal rights. Wider political and military perspectives might be cited, if briefly, and a comparison of the situations in 1180 and 1223 might be useful in evaluation. Wider reforms fed off and fed into further territorial additions and the expansion of royal authority and powers, so strengthening the monarchy.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3 Crusading and the Crusader States 1095-1192

(a) Assess the reasons for the failure of the Second Crusade.

Focus: evaluation of causal factors explaining failure.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to focus upon 'Assess ...' and adduce a range of reasons, prioritising wherever possible. No set conclusion is expected. Factors that can be assessed: a lack of a clear and unified command structure; internal divisions; differences between settlers and newcomers; a lack of money; poor choice of routes; shortages of key resources; tactical errors; the role of Emperor Manuel I and a lack of Byzantine help; the strengths and unity of their opponents; the decision to attack Damascus and the overall handling of the campaign; exaggerated expectations; a possible lack of crusading zeal; problems of terrain and climate, for example. Elaboration might include the activities of the French and Germans, the actions of the Emperor and the fierceness of Turkish attacks.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the view that the personal ambition of rulers was the most important motive in the Third Crusade.

Focus: evaluation of causal factors in launching the 3rd Crusades.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need a good focus upon 'Assess ...' and need to organise a range of factors, prioritising as much as possible. Answers may consider areas of ambition such as: military and personal prowess, the desire to create and sustain an image of powerful military leadership, feudal-chivalric factors, the desire to demonstrate leadership of the crusading movement and, indeed, the cult of the crusader knight/prince and the exporting of European rivalries, including that between Philip Augustus and Richard I. The latter may well gain decent coverage since he is readily associated with the Crusade, though other examples are required. It would be permissible to include Saladin and his prowess as well as success in uniting different Muslim elements. Other factors might well include the 'standard' religious

motivations, delivering the Holy Land from Muslim control, penitential-salvation goals, religious zeal, though it is possible to argue that, by this time, the pure religious motives had become more a norm than a major motivational goal. The search for lands and plunder might also be cited as a lesser factor. Given the nature of the question, candidates should embrace the Crusade as a whole, not just the origins. However, some flexibility should be exercised in adjudicating the quality and nature of the answer.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

4 Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century

(a) Assess the changes in architecture during the twelfth century.

Focus: evaluation of changes over time.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to convey a good sense of 'Assess ...' and to delineate a range of changes, prioritising wherever possible. Architectural developments will be contextualised and some examples are necessary here. Ecclesiastical and secular examples would be useful. References to church buildings are likelier than to secular but such to urban and military examples would be helpful. In regard to church structures, the painted arch, ribbed cross-vaulting, the flying buttress (pre-Gothic) are all possible, with perhaps some linkages to the emphasis upon visual beauty, strength, power yet delicacy and ideas of the changing relationship of God and man (figures, ornamentation, naturalism). In regard to urban and castle structures, again size and scale are likely themes; the greater strength of walls and public buildings, a greater sense of utility; developing domestic as well as stronger defensive features of castles.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there

will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent was the growth of trade the most important economic development of the twelfth century?

Focus: evaluation of the significance of developments across time.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need a good focus upon ‘To what extent ...’ and will be determined in their appropriate reward by the level of argument delivered. There is no set conclusion. Trade and trading activity need to be placed in the wider economic context across the period. International as well as internal trade should be covered. Supporting areas and elements (e.g. fairs, markets, finance) will probably be embraced. There was a key link between urban and commercial growth. The growth of both internal and international trade, the developing large-scale manufacturing activities and the specialisations of workers (and towns), increased food production, more social and political stability, the urban ‘pull’ from the countryside, population growth and greater demand for products, improved agrarian and industrial techniques, all played their part. Examples of trade routes, especially by water and sea, would be useful; these could be linked to urban centres of trade activity.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe 1450-1530

5 The Italian Renaissance 1450–1530

(a) How far were city states the key factor in the development of the Italian Renaissance during the period 1450-1530?

Focus: Evaluation of.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There is a good deal to be said about the city state and its encouragement of the Renaissance, such as: the absence of a centralising authority, secular interests, civic pride and competition. Candidates should set this against other possible factors driving the Renaissance’s development, such as: trade, finance, the classical background and reach their conclusion about the ranking of these factors.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent was self-glorification the main motive for patrons of Renaissance artists, architects and scholars during the period 1450-1530?

Focus: Evaluation of motives.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers may argue that self- glorification was widespread; such an argument needs to be well-supported with examples. Stronger answers may point out that motives for patronage were often mixed and that rulers were aiming not only at self-glorification but also at improving the status of their regime. Religious and patriotic motives might also be considered. Answers need not devote equal space to artists, architects and scholars, and examiners should reward the quality of the argument even if all three are not considered.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

6 Spain 1469–1520

(a) How far did Ferdinand and Isabella succeed in establishing law and order during the period 1469-1516?

Focus: evaluation of success in improving law and order.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers might well compare the years of the civil war with the relative peace of the years after 1476. Consideration will need to be given to the ways in which Ferdinand and Isabella tried to curb the nobility, perhaps noting that the events of 1504 suggest that this was not entirely successful. Other issues discussed might include: an assessment of such measures as the *Hermanidad*, the *Corregidores*, peripatetic kingship.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent were the religious policies of Ferdinand and Isabella dominated by a desire for uniformity?

Focus: evaluation of motives explaining religious policies.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The idea of uniformity might be pursued with reference to groups and issues such as: Jews, *Conversos*, the Inquisition, the conquest of Granada - though some differences might be noted in the attitudes of Aragon and Castile. However, candidates also need to look at the attempts to improve the Catholic church, especially on the part of Isabella, as well as the issues of power and the pope. Answers may consider religious uniformity as contributing to the political uniformity (stability and cohesion) of Castile and/or Aragon (e.g. binding together Castile after prolonged civil wars).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

7 The Ottoman Empire 1451–1529

(a) To what extent was military strength the main factor in determining the expansion of the Ottoman Empire during the period 1451-1529?

Focus: evaluation of causal factors explaining Ottoman growth.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need a good focus on the military strength. Other issues which may be discussed in the evaluation could include: the effects of absolutism, the qualities of individual sultans, the strengths of central government, the strengths of provincial government, the economy, the weakness of enemies.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far did the Mohammed II (1451–81) and Selim I (1512–20) strengthen the Ottoman Empire?

Focus: evaluation of attempts to strengthen the empire.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

In focusing on the extent to which the Empire was strengthened, candidates may look at the effects of Mohammed's capture of Constantinople (1453) in strategic and in economic terms. This may be set against limitations in other areas, such as: his failure to safeguard the Crimea through lack of control of the Danube. There is probably less to be said about Selim, but answers might refer to the strengthening of frontiers in Eastern Anatolia and the religious and economic advantages in the capture of Egypt and Syria.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted

range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

8 Exploration and Discovery 1450–1530

(a) How far was the geographical position of Spain and Portugal the main reason for their leading roles in overseas exploration during the period 1450–1530?

Focus: evaluation of causal factors.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers may consider issues such as: their position facing the Atlantic, favourable wind systems and currents, extensive coastlines. The importance of geography needs, however, to be set against other factors, such as: political stability, royal and noble patronage, rivalry between the two nations, technological developments.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the contributions of Columbus and Cortes to overseas exploration and empire-building during the period 1450–1530.

Focus: evaluation of the contributions of two Spanish individuals.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may refer to the pioneering nature of Columbus' voyages, though answers might point out that later voyages focused more on empire-building with mixed success. With Cortes, answers may focus more strongly in terms of empire-building with the conquest of the Aztec empire in Mexico, but he too was a pioneer. Perhaps the contributions of these two were complementary: Columbus finding the way to America and Cortes then starting to open it up.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less

effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe 1498-1560

9 The Holy Roman Empire 1517-1559

(a) Assess the impact of population growth and price inflation on the Holy Roman Empire in the period 1517-1559.

Focus: evaluation of the effects of rising population and prices.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to evaluate the impact of two major social and economic changes. There is overlap between population growth and price inflation and stronger answers may well refer to how these influenced each other. Candidates may refer to issues such as: trade, poverty, problems with agriculture, income, prices, revolt, overcrowding and urban growth, the weakening of the nobility and the princes as well as the emperor. What is important is the quality of the argument and candidates are not expected to cover all the issues. Some might link these problems to the instability of Germany that allowed (even encouraged) Protestantism to take root.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) 'The actions and policies of the princes were the main reason why Charles V failed to stop the spread of protestantism'. How far do you agree?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for Charles' limited success against Protestantism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question requires candidates to weigh up a variety of factors for Charles' failure. Many may devote substantial coverage of the role of the princes in the spread of Protestantism; this may include both religious and political reasons on their part. A range of factors needs, however, to be covered and these might include: Charles's frequent absences from the Empire, his lack of power within Germany, Charles's foreign policy distractions (the French and the Ottomans), the role of the cities in

nurturing and spreading protestantism. What is important is the quality of the argument and answers are not expected to cover every factor.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

10 Spain 1504-1556

(a) Assess the reasons for the weakness of the Spanish economy in the period from 1504 to 1556.

Focus: evaluation of causal factors.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question requires candidates to evaluate a variety of factors that caused the Spanish economy to be weak from the death of Isabella to the abdication of Charles V. Some answers may challenge the assumption that the economy was weak and point out that there were some areas of strength. However, even if they take that approach there are still some areas that were weak and some consideration of these should be made. Candidates may consider a variety of issues, such as: the desire for easy profits, over-reliance on imports, failure to use Spanish silver to develop the home economy, structural weaknesses at home, dominance of the *mesta*, war and its cost. Candidates should weigh up some of these issues and assess them according to their importance in causing the weakness in the economy.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons for the decline of unrest in Spain in the reign of Charles I during the years after 1521.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for greater stability.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question requires candidates to consider a range of reasons for a significant historical development. There is no agreed explanation for this development and examiners should not be looking for any set answer, relevant points linked to the question should be rewarded. Candidates may consider issues such as: Charles' presence in Spain in the 1520s, use of Castilians in government, change in methods and style of government after the Comuneros revolt, Charles' love of Spain, his marriage, religious unity. Some answers may look back to the causes of the Comuneros revolt, but this should only be rewarded highly when the answer explains how these problems were solved in ways that created stability.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

11 France 1498-1559

(a) How successfully did French monarchs solve the financial problems they faced in the period from 1498 to 1559? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of the success of financial initiatives.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to assess how far Francis and Henry solved the financial problems they faced. It seeks to evaluate the relative success of their policies and candidates are invited to measure the degree of success of their policies. Answers may point to the ultimate failure of the French crown given the bankruptcy at the end of the period. Candidates may explain this by reference to the cost of war, an expensive court, interest payments, inflation and the expanding size of government. Some answers may also suggest that one monarch was more successful than another. Examiners are rewarding the quality of the argument.

NB Answers considering 1515-1559 and answers considering 1498-1559 will be equally valid. The specification only refers to the financial problems of Francis I and Henry II so knowledge of the years 1498-1515 cannot be expected. Any discussion of financial problems during the reign of Louis XII is, of course, to be rewarded.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more

descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why Protestantism had only limited success in France in the period to 1547.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for limited success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question seeks to examine a variety of reasons for the failure of Protestantism to develop significantly in France in the period before 1547. Candidates should consider a range of reasons and weigh up their relative importance. Answers might consider issues such as: Lutheranism and Christian Humanism were separate movements, the appeal of the French church to many, parts of which were already in the process of being reformed (e.g. Bishop Briçonnet), the ambivalent role of Francis I, the importance of the Concordat of Bologna (1516), the active roles of the Sorbonne and the parlements in persecuting heresy, France's weak trade links to Germany which limited the influx of protestant ideas, the small scale of the French printing industry. It is the quality of the argument that is important and candidates are not expected to consider all the factors.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

12 Warfare 1499-1560**(a) Assess the impact on warfare of the development of defensive fortifications in the period 1499-1560.**

Focus: evaluation of a military development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The strongest answers will weigh up the impact on warfare of defensive fortifications. Candidates should discuss a range of issues and may consider some of the following: impact on how wars were fought from the 1530s (the rise of siege warfare and the ending of open warfare), the impact on the size and nature of the armies, the consequent impact on the cost of warfare. This should all be supported by reference to specific examples from the period. Some may point out that developments such as *trace italienne* were confined largely to those parts of Europe affected by the Habsburg-Valois Wars. Some may show how these developments made decisive victory far more difficult to achieve, relating that directly to the exhausted stalemate of the Habsburg-Valois Wars from the 1540s.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the effects of military changes on the nobility and the cult of chivalry during the period 1499-1560.

Focus: Evaluation of the effects of changes.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The strongest answers will weigh up various effects of military changes on the nobility and the cult of chivalry and reach a balanced conclusion. Answers might consider issues such as: how financial costs, caused by the growth in armies and defensive fortifications, affected the ability of the nobility to wage war; changes in tactics and their impact on the cult of chivalry; the use of mercenaries; the changing nature of armies. Some may point to the fact that, on the surface, nothing seemed to change in the way the nobility behaved. Others may argue that the cult of chivalry was itself an illusion.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well

organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe 1545-1610

13 The Counter Reformation 1545-c.1600

(a) To what extent was corruption in the Roman Catholic church the main stimulus to the Counter Reformation?

Focus: evaluation of the cause of Counter Reformation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

On the one hand this might be seen as the traditional Catholic v Counter Reformation argument. On the other hand, some candidates might argue that corruption was at the root of both Lutheran responses and the Catholic church's attempt to put its own house in order, attempts which predated Luther by many decades. Whichever approach is taken, answers will need to examine a range of causal stimuli, such as: abuses within the church, the responses of the church to Luther and other reformers, developments which predate Luther like the emergence of various new religious orders such as the Oratory of Divine Love (perhaps contrasted with later orders such as the Jesuits). Some may focus on combating reactive instruments like the index and the inquisition. Others may focus on pro-active reforms.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How effective was the Council of Trent (1545-63) in bringing about the reform of the Roman Catholic Church by c.1600? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of the effectiveness of Tridentine reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may measure the effectiveness of the Council within its own terms, or might suggest that the Council of Trent was not sufficient on its own to bring about

the reform and therefore go on to look at other factors which helped. Both approaches are acceptable as long as there is a substantial examination of the effectiveness of the Tridentine decrees. Answers are likely to include reference to issues such as: pluralism and non-residency, improvements in education of the clergy, papal supremacy, monastic reform, bishops as diocesan reformers. Issues to be considered outside the Council of Trent might include: new orders, particularly the Jesuits; the reformed papacy launched by Paul III; the Inquisition; the Index; the support of secular princes like the dukes of Bavaria and Philip II. Whatever approach is taken, due consideration must be made of the extent of the effectiveness of Trent.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

14 The Reign of Henry IV 1589–1610

(a) How successful were Sully's attempts to improve royal finances and the economy? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of Sully's effectiveness.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers may argue that, in the area of finance, Sully was much more successful than with the economy. Issues on finance might focus on attempts to decrease expenditure as well as methods of increasing income such as fiscal reform – focus here is likely to be on the palette, where the best candidates may point out that although a success in terms of finance it had its downside in other area such as control of administration. The best candidates will have some appreciation of the implications of a stable financial situation for the stability of the realm and may cite the peaceful accession of Louis XIII as evidence of this. Issues on the economy are likely to include his involvement in agriculture, industry and communications. Candidates should have a more or less balanced treatment of the two issues.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than

explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent had Henry IV achieved his domestic aims by 1610?

Focus: evaluation of Henry's domestic success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to consider what the aims were and measure his achievements against these. Some answers may focus on the collective nature of his achievements in gaining peace and stability and may point to the peaceful accession of Louis XIII as evidence of this. In doing so, however, they should consider a range of issues, such as: religion and the Edict of Nantes, finance and the economy, a largely tamed nobility. Whilst it is generally held that Henry was largely successful candidates may take a longer-term view of issues such as religion and finance and argue that there were still inherent problems in the system.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

15 The Dutch Revolt 1563-1609

(a) To what extent were Philip II's religious policies responsible for opposition to his rule in the Netherlands in the 1560s?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for opposition.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to assess Philip's religious policies against other possible factors. Focus on the religious policies should include reference to some of Philip's measures to strengthen Catholicism, i.e. Jesuits, Inquisition, plans for new bishoprics etc. – in an increasingly Calvinist setting. There are good opportunities for linkage here, such measures being opposed not just for their implied attacks on Calvinism but more because they offended local liberties. Issues such as the neglect of the Golden Fleece and the reliance on a 'Spanish' inner circle of government are also likely to figure, as is the social and economic situation.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or

less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) 'Philip II bears the greatest responsibility for the loss of the northern provinces.' How far do you agree with this statement?

Focus: evaluation of factors causing the loss of the northern provinces.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

It will be possible to argue either for or against the thesis – though it will be difficult to argue that Philip bore no responsibility. Arguments that support the question's view might consider issues such as: his uncompromising policies on religion, his inappropriate choice of personnel (e.g. Alva), his failure to keep his troops supplied, his failure to respect the particularism of the Netherlands, his diversion to other issues of foreign policy in England and France. Candidates may, however, reject the thesis, setting actions of Philip against other issues such as the leadership and military qualities of William of Orange and Maurice of Nassau and the importance of the geography of the northern provinces to their defence and economic strength. Whatever approach is taken, candidates need to support their arguments with reference to events.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

16 Spain as a Great Power 1556-1598**(a) To what extent did Philip II inherit a secure and prosperous kingdom from his father Charles I?**

Focus: evaluation of the state of Spain in 1556.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers may argue that, in terms of external threats, the gains of Charles I being recognised by the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis (1559) made Spain fairly secure and marked the beginning of Spanish dominance in Europe. Similarly, the threat from the Turks had diminished - although candidates could argue that inability to control the Barbary pirates might still be a problem and answers could link this with possible threats internally from the Moriscos. A discussion of Spain's prosperity might lead to the conclusion that although outwardly Spain appeared prosperous there were many structural weaknesses causing bankruptcy as early as 1557, and that short-term measures had been adopted at the expense of long term success for both finance and the economy.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the view that Philip II was a champion of Catholicism within Spain.

Focus: evaluation of Philip's religious role.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Many answers may take the view that Philip was regarded as a leader of the Counter-Reformation and point to his use of the Inquisition, actions against the Moriscos, welcoming of the Jesuits, implementation of the Tridentine decrees etc. as examples of this to support the thesis in the question. However, there are also issues to be set against this, chiefly Philip's strained relations with successive popes. Answers may also, for example, question the effectiveness of reforms and point out Philip's determination to control measures at home rather than allow papal involvement.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe 1598-1661

17 Richelieu and Mazarin 1622-1661

(a) To what extent was Richelieu successful in achieving his main aims for France at home and abroad by 1642?

Focus: Assessment of Richelieu's success in achieving his aims.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The question is not limited to either domestic political or foreign policy issues. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance in the treatment of each aspect. There is a need to examine Richelieu's aims, mainly the growth of power of the King and France. In domestic policy, the focus includes the weakening of the parlements and nobles, whilst foreign policy envisaged breaking the perceived threat of Habsburg encirclement (Austria/the Empire and Spain) - hence France's involvement in the Thirty Years' War. At home, Richelieu was successful against the Huguenots and reduced the power of the parlements and nobles, but sometimes had to give way to fierce opposition in the provinces. Richelieu entered the Thirty Years' War, taking up the baton from Sweden and candidates might mention that Mazarin, his successor, vindicated his policy at Westphalia. However, the financial cost of foreign policy was enormous and consequently Richelieu was faced with severe financial problems. For this and other reasons, he was less successful in handling economic and financial affairs.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far were the Frondes motivated mainly by opposition to Mazarin?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a major pontifical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There is no doubt that Mazarin was a hated figure and many answers might explain the reasons. However, it took the threat of widespread popular rebellion before the nobility and parlements sensed the opportunity to oppose Mazarin and the power that he enjoyed under the crown. Answers might consider the impact of wider issues, such as: war and its aftermath, excessive taxation, general hardship within France.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

18 The Problems of Spain 1598-1659**(a) Assess the reasons for the failures of Olivares' domestic policies.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the failure of an important minister.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Although the focus is clearly domestic, the decision to re-engage in war was to lead Spain into prolonged conflict, especially with France, which was a continuous drain on resources and an impediment to many of Olivares' reforms. His personality was a factor in his failure; convinced of his own rectitude, he tried to force through reforms too quickly and too far, alienating a society to which change was anathema. Regionalism was a very important factor that needed to be overcome if Spain was ever to be governed effectively. His intransigent policies against regionalism became a factor that ensured the destruction of his reforms and nearly of Spain itself.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted

range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) 'Spain's international decline by 1659 has been greatly exaggerated.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of a judgement about Spain's decline.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should remember that the question is about 'international decline'. Domestic conditions will be relevant only inasmuch as they are linked to external factors. There is general agreement that Spain underwent a gradual decline in the first half of the seventeenth century. There are differences of opinion about the extent of the decline. (Examiners will note that historiography is not an AS Level assessment criterion and candidates are not required for any mark to show an understanding of the views of particular historians in this or any question.) Answers might discuss the unsuccessful conclusion of the Dutch wars, failure in the Thirty Years' War and setbacks in the conflict with France after 1648. There is evidence to support an argument that the decline was not complete by 1659. Other powers still regarded it as a good and influential ally. Spain's European empire was still extensive. It retained its empire in the New World although an omission of this point should not be regarded as a major gap that should relegate an answer to a lower band. Perhaps Spain's most clearly defined area of decline was in its military power, mainly because of its inability to finance large armies.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

19 The Thirty Years' War 1618-1648

(a) To what extent was Habsburg success in the war to 1629 (Edict of Restitution) mainly caused by the weakness of their opponents?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the early success of the Habsburgs in a major war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The stated reason is the weakness of opposition to the Habsburgs. Answers might offer alternative explanations and claim that they are more important but the stated case should be considered. The weaknesses of opponents from 1618 to 1629 were legion. It might be that this weakness enabled the Habsburgs to overreach

themselves in the Edict of Restitution (1629). The opposition was divided and poorly led. Even Danish intervention was so poorly judged and uncoordinated that the Protestant forces in Germany were well nigh prostrate by 1629. Other, and often complementary, factors considered might include the genius of Wallenstein.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons for the intervention of foreign powers in the Thirty Years' War from 1618 to 1648.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important development in a war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Better answers need to consider more than Sweden and King Gustavus Adolphus - Denmark, France and Spain were also involved in the War. The focus should be on the reasons for these interventions and there is no need for descriptions of events that are not linked to examinations of causes. The reasons were varied, ranging from territorial gain to religion. The former was probably more important but this is not to deny that Sweden had a real concern for Protestantism and Spain wished to show Catholic solidarity as well as its adherence to the Habsburg alliance.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

20 Social Issues in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century

(a) How far was religious belief the main reason for the witch hunts of the first half of the seventeenth century?

Focus: Assessment of the reason for an important social phenomenon.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

'How far...?' implies the need to examine other factors but candidates should give consideration to religious beliefs even when they prefer other explanations for witch hunts. Certainly the most common charge of consorting with, or being under the influence of, the Devil/Satan was religious in its basis. Religious authorities heard cases and pronounced sentences on those who were found guilty. But not all religious authorities were determined to hunt and destroy witches. Neighbouring countries, even provinces, often acted very differently. Catholic Spain was less prone to orgies of witch-hunting. There is also considerable evidence to suggest a number of factors for witch hunting that used religion as a cloak. Economic, social and political uncertainty or dislocation often acted as triggers, as did personal spite or the suspicion of outsiders and minorities.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far did the social structure in Holland encourage Dutch economic development in the first half of the seventeenth century?

Focus: Assessment of the link between social and economic factors.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The characteristics of Dutch society that promoted economic development were varied and the most successful answers should rank them. The holding of land was less important in the northern provinces. The land was less amenable to farming. Social progress was less dependent on it than elsewhere. (The question is not based on a comparison but it will be relevant, although not required for any mark, to provide brief comparisons with other countries.) Governments actively promoted economic activity through trade, understandable because of Holland's geographical circumstances and location. But candidates might examine the social basis of its governments. There might be a case to argue that Calvinism encouraged business although the link can sometimes be made simplistically. In spite of some narrow Calvinist tendencies, Dutch society was tolerant of other religious groups, especially if they could offer economic benefits, including cross-fertilisation of ideas.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or

less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe 1660-1718

21 Sweden and the Baltic 1660-1718

(a) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Sweden in 1660.

Focus: Assessment of the condition of Sweden at a particular stage.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The strengths of Sweden might include the international prestige that resulted from the Thirty Years' War, recognition of its empire and influence in and around the Baltic and a government system that was mostly effective. Weaknesses might include the diminution of economic and demographic resources. This made a long-term empire unsustainable. Sweden had actual or potential enemies in Denmark, the north German states and Russia. The minority of Charles XI threatened a period of diminution in the strength of the monarchy.

NB The study topic begins in 1660 and therefore candidates are expected to have only enough knowledge of developments before to make sense of the situation at that point.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the success of Charles XI's development of absolutism in Sweden by 1697.

Focus: Assessment of the success of a ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The condition of the monarchy at the accession of Charles XI might be compared with the situation at his death in 1697. A situation in which the monarch's lands, finances and authority were diminished had been substantially retrieved. One might claim that Charles XI developed an absolute monarchy on a popular basis; he was strongly supported by the people and the Church. However, his success was not complete and it might be judged that Charles XI did not overcome the oligarchic style of Swedish government.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

22 France and Europe 1661-1715

(a) 'The only aim of Louis XIV's foreign policy was the achievement of personal glory.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of a judgement about the aims of a king's foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Louis XIV's aim to achieve personal glory is undeniable and the issue needs to be addressed, even when candidates prefer an alternative explanation. It might be argued that the King wanted glory for France also, although he probably did not distinguish between the two. Answers might consider issues such as: the perceived threat from other states, the wish to secure natural boundaries, Louis' defence of rights as he saw them and his desire to secure the Spanish throne, his desire for military and cultural ascendancy in Europe. The focus of answers should be on aims/motives, but candidates will need to refer to specific developments to demonstrate aims at particular points.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less

effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the claim that, by 1715, France had gained more than it lost from Louis XIV's foreign policy.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the consequences of foreign policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A number of approaches might commend themselves equally, for example, a comparison of 1660 and 1715, a chronological balance sheet that comes to a considered conclusion, or a focus on turning points. The relevant period is long and examiners should not look for a complete answer in terms of chronology but for an awareness of salient developments. Gains might be seen in the fact that the strengthening of frontiers since 1661 was largely retained by 1715. The perceived Habsburg threat had been thwarted. The Spanish throne had been (partly) secured. French power was still seen as very considerable in Europe, although widely hated. Losses might include the failure to achieve complete success over the issue of the Spanish monarchy. The long wars exhausted France. France was not as dominating as it had been in 1661, especially with the rise of English/British power.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

23 The Development of Brandenburg-Prussia 1660-1713

(a) 'The army was the main reason for the success of Frederick William, the Great Elector, in governing Brandenburg-Prussia.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of reasons for the success of an important ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

An adequate focus on the role of the army is expected; its role was very varied including civil as well as more narrowly military functions. The amount of time devoted to the army will depend on the weight of the arguments. Other factors might

include the Great Elector's personality because much of the efficiency of government reflected his force of personality. He was interested in government and administration and created a loyal bureaucracy. Policy towards the Junkers may also be considered. The question does not ask how successful was Frederick William as a ruler and candidates who do not include this assessment can merit any mark. However, such an appraisal can be made briefly. There is agreement that he was successful and the question is about the reasons for this, not its extent.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent had Brandenburg-Prussia been unified by 1713?

Focus: Assessment of the condition of a state at a specific point.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

One of the enduring features of Brandenburg-Prussia was the scattered and disparate nature of its territories. It needed more than the life-time work of Frederick William, the Great Elector. Frederick I acquired the kingship but only "in Prussia". However, there was a greater degree of unity of government, administration, economy and the law, even when not all of the territories were physically united by 1713. Much of the driving force of this was the rulers' use of the army, not only in a peace-keeping capacity but also as tax collectors. Answers might note the distinction between unifying factors and the strength of territorial unity.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

24 Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century**(a) To what extent was there a 'scientific revolution' during the second half of the seventeenth century?**

Focus: Assessment of the justification of an historical description.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers might define and refine the term 'scientific revolution, as applied to the specified period. Arguments for the description might consider the work of Newton although its immediate impact was limited because few understood it at the time. Answers might also examine the work of other individuals (such as Hooke, Huygens, Leibniz and Leeuwenhoeck), but examiners must note that Newton is the only scientist named in this study topic's specification. Technological developments generally lagged behind the theoretical. Although interest in science became more widespread and academies were established, there was no popular application of scientific developments at this time. The emphasis in change was on mathematics, physics and astronomy; the 'life sciences' were still lagging behind. Some might consider new scientific methods.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How far was foreign trade the main reason for the economic prosperity of Holland in the second half of the seventeenth century?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the economic condition of a state.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The importance of foreign trade to the Dutch economy must be examined and should form a major part of answers because it is difficult to envisage an alternative argument that denies its primary importance. Answers might consider Dutch control over much of the entrepôt trade in the Baltic as a crucial factor in the prosperity of the Dutch economy. There was also considerable trade with other regions in the world. Other factors that might be considered include: the comparative religious tolerance of a society that welcomed immigrants who could bring economic skills, a sound banking system and finance structure, a series of governments that saw economic progress as vital to the survival of the state and the dominance of Amsterdam. The question does not ask candidates to assess the extent of Dutch prosperity. There were signs of serious problems in the relevant period. However, this is outside the narrow remit of the question and its omission should not be regarded as a gap in the argument. A brief assessment can be given credit, perhaps in an introduction or conclusion, but should not be a major part of the central argument.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Mark Scheme 2586
January 2006

Unit 2586**Europe 1789-1849****1 The French Revolution****(a) Assess the reasons why the French monarchy was finally overthrown in August 1792.**

Focus: evaluation of reasons for an event.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The focus of the question is on the period 1789-92, rather than the 1789 revolution. Candidates who discuss the reasons for the revolution in 1789 may only get credit insofar as they connect such reasons with the overthrow of the monarchy in 1792. Focussed answers may discuss the relative importance of, for example: the attitude and actions of the Crown, religious division, faction and clubs, developments in Paris, economic crisis, war. Relevant events/developments that may be considered include: Legislative Assembly, Civil constitution of Clergy, Flight to Varennes, Champ de Mars, the onset of war in 1792, the impact of the Brunswick Manifesto, the events of June-August 1792.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the impact of war on the course of the Revolution from 1792 to 1795.

Focus: evaluation of the impact of a single factor.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The focus is on the impact of war. Events/developments that candidates may wish to analyse in relation to war include the overthrow of the monarchy, the development of Counter-Revolution, the overthrow of the Girondins, the Federal Revolt, the development of the Reign of Terror and its end. Candidates may seek to develop arguments showing how the course of the revolution was affected in different ways by victory or defeat – defeat encouraged the development of Terror, whilst victory provided a justification for its end, for example. Candidates may also seek to show how war was one of a range of factors involved in explaining the development of the Revolution, but, given the question, good answers will focus on war and show the interrelation of war to other factors.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands**

III and below will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

2 Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815

(a) 'Securing himself in power was Napoleon's only concern.' How far do you agree with this judgement on Napoleon's domestic policy from 1799 to 1804?

Focus: evaluation of domestic policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Success in this question depends on examining the possible motives behind Napoleon's domestic policy. Candidates may consider the following areas: Constitutions, organisation of administration, economic policy, the Civil Code, the Concordat and Organic articles, education, police, censorship and propaganda. One approach would be to examine each and show how far they contributed to maintaining and securing Napoleon's position and how far other motives were involved. No specific answer is being looked for.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent was defeat in Russia (1812) the main reason for Napoleon's downfall?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for Napoleon's downfall.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There must be sufficient treatment of the role of defeat in Russia even if the candidate wishes to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may

consider a range of factors apart from Russia – opposition to Britain, the Continental system, the Peninsular War, relative decline of Napoleon and his forces, the relative improvement in the capability of his enemies, the formation of the Fourth Coalition and the campaigns of 1813-14. Better candidates will show how factors are related and analyse using suitable categorisation of causes, such as: long-term, short-term, indirect, direct.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3 France 1814-1848

(a) Assess the reasons why Charles X was overthrown.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for the 1830 Revolution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This question requires not only the examination of a range of reasons but some kind of justified analysis of their relative importance and/or linkages/interaction. Candidates may argue that Charles brought about his own downfall, or that economic crisis was significant or that his overthrow was inevitable given the heritage of revolution for example. Candidates may also examine, for example: the growth of opposition, the significance of religious policy, different administrations and ministers, the Ordinances of St Cloud.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent was economic crisis the main reason for the revolution of February 1848?

Focus: evaluation of causes of the 1848 revolution.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates, to score well, must give sufficient treatment to the role economic crisis even if they wish to argue other reasons were more important. Candidates may consider, for example: long-term economic reasons for the 1848 Revolution, short-term economic reasons for the 1848 Revolution, the growth of social tensions and socialism, the role of Louis Philippe, the role of Guizot, the lack of reform, scandals, the issue of foreign policy and the reform banquets

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

4 Revolution and Repression in Europe 1815-1849

(a) 'Before 1848, Liberal and Nationalist movements did not seriously threaten the existing regimes in the Austrian Empire and German Confederation.' How far do agree with this view of Liberal and Nationalist movements in the period before 1848?

Focus: evaluation of the strength of Liberal and Nationalist movements.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The focus is on liberal and nationalist movements. Candidate may deal generally with these or may seek to compare and contrast movements in different areas. There may be examination of particular events and their consequences, such as: the Wartburg Festival, and/or the aims, methods and membership of different groups. There may be consideration of, for example: the attitude and policy of governments (especially Metternich) in order to assess the strength/weakness of the movements.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than

explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) 'The loyalty of its army was the main reason why the Austrian Empire overcame the 1848 revolutions.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for failure of the 1848 Revolutions.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates, to score well, must give sufficient treatment to the role of the army even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. We can expect consideration of the role of the army in dealing with the revolutions in northern Italy and Bohemia (Radetsky and Windischgrätz) and of the Austrian army in Hungary (although here the intervention of Russian forces was decisive). Candidates may set the role of the army against other factors, such as: inherent weaknesses in the revolutionary movements, divisions over aims and national rivalries, the maintenance of the Austrian monarchy, lack of mass popular support.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe 1825-1890

5 Italy 1830-1870

(a) To what extent was the Roman Catholic Church was the main obstacle to Italian unification in the period from 1830 to 1849?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for a historical development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

To score well candidates must deal adequately with the Roman Catholic Church even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. Candidates may refer to the innate conservatism of the Catholic Church and the links between Church and the established order in Italy through this period. They may discuss the influence of the Catholic Church over the people. There may well be close discussion of the papacy of Pius IX in this period and his apparent sympathy initially with reform followed by the impact of the Allocution. Against/alongside the influence of the Catholic Church candidates may discuss a range of other factors to establish relative

importance, such as: political and geographical division, the influence and conservatism of Austria, the conservatism of established rulers, repression, disunity of those pressing for change, the lack of popular support, the lack of international support.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent was foreign help the main reason why Italy was united in the period from 1859 to 1870?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for Italian unification.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates, to score well, must deal sufficiently with the role of foreign aid even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. Candidates may examine the roles of France, Britain and Prussia over these years. They may argue that, certainly in 1859, the role of France was decisive but that Britain and Prussia played significant roles. They may suggest further that France was not always a help (for example backing out of the war at Villafranca and France's commitment to Rome). Such analysis may be set against other factors, such as: the weakness of Austria, the strength of Italian nationalism, the diplomacy of Cavour, actions by Garibaldi.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

6 Germany c.1862-1890**(a) Assess the reasons why Prussia was able to replace Austria as the main German power by 1866.**

Focus: evaluation of reasons for Prussian dominance in Germany.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should consider a range of reasons and their linkages/relative importance to score well. Among other things, answers may examine some of the following: relative decline in Austria's economic and political power in the period after 1815; the impact of economic developments, especially the Zollverein and Prussian industrial development; the consequences of the 1848 Revolutions for the German Confederation; the development of Prussian military power in the 1860s; the development of German nationalism; Bismarck's diplomacy and the wars of the 1860s.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How successful was Bismarck's foreign policy from 1871 to 1890?

Focus: evaluation of the success of policies.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Successful candidates will examine Bismarck's foreign policy by reference to criteria by which to judge success. These could include, for example: the survival of the German Empire, the degree to which German influence and power grew under Bismarck, Bismarck's aims in foreign policy, the context in which Bismarck operated (problems, limitations etc. which he faced). Candidates may deal with events and analyse success or may examine the period as a whole picking out themes. What will matter is the quality of the analysis and evaluation. Candidates may refer to, for example: the isolation of France, the Dreikaiserbund (1873), the war scare of 1875, the Berlin Congress (1878), the Dual Alliance (1879), the Three Emperors' Alliance 1881, the Triple Alliance 1882, the Reinsurance Treaty 1887. There may also be reference to German colonial policy in the 1880s.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well

organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

7 France 1848-1875

(a) 'The Second Republic was doomed from the start.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for the failure of the Second Republic.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to assess several reasons and examine their linkages and/or relative importance. They must deal sufficiently with the idea that failure was inevitable from the start even if they wish to argue against this. Candidates may well examine the circumstances in which the Second Republic came about and may point to the expectations of different groups and the divisions which quickly emerged (between the party of 'Order' and that of 'Progress', the June Days and the election of Louis Napoleon, the nature of the Constitution (particularly the arrangements concerning the relationship between President and Assembly), the coup of December 1851, the plebiscite of December 1852.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why Napoleon III stayed in power for so long.

Focus: evaluation of Napoleon's rule.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to assess several reasons and examine their linkage and/or relative importance to score well. Candidates may examine, for example: Napoleon III's popularity (association with Napoleon Bonaparte, authority lent by plebiscite etc.), the authoritarian nature of the Empire for many years, economic prosperity and state

encouragement or railways, banking etc., foreign policy successes in the 1850s, liberalisation in the 1860s, Napoleon III's political skills.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

8 Russia 1825-1881

(a) How successful was Nicholas I in dealing with the problems he faced from 1825 to 1855?

Focus: evaluation of Nicholas's rule.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates will need to deal with policy in relation to a number of problems to score well. There must also be reasoned judgement on the question of success which might be assessed in relation to aims, effects and the difficulty of the problem. Candidates may examine the Decembrist Revolt, nationalism (especially Poland), how to maintain autocracy, political opposition, Russian 'backwardness', serfdom, foreign policy and the Crimean War. Candidates may refer to Nicholas' policies in the framework of orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality, his limited reforms, his various 'Sections' to deal with different areas – especially the Third Section.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why Alexander II introduced reforms in Russia during his reign.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for reforms.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to deal with several reasons and analyse their linkages and/or relative importance to score well. This may be done by examining the reasons for specific reforms or more generally, although to score well it is likely that candidates will adopt a mixed approach to place specific reforms in a more general context. Reforms dealt with may include, for example: the emancipation of the serfs, *zemstva*, judicial reforms, tax and financial reforms, education, censorship, military reforms. Reasons may include, for example: the impact of the Crimean War, the need to defuse opposition to Tsarist rule, the pressures of modernisation, the need for efficient government. Candidates may stress the need to reform in order to maintain autocracy and the linkages between, for example, the emancipation of the serfs and the introduction of *zemstva*.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

America 1846-1919

9 The American Civil War 1861-1865

(a) Assess the reasons why the secession of the Southern states from the Union resulted in civil war.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for the Civil War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

NB the specification requires no specific knowledge prior to 1861, although we can expect answers to put what they say about the short-term reasons for civil war in some historical context. Candidates may refer, for example, to: the election of Lincoln, the issue of slavery, the issue of state rights, the growth of a north-south divide, the first wave of secession, the failure of compromise, the creation of the Confederacy, events and issues surrounding Fort Sumter.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well

organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent do you agree that Grant was a better general than Lee?

Focus: comparison of two generals.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The emphasis here is on a comparative assessment of the generalship of Grant and Lee. Candidates may draw out both similarities and difference between the two generals but will need to justify their argument that one or the other was 'better'. Answers may examine performance in particular campaigns and battles (e.g. Shiloh, Vicksburg, Chancellorsville, Antietam, Gettysburg, the Wilderness campaign). Answers may, for example offer: comparison of strategy and tactics, comparisons of relationships with officers, men and political leaders.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

10 Politics and Reform 1877-1919

(a) How successful was the Populist movement?

Focus: evaluation of the success of a political movement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates can assess success in a number of ways, e.g. in terms of aims, effects/impact or in the context of the problems faced. Candidates needs to show an awareness of the elements of populism and the support populism achieved in the 1880s and 1890s largely amongst rural populations. The issues of agricultural tariffs, railroad costs and banking/currency issues. There may be reference to populist success locally in southern states, the creation of a Populist Party in 1892, failure in the presidential election, the adoption by the Democrats of some populist policies in the 1896 election and their support for the Democrat candidate.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why America pursued an imperialist foreign policy in the 1890s and the early twentieth century.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for US imperialism.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to assess a number of reasons and their linkages and/or relative importance to score well. Candidates may examine some of the following: the extension of the notion of 'Manifest Destiny' to foreign affairs; the expansion of 'superior' US 'civilisation'; a christianising mission; economic motives as markets became saturated and cheap raw materials were sought; diversion from domestic depression; imperial rivalry with Europe; the significance of Mahan's 'The influence of Sea Power on History'. In assessing reasons candidates may refer to McKinley's presidency, Samoa and Hawaii, the Philippines and China, Cuba and war with Spain, Panama, the Roosevelt Corollary and interventions in Dominica, Nicaragua and Haiti.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

11 Western Expansion 1846-1900

(a) To what extent were government land policies the most important factor in encouraging Westward expansion?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for Westward expansion.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

To score well candidates must give sufficient treatment of the impact of land policies even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. In relation to land policy, candidates may well concentrate on the impact of the Homestead Act (1862), although there may be reference also to the Morrill Act (1862), the Desert Land Act (1877) and the Timber and Stone Act (1878). Candidates are likely to balance their assessment of such policies against the influence of railways, the mining and cattle frontiers, and the 'push' factors affecting emigration from the eastern seaboard.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the impact of Federal policies on Native Americans from 1846 to 1887.

Focus: evaluation of the effects of Federal policy on Native Americans.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may place their assessment of the impact of Federal policies in the context of the tensions and conflicts arising from continuous westward expansion. There may be assessment of the attempts at peaceful coexistence as evidence by such agreements as that made at Fort Laramie in 1851, the onset of violence and the Indian Wars, the 1867 Peace Commission, reservations, Americanisation and the Dawes Severalty Act (1887).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there

will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

12 Race Relations in the South 1863-1912

(a) Assess the reasons for Lincoln's decision to issue the Emancipation Proclamation (1863).

Focus: evaluation of reasons for Emancipation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to examine the reasons and assess their linkages and/or relative importance to score well. Candidates may seek to place their assessment in the long term context of the slavery issue and the controversy surrounding it which had proved a major factor in the causing the Civil War. They may also argue that Lincoln did not go to war to free slaves but to preserve the Union and so short term reasons explain the decision to issue the proclamation. Factors that may be referred to include the demands of the abolitionists, the problems caused by fugitive slaves from the South, the tensions created in the border states which maintained slavery, the roles of slavery in bolstering the southern war effort, the flagging morale in the north and the need for a moral cause, and the need to stop any chance of Britain and France supporting the south.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent did Reconstruction improve the political, social and economic position of Blacks in the South to 1877?

Focus: evaluation of the impact of Reconstruction.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to discuss arguments for and against the question focus. They may argue that the intention was to improve the position of Blacks and, for example, point to influences such as: the constitutional amendments and Civil Rights Acts, the Freedman's Bureau. On the other hand, the reality was often different because of the black codes, the Ku Klux Klan, continued economic poverty and effective discrimination. Others may point to the involvement of Blacks in elections and Federal action to prohibit vigilante groups. A further line of argument used might, for

example, be that gains for Blacks were at best temporary, and although slavery was permanently at an end, when Reconstruction came to an end there was a further deterioration on their position.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe 1890-1945

13 Russia 1894-1917

(a) How stable was the Russian state in the period from 1906 to 1914?

Focus: evaluation of political, economic & social stability.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Note the dates here – candidates who write at length on the 1905 Revolution cannot score well. Candidates may, in analysing the degree of stability, examine some of the following: the various dumas (their actions, dissolution, manipulation of elections etc.), the repressive policies of Stolypin, Stolypin's agricultural reforms, opposition and the assassination of Stolypin, strikes and other unrest. Candidates may also consider economic developments depending on the breadth of their treatment of 'stable'. Some may argue that in this period Russia appeared deceptively stable, pointing to relative peace and the unity that the outbreak of war in 1914 demonstrated; others may point to underlying instability as the problems of 1905 had not been resolved and repression only contained opposition.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why the Provisional Government was overthrown in the 1917 October Revolution.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for the overthrow of the Provisional Government.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to consider several reasons and explain their linkages and/or relative importance in order to score well. Candidates may refer to some of the following in their analysis: the narrow basis of support for the Provisional Government, the tensions with the Soviets, the continuation of the war, the actions of the peasants (seizing land), the organisation of the Bolsheviks under Lenin (April Theses, 'Peace, Bread, Land'), the July Days, the Kornilov affair, the actions of Kerensky, the tactics and organisation of Trotsky and Lenin.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

14 The Causes and Impact of the First World War c.1890-1920

(a) To what extent was Austrian and Russian rivalry in the Balkans to blame for the outbreak of the First World War?

Focus: evaluation of causes of the First World War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The emphasis here is on the role of Balkan rivalry in causing the First World War, but candidates may place this in the context of other factors. However, candidates must deal effectively with the role of Austro-Russian rivalry in order to score well. Candidates may analyse the nature of the rivalry, the context of Slav nationalism, and explain the increasing tensions in the early twentieth century and especially the events of 1908 and the Balkan Wars. There may be some focus on the crisis the summer of 1914 after the assassination of Ferdinand to explain how Balkan rivalry interwove with wider tensions and the alliance system to turn a Balkan crisis into a major war.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less

effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons why attempts to break the stalemate on the Western Front were unsuccessful from 1914 to early 1918.

Focus: evaluation of reasons for stalemate.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to examine a number of reasons and show their linkages and/or relative importance in order to score well. Candidates may explain the main features of the stalemate, but will need to analyse the reasons for its development to meet the demands of the question. Candidates may refer, for example, to: the development of the trench system, the limitations placed on the type of warfare by the technology available (heavy artillery, the machine gun, lack of mobility once at the front etc.), the strategies and tactics employed by both sides, the failure of alternative approaches, the size of armies. There may be reference to relevant campaigns and battles to illustrate points made (e.g. the battles around Ypres, Verdun, the Somme, the Nivelle offensive).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

15 Italy 1919-1945

(a) To what extent was the rise of Mussolini to 1922 caused by the effects of the First World War on Italy?

Focus: evaluation of reasons for Mussolini's rise to power.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

To score well, candidates need to deal with the impact and aftermath of the war effectively even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important. Candidates may refer to the nature of Italy's commitment to the war, the losses they suffered, the expectations of peace, the 'mutilated victory', the disillusion with political leaders, the economic problems resulting from the war, D'Annunzio and Fiume,

nationalism, the rise of socialism/communism, the formation and actions of the fascists, the failure of liberal politicians, Mussolini's ability, actions and approach, Giolitti's alliance with the Fascists in 1921, the attitude of the King and the March on Rome.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How successful was Mussolini in transforming the economy and society of Italy in the period from 1922 to 1940?

Focus: evaluation of Mussolini's economic and social policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates need to focus on evaluating 'success in transforming' the economy and society rather than simply explaining policies and their effects. A broad range of aspects can be considered under the umbrella of economy and society, and answers may include, for example: economic policy (e.g. the 'battles' for grain, land, lira, the corporative state, self-sufficiency and protection), social policy (the battle for births, propaganda and indoctrination, education and youth movements). Answers may explain ways in which Mussolini hoped to change Italians and use this as the test to judge success; many judgements may be largely negative.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

16 Germany 1919-1945**(a) Assess the impact of the Treaty of Versailles (1919) on Germany in the 1920s.**

Focus: evaluation of the impact of Versailles.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

This is not simply an invitation to candidates to write out the terms of the Treaty, although analysis of them and the conclusions that can be drawn about their impact are clearly important. Candidates may take a thematic approach and examine the territorial, military, psychological, economic, social and political impact of the Treaty. Candidates may refer to issues such as: humiliation, desire for vengeance, the association of defeat and humiliation with the new republic, political disorder, coups and revolution, economic chaos reinforced by reparations, social distress and violence. Answers may contrast early Weimar instability with the greater calm of the 'Golden Years'.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent was Hitler's control of Germany from 1933 to 1939 based on fear?

Focus: evaluation of the nature of the Nazi regime.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

To score well, candidates need to deal fully with the role of fear even if they wish to argue other factors were more important. Candidates may refer in their analysis to issues such as: the attempt to create a totalitarian regime, the use of violence, intimidation, the machinery of the police state (SS, Gestapo, informers, concentration camps etc.), propaganda and censorship, indoctrination, economic and social policy (including the 'benefits'), foreign policy successes. Some candidates may take the sophisticated line that despite the apparent benefits of Nazi rule (e.g. order, stability, economic recovery, restoration of pride and purpose) at root it was a regime based on terror.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well

organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Europe and the World 1919-1989

17 International Relations 1919-1941

(a) To what extent was the Treaty of Versailles (1919) a recipe for future conflict in Europe?

Focus: evaluation of connections between Versailles & later conflicts.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to consider links between elements of the Treaty and subsequent conflicts, especially Hitler's aggressive actions in the later 1930s. Elements considered might include: territorial disputes (Germany's boundaries, German speaking minorities), reparations, the principle of war guilt, disarmament, the wider resentment in Germany that this Treaty helped to breed that encouraged the growth of extreme nationalism. Some might bring in other possibilities, e.g. the ineffectual nature of the League of Nations. Some may point to the leniency with which elements of Versailles were implemented (e.g. reductions in reparations, German implementation of disarmament requirements that were quietly flouted). There may also be discussion of the attitude of Britain and France and their policies during the 1920s and 1930s.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent did the structure and organisation of the League of Nations contribute to its failure?

Focus: evaluation of factors leading to League failures.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Evaluation of factors causing League failures needs to be made, within which League structures & organisation must be one element fully considered. Linking League weaknesses specifically to League problems and successes in the 1920s and 1930s would be one way of answering the question (so Manchuria and Abyssinia alone should not be the only examples considered). In discussing the impact of structure and organisation candidates may point to the need for unanimity, the inadequacies of the sanctions available to the League, the limited membership of the organisation. Candidates may link these points to actual crises and events to demonstrate their impact. Answers may also point to the desire by some key states (e.g. Britain) not to be 'world policemen', and the idea that the Council's dominant members (Britain & France) had very different ideas on the League's role, and the reluctance of members to involve themselves in boycotts if these went against national interests. To cover the issue of 'To what extent ...?', wider perspectives may be drawn, such as: the deteriorating state of international affairs and the rise of aggressive states in Japan, Germany and Italy, the lack of will by France and Britain to use the League. Candidates may point to successes in the 1920s and thus question whether the League itself was flawed or whether it could only ever be hoped to keep the peace where both sides in a conflict were willing to cooperate – which the Fascist dictators were not.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

18 The USSR 1924-1953

(a) How successful were the Five Year Plans?

Focus: evaluation of the Plans' successes.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to be focused around the evaluation of the Five Year Plans of the Stalin regime, and answers may consider collectivisation of agriculture as well as the reorganisation of industry. Success may be measured against political, economic and social factors. And success for who: better standards of living for peasants, better standards of living for industrial workers, a stronger grip on Russia for Stalin? The extent to which Stalin met these may be explored. Did collectivisation produce famine? How many were executed or deported to the gulag? Did living standards fall from 1928? Some may question how far we can actually know since the official statistics are unreliable and the Stakhanovite system was abused. The study topic goes to 1953 so reward those who make some reference in their evaluation to Plans beyond the 1930s.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) How successfully did Stalin organise the defence of the USSR in the period from 1939 to 1945?

Focus: evaluation of the effectiveness of the USSR's defence.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Overall evaluation should consider the perspectives of Russia's struggles and then eventual success in the Great Patriotic War. The background of Soviet foreign policy in the 1930s may be considered; Molotov's support for and Stalin's scepticism about the Nazi- Soviet Pact may be weighed, with the open and secret clauses for trade and territorial expansion. The opportunities posed by this could be considered – was the USSR better prepared for defence in 1941 than it had been in 1939? Hitler's invasion in 1941, the drawing in of the German armies, the plans to relocate industry and the overall effectiveness of Stalin's planning could be considered. There should be consideration of Russian defence during the Great Patriotic War. Consideration of the events in 1945 after the defeat of the Third Reich may legitimately be discussed in so far as they are relevant to the focus of the question.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

19 The Cold War in Europe 1945-1989**(a) To what extent did the Berlin Blockade (1948-49) make the Cold War in Europe worse during the period 1945-61?**

Focus: evaluation of factors making East-West relations worse.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers need to evaluate reasons for the escalation of the Cold War during the years, and the place of the Blockade within that – driving forward the division of Germany. There should be full discussion of the impact of the Berlin Blockade on East-West tension. Among causal factors considered in answers might be: the division of Germany, attempts by each side to control their sectors, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, the setting up of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. 'To what extent ...?' may be addressed by setting the impact of the Berlin Blockade against other influences that made the Cold War 'hotter' - such as Russia's crushing of the Hungarian Uprising (1956), the escalating space race (from 1957), the U2 incident (1961), building the Berlin Wall (1961) – or perhaps calmed things down [e.g. the death of Stalin (1953), summits (1955, 1959, 1960)].

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) Assess the reasons for the decline of Soviet control in Eastern Europe during the 1980s.

Focus: evaluation of factors causing declining Soviet control.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Analysis of the factors determining the decline of Soviet control in Eastern Europe and their erosion during the 1980s will form the basis of discussion. Political, economic and social issues, along with the resurgence of nationalism will give ample scope for a good answer to be developed. Many answers may focus on the role and significance of Gorbachev from 1985, perhaps considering whether he was the prime reason for the Soviet collapse in Eastern Europe when he publicly abandoned the Brezhnev Doctrine. Some may focus on the seminal role of Poland and the influence of Solidarity and the Catholic Church in weakening the communist grip. The influential roles of Hungary (opening the border with Austria) and East Germany in accelerating the pace of change in 1989 might be considered. Answers may point to the growing awareness of Western prosperity. External factors can also be brought to bear, such as President Reagan's bid to bankrupt the USSR and win the Cold War via a new arms race (the so-called 'Second Cold War') – hence Gorbachev telling the

East German government in 1989 that it must form closer ties with West Germany because Moscow could no longer afford to subsidise the East German economy.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

20 The Cold War in Asia and the Americas 1949-1974

(a) 'The USA was losing the Cold War in Asia and the Americas in the period from 1949 to 1962.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: evaluation of the USA's position in the Cold War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Evaluation of the whether or not the USA was falling behind should form the focus of the evaluation. Answers may discuss factors such as: containment theory, the developing arms race, the impact of the Korean War, the rising strength of communism in South East Asia (e.g. Mao won the Chinese civil war in 1949; the deteriorating situation in Vietnam) and Cuba (Castro came to power 1959). Some answers might point to the failure of US ideas to establish good relations with newly-communist China, swept away in the hysteria of McCarthyism that generated strong feelings in the US that it was losing the Cold War, especially as the USSR pulled ahead in the space race. On the other hand, answers might point out consequences of the Korean War, such as: the strengthening of US support for other states (Taiwan, the Philippines, South Vietnam), the creation of the ANZUS Pact, the creation of SEATO, the US taking on the role of 'world policeman'. Answers might also question the 'success' of the communist bloc, pointing out e.g.: the deteriorating relations between China and Russia, China backed down in the 1st Taiwan Straits Crisis (1954) and negotiated a deal in the 2nd (1958). Consideration of the Americas will probably be confined to Cuba – that is fine, although some answers might refer to other states, such as the CIA's coup in Guatemala (1954). Answers may end with an evaluation of whether either side can be said to have won the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less

effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

(b) To what extent did the Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) lead to a thaw in relations between the USA and USSR during the 1960s?

Focus: evaluation of the impact of the Missile Crisis.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Evaluation of the impact of the crisis on relations between the USA and USSR needs to be central. Consideration of how Khrushchev and Kennedy regarded each other before and after the events of 1962 may be used by some, but the core focus must be on post-1962 and the developing thaw, culminating in détente, by 1969-70. Factors encouraging a thaw might include: the installation of the 'hot line' (1963), the signing of the Test-Ban Treaty (1963), the sale of US grain to the USSR, the role of the Crisis in bringing down Khrushchev (1964), the developing 'peaceful co-existence' of the Brezhnev years SALT 1 (1969). Some answers may argue that, for the US, détente was produced as much if not more by the impact of the Vietnam War than the Cuban Crisis - and for the USSR by the impact of economic difficulties and the growing Sino-Soviet split. On the other hand, answers might point to the on-going Cold War struggle fought out indirectly between the USA and the USSR in the developing world, whether in Bolivia or Vietnam. Answers might point also to the on-going tensions over Berlin generated by the crisis of 1958-61, the impact of Brezhnev crushing the Prague Spring (1968).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issue raised by the question. Answers in **Bands III and below** will be less focused, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

Band I answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and be well organised.

Band II answers will do most of that, but the quality of the analysis will be less effective, perhaps being more uneven in their treatment.

Band III answers will offer good descriptive knowledge of the topic rather than explanation and assessment, but will nonetheless produce an argument and there will be some evaluative comment. Answers may lack balance.

Answers in **Bands IV and V** will be very descriptive and may well have a restricted range.

Answers in **Bands VI and VII** will not answer the question. **Band VII** answers may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2587
January 2006**

Unit 2587

Charlemagne

(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C about government in the final years of Charlemagne's reign. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both agree that the capitularies repeatedly denounce misgovernment and acts of violence - by individuals (in Passage B) and by the counts (in Passage C).

Differences: Passage B argues that the Carolingian state was very badly administered. Passage C asserts that Charlemagne was determined to stamp out evils. Passage B suggests that things were much worse than they had ever been, but Passage C argues that there is little evidence for decline from better days because the evidence says little about the situation before 800. Passage B stresses the repeated denunciations of malfunctioning government, but Passage C sees this as evidence of Charlemagne's sense of urgency.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that in the years after 800 Charlemagne's empire was in a state of decomposition.

[30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Candidates may note that all parties share the view that there were grave shortcomings in Carolingian government. Passage **A** outlines many of the abuses which they fear are going on. It is especially interesting that the *missi* are concerned by attempts to hide such abuses when they make visitations. This is convincing evidence of corruption in government under Charlemagne. There are very many parallel statements, and almost all of these date from after 800 and candidates may cite examples. Passage **B** says the repeated injunctions are evidence that the government of the empire was at this time in decline. Passage **C** argues that the phenomenon of corruption cannot simply be linked to a period of decline after 800, and the frequent repetition may be evidence of the emperor's determination to eradicate long-standing abuses. Passage **D** points out that Charlemagne's success was probably linked to expansion, and that this had more or less stopped after 800. Passage **D** goes on to say that when expansion ended, government was too poorly developed to control the new conquests. Candidates should be familiar with this view

and some of the counterarguments and be able to apply this knowledge to the answer. They may well place heavy emphasis on the notion that the empire was held together by conquest but should also indicate some knowledge of the administration of the empire. It is possible that own knowledge of this subject may be coloured by information about Louis the Pious and markers need to be careful to assess relevance where this is the case.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

2. To what extent did Charlemagne's inheritance from his father shape his policies towards the peoples outside the Frankish lands? [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about Charlemagne's policies towards the neighbours of the Franks.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The main line of argument is to establish how far Charlemagne was original in his policies and how far influenced simply by precedent. Many have a very favourable view of Charlemagne and see him as the originator of a great tide of Frankish conquest. However, others suggest that Charlemagne inherited from his father, Pepin, a strong notion of the Frankish ascendancy over the neighbouring peoples. Pepin had almost completely conquered the Aquitaine and attempted to enforce his authority over the duke of Bavaria whose evasions infuriated Charlemagne. Pepin had also asserted the Frankish supremacy over the Saxons and other peoples of western Germany, though this had enjoyed limited success. He had also enjoyed close relations with the papacy. Once his brother Carloman was out of the way, Charlemagne can be seen as pursuing the policies of his father. However, it is possible that Charlemagne did these things in different ways and to a much greater degree than his father. Answers may discuss his policy towards Rome and consider how far this was part of his inheritance from his father. They may also consider that Charlemagne did things without precedent in his father's reign – in Spain and against the Avars, for example.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

3. Assess the reasons why Charlemagne's government was dependent on the Church and churchmen?

Focus: evaluation of debate about reasons for royal dependence on the Church.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Some have seen the dependence on churchmen as a result of the limited nature of contemporary government. They stress that part of the inheritance of Charlemagne was a close alliance between the Carolingian family and churchmen (one of whose main consequences was the deposition of the last Merovingian in 750 and the coronation of Pepin with papal consent). The new dynasty needed Church support because churchmen controlled vast resources in land and troops; they were also literate. Others argue that what distinguished Charlemagne's relations with churchmen was the way he brought them into government to act as a counterbalance to the power of the nobility, and to put their literacy to good use in the service of the state. Answers might suggest it was a two-way process. The Church benefited from Carolingian protection and patronage.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

King John

(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and C about reasons for John's loss of Normandy in 1204. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Passage C makes it clear that Philip had vastly superior financial resources and Passage A does not contradict this. Philip's success at Chateau Gaillard could be seen to bear this out.

Differences: Passage C refers to the financial failings of the English Exchequer but Passage A indicates that John had money at his disposal and not 'totally committed'. Passage A blames both John's pride and lack of concern and his luxuriating with his wife. Passage C fixes on his financial shortcomings, although this is only 'one of the reasons'.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that John lost Normandy because his financial resources were inadequate for the task of fighting a war against Philip Augustus. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Roger of Wendover (Passage **A**), as candidates should recognise from their own knowledge, was a monastic chronicler and therefore somewhat predisposed to be hostile to John. His view that the loss of Normandy was the result of John's faults of character was, for a long time, accepted by historians in the 'classic' view of John and the loss of the Angevin lands which forms part of the picture of John, the incompetent tyrant. However, the debate has moved on and Warren (Passage **B**) argues that Normandy was alienated from its ruler and its barons were prepared to

defect to the French king, and had been for some time. This does not contradict Passage **A** but points to new evidence and candidates should be able, from their own knowledge, to indicate why this may have been happening, referring, for example, to the constant warfare in the later reign of Richard I. In Passage **C**, Holt stresses the importance of finance and the relative wealth of the Angevin and Capetian monarchies, an important extension of the debate because money was essential to pay for war. This subject was explored more thoroughly by Gillingham (Passage **D**) who thinks that, effectively, the two monarchies could raise rather similar resources. He goes on to suggest that the crucial factor was that John had alienated barons in key areas of the continental lands, and this gave Philip the edge. Candidate should be able to recognise that the treatment of Arthur and its impact were important here, and relate these statements to those in Passage **B**. The Lusignans may also be mentioned as contributing to John's downfall, thus emphasising his personal failings.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

5. Assess the view that Innocent III's dislike of English arrangements for the selection of an archbishop of Canterbury was the most important cause of the conflict with King John over the Canterbury election. [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about the breach between John and Innocent III.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Partly under the influence of contemporary chronicles, historians have tended to approach the quarrel between John and Innocent from a rather insular viewpoint. More recently, historians have related events to broader developments in the Church, and particularly connected it to the exaltation of papal authority by Innocent III. Answers will need to analyse the way in which the Canterbury election was conducted. In that, they may stress its anomalies – the tension between the monks and the bishops is particularly important. They may also show they understand that the king, for good reason, had always had a major say in the choice of the archbishop. It was the action of the monks which gave Innocent standing in the affair, because, arguably, if there had been a single candidate, however chosen, it would have been difficult for him to intervene. However, once there was a dispute it had to be settled, and candidates could analyse the development of ideas which may have influenced Innocent, in particular the notion that the pope could intervene to

safeguard the church, and his ideas about rights of election by churchmen. This was essentially a clash between custom and practice - royal power over elections, and the new emphasis on freedom of election. However, candidates may point up evidence that Innocent was not intransigent, e.g., that he may have regarded Langton as an acceptable compromise while, at times, John took a very hard line.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

6 How united were the English barons in opposition to King John at the time that *Magna Carta* was agreed? [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about how far the revolt against John was revolt of all the barons?

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

There are clear indications that, by 1215, John had offended to a degree a large number of the English barons as a result of his personality and the way in which he ruled England. However, some historians have pointed out that some barons were more hostile than others. In particular, it has been suggested that a group of mainly (but not entirely) northern barons had a history of opposition to the king – many had refused to accept the scutage and service in Poitou before Bouvines. Many barons had held aloof from the outbreak of violence against the king, but joined the rebels when they seized London on 17 May 1215 when they seemed likely to succeed. By contrast, some historians have observed that there were many faithful barons who never wavered in support of the king: e.g. Ranulf de Blundeville, earl of Chester, is a notable example. So the king had a party and not all the barons were equally committed to opposition to the king. There was intense negotiation and two men played a particular role: Archbishop Stephen Langton and William Marshal, earl of Pembroke. They have sometimes been seen as a middle party working for peace. The Charter, as eventually agreed, was much more moderate than earlier drafts and some of the ideas expressed by the rebels. This points to the divisions amongst the barons. Moreover, some barons refused to be associated with the Charter but, as

civil war became likely again after the Charter was concluded, there was still plenty of negotiation, though ultimately it failed.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Mark Scheme 2588
January 2006

Unit 2588**Philip II****1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D on Philip II's motives in sending the Spanish Armada in 1588.** [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both mention national interest, Passage A with respect to piracy in the New World, Passage D with reference to the defence of Spain, the Netherlands and the Americas. Both agree that Philip was responding to damaged prestige - injury and insult in Passage A; incidents like the Cadiz raid in Passage D. Both refer to the aim of overthrowing Elizabeth.

Differences: Passage A sees an aggressive, imperialistic motive whereas Passage D argues for serving God's cause and defending Philip's inherited interests.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, how far do you agree that Philip II's foreign strategies were responsible for the decline in relations with England during his reign? [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

There is debate on the nature of Philip's foreign policy, whether aggressive or defensive, planned or opportunist. Was it primarily inspired by religious fanaticism, or by economic, political or dynastic motives? **A** and **D** consider English actions to responsible, whereas **B** considers Philip misinterpreted some of Elizabeth's actions. The changing nature of relations needs to be analysed: intended peace spoilt by Elizabeth's provocations, in Passage **D**, met with patience by Philip until economic factors pushed him to attack for defensive reasons and reputation's sake. Elizabeth's involvement with the Sea Beggars is mentioned in Passage **B**, but the Treaty of Nonsuch 1585 and England's invasion of the Netherlands might be used to attribute responsibility to Elizabeth for declining relations. On the other hand, Philip's imperialist strategy in Passage **A**, to conquer England and France, and his religious strategy as champion of the Counter Reformation, in Passages **A**, **B** and **D** might be considered main factors. Own knowledge that might be used includes: Philip's views on heresy and his aim to reconvert England to Roman Catholicism, to gain toleration for and return of English Catholic exiles - 'enormous efforts in God's cause' (Passage **D**) might be used in support. His flawed strategy regarding sea routes (Passage **C**) may be linked to Drake's exploits in Passages **A** and **D**, and responsibility balanced

between the two sides. His Grand Strategy, in Passages **A** and **D**, combining defensive, dynastic aims with preservation of personal and national reputation might be seen as pre-planned and responsible for declining relations, or his strategy might be seen as reactive, giving Elizabeth some blame. References could be made to the 'injuries and insults' which had worsened relations between Spain and England – Elizabeth's seizure of bullion en route to Alva; trade embargoes and seizure of Spanish ships; Ireland; the execution of Mary Queen of Scots in whose interests Philip had been involved in plots. The turning point in acquiring Portugal and its empire in 1580 may be used in argument. There may be consideration of the exploits of Drake and Hawkins in connection to reputation and economic damage.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

2 Assess how far Philip II's problems in governing mainland Spain were due to the Spanish administrative system. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate about reasons for Philip's problems in ruling Spain.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate on Philip II's problems in ruling Spain focuses on whether the administrative system he inherited was the main factor in limiting his control of his provinces, or whether other factors, such as his personality or pressure of imperial commitments, were more significant. His conservatism and respect for his father's Instructions of 1543 led him to maintain the inherited administrative system, expanding the number of councils by 3 to 14. Overlapping conciliar jurisdictions, factional rivalry, distance, *fueros* and local grandee power undermined his attempts to use Viceroy, *letrados* and *corregidores* effectively to rule his provinces. The deficiencies of the financial system included inherited debts, foreign loans, *juros*, *asientos*, and corruption. The economy had flaws, such as an adverse balance of payments, export of bullion, and import of arms and grain. The Inquisition gave him a reputation for cruelty, religious and racial bigotry, which his intransigent orthodoxy aggravated in a Counter Reformation context. Some historians view his personality as indecisive, weak and financially inept, others as authoritarian and cruel, causing the Aragon and Morisco revolts. A supported evaluative judgement should be reached on the relative significance of the system in regard to other factors, such as his personality or pressure of imperial commitments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

3 Assess the extent to which the Revolt of the Netherlands was caused by Philip II's reaction to the spread of Calvinism there during the period 1555-72.

[45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about the part played by religion in causing the Revolt.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Was it the spread of Calvinism, linked with rebellion, or Philip's Counter Reformation zeal which played the greater part in the religious cause? The debate centres on the importance of religion as a cause of the Revolt, emphasised by traditional and 'Black Legend' historians but disputed by revisionists, who suggest a range of other causes – political, social, economic and provincial. Philip's reaction in fulfilling his role as champion of the Counter Reformation is central to the discussion, but should be balanced with his view that rebels and heretics were one, and guilty of treason. The religious argument might be approached from both angles in better answers: Philip's suppression of heresy versus rebel subversion of the established Church with foreign Protestant support. A range of other causes have been suggested: provincial liberties and grandee privileges v Castilianisation; opposition to absolute foreign rule supported by military force and the subversion of law; economic exploitation to fund Habsburg priorities such as war with the Turks, causing neglect of the provinces. Philip's choice of governors, Margaret of Parma and the Duke of Alva, together with delays and micromanagement from Madrid, compounded these causes. The main focus needs to be on factors which caused the Revolt, argued with a sense of debate.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Elizabeth I

4(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C on the problems Elizabeth faced in devising her Church Settlement. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both refer to opposition in Parliament, in the House of Lords (Passage B) and in the House of Commons (Passage C), although the point is refuted in Passage C. Both agree that there was a need for caution and compromise. Both suggest Elizabeth's own preferences were less important – Passage C explicitly and Passage B by reference to legislation being re-written.

Differences: Passage C mentions the importance of placating foreign powers. Passage B gives less weight to the international situation, arguing its impact is unclear.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, how far do you agree that domestic considerations were the main influence on the Elizabethan Church Settlement? [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **A** makes it clear that Elizabeth aimed to be ambiguous and implies this was to avoid trouble both at home and abroad. Passage **B** emphasises domestic considerations on the basis that it is difficult to make clear links between foreign policy considerations and the actions of Elizabeth's government on religion. Passage **C** denies the influence of the Commons and refers only to Elizabeth's awareness of the international situation, while Passage **D** emphasises the need to control her realm, making no mention of foreign affairs. Candidates are likely to be aware of the debate (Neale's thesis is referred to in **C**) regarding the respective influences of the two Houses of Parliament on the religious settlement, but should be careful not to digress into this debate to the detriment of answering this question. They might also refer to the danger of Catholic rebellion in England and/or Ireland, linking this with the Catholic ceremonial retained in the Elizabethan Church. However, they might note that there is debate over whether this was down to Elizabeth's personal preferences or the desire to placate a predominantly Catholic population. The specification makes it clear that an understanding of foreign policy as it relates to domestic issues will be useful when studying this option so candidates should understand the references in the Passages to the French war, Papal influence and the need to remain friendly with Spain, as well as the reference to Protestant princes. Candidates should reach a judgement about whether the Passages, which tend to emphasise domestic considerations, hold greater validity than arguments stressing the influence of other factors.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

5 To what extent was the decline of Catholicism in Elizabethan England bound to happen? [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about the extent of Catholic survival.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

While there is no doubt that England did become a Protestant country during Elizabeth's reign (and not earlier), there are differences of opinion as to the inevitability of this change. Candidates may distinguish between social and political papistry on the one hand and religious Catholicism on the other, but should not become overly distracted by issues of definition. Catholicism was not eradicated in Elizabeth's reign, but there is no doubt that it survived as a minority religion. It can be argued that although the clergy gradually became Protestant, long, tedious sermons did not convert the people and their content may even have antagonised them. However, it is now acknowledged that catechizing was more effective. There is debate over the extent of survivalism by the time the seminary priests arrived in 1574. Some historians have argued there was little survivalism, while others argue for it in specific counties. They suggest that survival was not simply a result of the missionary priests' activities and decline was not, therefore, inevitable. There is also debate over the impact of the persecution of Catholics in the second half of the reign. This was largely directed against the Catholic clergy on political grounds. The lay Catholic gentry disassociated itself from treason and thereby became or continued to be an inert religious group. The effectiveness of the missionary priests has also been debated, with some historians emphasising their lack of effectiveness in contrast to others who shows that they did convert heretics. Candidates may question the concept of historical inevitability, and may be rewarded for doing so provided that their argument depends on relevant material, such as a counter-factual approach, rather than taking issue with the question on purely philosophical grounds.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

6 How far was Elizabeth's image as queen a positive one across the years to 1603? [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about the nature of the impact of Elizabeth's royal image.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates need to have a clear understanding of the range of contemporary images of Elizabeth. The positive image was on two levels - for her more educated subjects and at a popular level. Elizabeth created an image of herself which was developed and controlled during the reign. It was based on a number of images that would have been familiar to contemporaries, from both the Bible and classical mythology. They may consider her image in art and literature, as well as pageants and progresses. The date of her accession became an annual festival in 1576, with elaborate and symbolic tournaments. To her ordinary subjects Elizabeth was portrayed as the saviour of the true faith through the wording of the Prayer Book. The printed word was used in pamphlets. Plays were also controlled by the Master of Revels. They may also consider problems and responses associated with her marriage and the succession. Historians have disagreed about how successful the control of Elizabeth's image was and hence how positive the image was. While some focus on successes, contrasting Elizabeth's success with the failure of Mary Tudor, others criticise the image as a mere illusion and provide examples to demonstrate that the population was not convinced by the elaborate efforts to create a positive impression. The argument that Elizabeth failed to maintain a positive image in her final decade could be contrasted with the views of more adulatory historians. Similarly, candidates may question how positive a view of Elizabeth was taken by authors such as Foxe and Spenser.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Oliver Cromwell

7(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C on Cromwell as a politician before and during the First Civil War. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both agree that Cromwell did not become a prominent politician until after the beginning of his military career.

Differences: Passage B emphasises Cromwell's gradual development and emergence as an important political figure while Passage C takes the view that Cromwell only became significant in politics because of his military success. Passage B sees Cromwell's success in 1644-45 as a result of his previously acquired experience while Passage C shows he was not previously prominent, unlike other MPs. Passage C describes Cromwell as relatively weak in the House of Commons whereas Passage B implies that he was an active MP, even if he only received recognition in 1644.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

- (ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the qualities that brought Cromwell to prominence during the First Civil War. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passages **A**, **C** and **D** broadly agree that Cromwell's rise to prominence resulted from his military activities, while Passage **B** implies that although the war was the occasion for this rise, Cromwell had already become an able politician. **D** does hint at this when it notes that by late 1641 Cromwell's hawkish views were apparent. This contrasts with Passage C which argues that war was the reason for his rise to prominence. Answers may draw on the range of evidence referred to in the Passages to illustrate their argument, expanding on it to show evidence of their own knowledge. For example they may refer to specific engagements, the way in which Cromwell disciplined his troops, and/or the steps by which he rose as an officer when assessing the reputation he gained during the war. They may also draw on their knowledge of the role of the Committee of Both Kingdoms in directing the war after the Solemn League and Covenant was concluded, and/or to the part played by Cromwell in the quarrel over parliamentary war aims and leadership during the winter of 1644-45.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**.

Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

8 How far do you agree that, for the years 1648-1653, Cromwell should be remembered as a 'brave bad man'? [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about Cromwell's reputation 1648-53.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Cromwell's reputation has been a matter of historical debate from the Restoration onwards; this quote from Clarendon (which candidates do not need to identify as such) is an early example of a judgement on him. Candidates may draw on the judgements of Cromwell's contemporaries and/or the views of historians in constructing their argument. Levellers and Republicans were both critical of Cromwell by 1653, based on his role in the trial and execution of the king and the constitutional developments of 1653 on the grounds that he had abandoned 'the cause'. However, recent historians have generally been more sympathetic to Cromwell, and sometimes identified greater consistency in his aims and motives. Besides this, some candidates may include material on other aspects, for example Cromwell's Irish campaign of 1649 (the subject of debate between those who take the Irish Nationalist viewpoint and those who challenge it).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

9 To what extent did Cromwell's rule become increasingly conservative from 1653 to 1658? [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about the balance between radicalism and conservatism in Cromwell's government.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

There are two contrasting views on this issue. Recent research on Barebones suggests that it was an effective, reforming institution, removed by threat of military force, and this reinforces the view of the Cromwellian Protectorate as conservative. Candidates may argue that the Protectorate was conservative neither in aims or means. While the constitution apparently moved away from republican ideals and came to resemble that of the Stuart monarchy, with head of state, Council and parliament (including a bi-cameral parliament from 1657), candidates may challenge the view that this constituted a retreat from revolution on the grounds that the workings of the constitution, and Cromwell's attitude to his role prevented it from operating like a monarchy, or they may challenge the idea that his policies were conservative. In following the latter argument they will probably focus on his religious policies. Candidates may take into account arguments concerning the extent to which the Cromwellian regime constituted a military dictatorship, and provided that they justify designating 'military regime' as conservative, this is an acceptable approach.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Peter the Great

10(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D on Russia at the time of Peter the Great's accession. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both Passages refer to there being some progressives in Russia. Passage A is explicit on this while Passage D's talk of the existence of minority

tastes among the Moscow elite supports this view. Both mention the impact of European influences in Russia.

Differences: Passage A argues that most Russians were hostile to change and that Russian society vegetated. Passage D argues that change was already under way and that Russia was far from being a 'blank sheet'. Passage A indicates a divided society in Russia while Passage D implies a united one, although it covers a limited range.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the nature and scale of the problems that faced Peter the Great on his accession. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage **A** emphasises Peter's problems by showing the wide-scale apathy and resistance to change at the time of his accession. Passage **C** mostly agrees with this view. To an extent, Passage **B** also agrees but modifies it by claiming that the traditional forces were weakened and that they were not able to offer much resistance to a reforming tsar. Passage **D** is the most obvious contrast. Signs of change are highlighted. In using their own knowledge, candidates might refer to the struggle that Peter had in gaining power. There were dangerous elements such as the *streletsi*. Against that, the powers of a tsar were very considerable when properly used; his power was absolute. The Passages do not refer to foreign policy. Candidates might refer to this, but it is not a necessary aspect of answers in qualifying for any mark Band. As always, candidates are not expected to have any knowledge of historians who have written Passages - the information about Schmurlo (Passage **A**) is given only to deter candidates from the assumption that a Russian historian must be a Marxist.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

11 How far do you agree that, throughout his reign, the support for Peter the Great within Russia outweighed the opposition? [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about the degree of support for and opposition to Peter the Great.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Many answers might give more weight to the opposition, but examiners are not to look for anything like a 50:50 balance between support and opposition for a mark in any Band. However, answers in **Bands I and II** should normally be able to consider both aspects successfully. The question is drawn from the third Key Issue and associated Content, 'Why was there so much opposition to [Peter's] rule? Reaction to Peter's reforms: opposition from the *strel'tsi*, the boyars, Alexis and the Church'. Each of these was important, but each also had its limitations. Those who immediately surrounded Peter tended to give him their support. Peter was personally unchallenged as tsar after the initial turmoil of his accession. There were rebellions but none came close to overthrowing him. There is good evidence that he was admired, if not loved, for his willingness to suffer hardships for Russia. Some members of the nobility, especially the service nobility, gave the Tsar support, but that support did vary (over time as well as from individual to individual). Candidates should note that the question asks about developments throughout his reign; this limits overlap with Q10(ii).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

12 Assess the claim that Peter the Great merely copied western models in reforming his administration. [45]

Focus: evaluation of debate about the nature of Peter's administrative policies.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The broad area of debate is the link between Peter's reforms and westernisation. Russia was divided into eight *gubernia*, with sub-districts under them. *Prikazy* looking after specific areas of responsibility were established to centralise administration. Peter set up the Senate. Officials such as the Procurator-General were appointed. The Table of Ranks was established. It has been claimed that the reforms copied western models, such as in Sweden and Poland. On the other hand, some argue that they were not 'merely' copies because Peter's aims and actions had very Russian characteristics, fitting the requirements of Russia as Peter saw them. He drew from the west what he believed to be necessary - sometimes called a 'selective adaptation' - but he did not simply ape the west. The question asked includes the word 'merely' and better answers will address that.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

**Mark Scheme 2589
January 2006**

Unit 2589**Napoleon I****1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and C on the reasons for the Concordat. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Passages A and C both refer to the benefits to the Napoleonic regime of a Church reconciled to the state by the Concordat. Passage A refers to the Church as 'rallied to' the Napoleonic regime or at least ready to accept the new institutions' and interprets the Concordat as part of a general policy of reconciliation. Passage C is stronger in tone, referring to the Concordat as 'bolstering' and endorsing the new regime. Clearly then both agree that increasing support for the new regime was important.

Differences: Passage A stresses Napoleon's desire to reconcile and unite the Church and to satisfy the priesthood and heal divisions in France – suggesting an altruistic motive - whereas Passage C emphasises the desire to remove a 'powerful weapon from the royalists' and bolster the regime.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that reconciliation was the main means by which Napoleon sought to secure himself in power in France. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

In the passages, the role of reconciliation is referred to directly in Passages A and D, and Passage C, in addressing the role of the Concordat, also discusses a key aspect of the reconciliation policy. All three stress its importance, with perhaps Passage A arguing most forcefully that its impact was, because it served the needs of the time, to secure Napoleon in power. Passages C and D both stress that it 'bolstered the regime' (Passage C) and brought relative unity to France (it 'eliminated the factionalism which had torn the country apart' (Passage D). However Passage B strongly suggests that there was another key means by which Napoleon secured himself in power – the machinery of a 'police state' with all its spies, informers, arrests, repression, bribes and inducements. Passage A also indicates that the victory at the Battle of Marengo (1800) contributed, whilst Passage D mentions the codification of laws and the introduction of monetary and financial reforms, including the foundation of the Bank of France (1800). Candidates may expand/develop these

areas using 'own knowledge' and may also, for example, discuss issues such as: the role of constitutional changes, the role of administrative reform, the wooing of the notables.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

2 Assess the view that defeat in Russia (1812) was the main reason for Napoleon's downfall? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the reasons for Napoleon's downfall.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates must deal effectively with the interpretation given in the question even if they wish to argue that a different interpretation is more justified. Candidates may discuss other interpretations that emphasise, for example, Napoleon's decline, the growing strength of Napoleon's enemies, the deleterious effect of the Continental System, British opposition, the Peninsular War, and so on. In discussing 1812, answers may refer to issues such as: loss of manpower, loss of cavalry horses and artillery, damage to morale, stimulus to resistance and opposition, the link between the Russian campaign and the development of the Fourth Coalition against Napoleon in 1813. In discussing the relative merits of this and other interpretations, answers may examine links between different factors and use analytical language to discriminate between them (e.g. long-term, short-term, decisive, contributory, necessary but not sufficient). There may be reference to Napoleon's own explanations.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

3 'The harmful impact of Napoleon on Europe (outside France) has been exaggerated.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the impact of Napoleonic rule.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The key to a good answer is how far the candidate effectively argues around the question focus of negative impact being exaggerated. More effective answers will examine both positive and negative interpretations of the impact of Napoleonic rule. They may on the one hand discuss the economic and political impact of the Continental System and on the other the political, legal and social changes wrought in those states and regions which came under the Napoleonic sway. They may also differentiate between the negative/positive impacts in different areas/regions depending on closeness to France, local conditions, time under Napoleonic influence and so on.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80**4(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C about how far Gladstone actively sought publicity. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Passage C suggests Gladstone was very careful to ensure he stayed in the public eye and Passage B agrees he went deliberately to the north to speak. Passage B takes the view that Gladstone's reputation was responsible for his popularity, not his self promotion. Passage C agrees, saying he became newsworthy without any pressure on his part. Both Passages refer to the positive publicity his budgets gave him and to the eventual position where publicity came to him without any effort on his part.

Differences: Passage C indicates that Gladstone's apparent lack of interest in publicity was a front and that he had cultivated the press since 1861. In contrast, Passage B sees him almost as a national institution who had no need to seek publicity. Passage B indicates his speeches were the way he sought publicity while Passage C emphasises his use of journalists.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the extent to which working-class support was important to Gladstone's political success. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

All the Passages agree that Gladstone was popular with the working classes and that this enhanced his political position. In Passages A and B it is seen as a result of his free trade budgets. Passage C suggests that his popularity depended partly on his budgets and Passage D agrees that cutting taxes was a key factor. All the Passages also suggest that the working classes supported Gladstone, in Passages A and B and Passage D by their enthusiastic attendance at his northern meetings and in Passage D by visiting him at Hawarden. Even Passage C by showing how cheaply his photograph was sold supports this view. The Passages also indicate that this support affected Gladstone's own view thus increasing his efforts to maintain their backing. Passage A shows him appreciating the high moral worth of the working class and in Passage D he is convinced that the respectable working class deserved the vote. Passage D also indicates that Gladstone went out of his way to get their support when he saw how his success could be built on it and Passage C backs up

this view. But equally, Passage B argues that few politicians cultivated the working classes, which suggests their support was not that valued. Workers may have despised the glitter of London but power remained there. Candidates could argue that in the period support from the working classes, who only got the vote in 1867 was not enough to bring a politician to power. They might show how Gladstone received Radical and non-conformist support which could be signs of working class backing. Gladstone remained socially conservative but it has been argued that he did to an extent rely on popular radical support. Other factors which accounted for his political success could be examined.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

5 How far was Disraeli personally committed to a programme of social reform after 1872? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on Disraeli as a social reformer.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Evidence that Disraeli supported social reform could come from the Crystal Palace speech and his defence of a 'policy of sewage' and his enthusiasm for Trade Union legislation. The evidence that he was lukewarm could include his lack of a coherent programme in 1874, his reliance on ministers like Cross and Sclater-Booth to be responsible for measures, the utilising of Liberal measures, the permissive nature of the legislation and pressure from individuals like Plimsoll. Despite these limitations some historians believe Disraeli's benign attitude to social reform and his readiness to draw attention to his triumphs mean that his contribution should not be underrated. Reference could also be made to 'Tory Democracy' and the debate about how far this was a cynical vote-winning exercise or a genuine attempt to better living conditions. Disraeli's greater interest in foreign and imperial issues could be mentioned. Candidates who describe the reforms with minimal comment are **not likely to reach Bands II or I**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

6 Evaluate the view that Gladstone did more than Disraeli to involve Britain in European affairs during the period 1868 to 1880. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the extent to which Disraeli and Gladstone involved Britain in European affairs and how far they succeeded.

What matters here is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

It could be argued that both Disraeli and Gladstone were eager to see Britain involved in European affairs, Gladstone because of his belief in the Concert of Europe to work for the moral good and Disraeli in order to keep Russia from threatening the route to India. But this shows the international and national viewpoints contrasted. Evidence that each succeeded could come from Gladstone's calling of the conference on the Black Sea issue in 1871 and his protests over Bulgaria when Disraeli failed to support united action by the great powers. From Disraeli's ministry, his determination in standing up to Russia and his triumph at Berlin might support his success. But Gladstone can be criticised for failing to stop Bismarck in the Franco-Prussian war. Some historians have argued that his apparent success depended on Bismarck's pressure on Russia and he did not appreciate the outcome of France's defeat. Disraeli's eastern policy can also be criticised for its brinkmanship and failure to secure a permanent settlement at Berlin. Their relative success could be assessed in both moral and practical terms. Many answers may settle for Disraeli, possibly on the basis of his flamboyance.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-71

7(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D about Prussia's role in the North German Confederation. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

The views expressed are largely different, but there are similarities about Prussian influence, if not its extent and importance.

Similarities: Prussian domination Passage A: the North German Confederation is seen as a confederation in name only and members have surrendered to Prussian power. In Passage D, Prussia is viewed as holding extensive powers as president with the king controlling foreign policy and army. Prussia could prevent constitutional change. Both Passages mention the power of the King of Prussia.

Differences: Passage D has Bismarck aware of and respecting traditional states rights, with important areas of public affairs left to them; Passage A sees no limits with states' liberties being destroyed and there being no limit on Prussian power. Passage D does not even see Prussia dominant in the federal structure and points to its veto only being operative in constitutional matters - which clashes with Passage A's view of the Confederation being one in name only.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Bismarck's unification of Germany destroyed hopes for a liberal parliamentary system. [45]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

The debate is about whether Bismarck's constitutions for the North German Confederation and the Reich amounted to total Prussian domination or a genuinely federal Germany. Historians also debate whether unification by 'Blood and Iron' had implications for the excessive power of the Prussian army and whether restrictions on the Reichstag (e.g. the military budget issue) were more important than its powers and the large electorate. Some have seen the Bismarck state as a forerunner of the Third Reich and seen the Battle of Sadowa (1866) as being as great a defeat for the Liberals as for the Austrians. Others see Bismarck as a real parliamentary statesman. Passage A stresses the powerful militaristic monarchy crushing the traditions and freedoms of the states; Prussia is unlikely to keep constitutional guarantees. This could be evaluated by reference to details of the constitutions and the way army reforms were driven through in the teeth of parliamentary resistance. Passage B argues the masses were indifferent to constitutionalism and supported authoritarianism. Bismarck is supposed to have been hostile. This could be linked to the huge popular support for successful wars in 1864 and 1870-71, and the idea of universal suffrage as counter-revolution. It ignores the genuine constitutionalism in the states and the fact that Bismarck did not merely take the authoritarian option but virtually apologized for collecting revenue without authorization, and went to some trouble, as Passage D says, to get a balance between Prussian and state power, a strong executive and a parliamentary system. The case can be argued both ways. Passage C offers a controversial counter-thesis, arguing from Bismarck's alliance with the National Liberals and the dislike of reactionary elements for the new Germany that it must have been liberal. Details of the constitutions could be deployed: Prussian dominance cannot be argued out of existence; does it strain credulity to see Bismarck as quite so liberal? Passage D looks at states' rights and the powers reserved to them (e.g. no national flag in this period; Bavaria kept its own armed forces) However, Prussia was dominant in foreign and defence and had complete control of constitutional change.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**.
Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

8 Assess the significance of economic factors in the unification of Germany from 1858 to 1871. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the relative significance of factors influencing German unification.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

This question draws primarily on Key Issues 1 & 2, but the nature of the option on Bismarck is that much revolves around one big issue so material can be relevant in more than one context – that is the case on this January 2006 paper so candidates may thus validly reuse material here that they used to answer Q.7.

Candidates may consider the *Zollverein* and the growing industrial power of Prussia. There is some debate about whether the *Zollverein* was more than a fiscal organization and some doubt whether it gave rise to economic growth. The arguments for the primacy of economic factors centre on whether the *Zollverein* which excluded Austria set a precedent for Prussian domination of a little Germany. This is debated, given the failure of the other members to support Prussia in 1866. Other arguments suggest that Prussian military might depended on the railways and industries that produced the needle gun and the Krupps artillery. This can be set against explanations that stress the purely military and diplomatic factors, especially the decline of the so-called Crimean alliance and the skill by which Bismarck isolated and entrapped his opponents. Some consideration might be given to national feeling, but some argue that this was encouraged by railways and the *Zollverein*.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

9 Assess the importance of German nationalist groups to the unification of Germany from 1858 to 1871. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the role of nationalist groups & nationalism in German unification.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

This question draws primarily on Key Issue 4 and content paragraphs 1 & 2, but the nature of the option on Bismarck is that much revolves around one big issue so material can be relevant in more than one context – that is the case on this January 2006 paper so candidates may thus validly reuse material here that they used to answer Q.7.

The main groups are: the National Association of 1859 which reasserted the ideas of 1848 and looked largely for Prussian leadership, and the Reform Association formed in Frankfurt in 1862 which looked to a revival of the Bund and a 'big Germany'. The influence of the National Liberals after 1866 might be considered. The extent of support for nationalism of any sort has been questioned, especially among the peasantry and the urban working classes. The junkers and princes were distrustful. Bismarck referred to the 'National Swindle' and the movement though full of middle class cultural luminaries was divided. However, there is a debate about its importance, especially when it was unleashed by Bismarck. Candidates could set other factors against it, such as purely diplomatic or economic factors; some might consider whether the new Germany was even truly nationalistic – the groups were disappointed about the extent of the German Empire by 1871 and by the national integration, with the states still significant. This could lead to different approaches in answers, but the focus of any answer must be on nationalist groups and nationalism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Roosevelt's America 1920-41

10(i) Compare the views expressed in Passage A and C on the priorities of Unites States foreign policy.

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Differences: Passage A suggests the USA did in part follow an isolationist foreign policy. It argues that the US reverted to pre-1917 policy. This avoided foreign entanglements. However, it also argues that the USA followed an aggressive economic based foreign policy. At the same time, it believes that the US was as internationalist as most other nations in the 1920s. Passage C takes the view that the USA was, in essence, isolationist in the 1920s. The voters of USA had rejected Wilson's internationalism and the Treaty of Versailles. Harding was isolationist. Similarities: However, Passage C also argues that US foreign policy aimed to support US economic interests overseas, similar to Passage A.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the USA was never truly isolationist in its approach to foreign policy in the period 1920 to 1941.

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

Passage A suggests that the USA avoided foreign alliances and political involvement overseas but was also willing to follow a policy which advanced US economic interests. Passage B suggests that there was isolationist support in the 1930s. However, this was limited to Europe. The isolationists, however, were willing to intervene to aid China. In addition, internationalists in the 1930s supported a more interventionist policy because the USA required a stable economic system worldwide (similar to Passage A) and that modern technology made the USA vulnerable to attack. Passage C suggests that US policy was consistent with supporting economic interests (similar to Passage A) but avoiding foreign political involvement. Passage D highlights degree of continuity between the presidencies of the Republican Hoover and FDR. It suggests the USA was opposed to using force overseas. This could be linked to own knowledge of 1920s, referring for example to the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928. Answers might mention issues such as: the USA followed a neutralist foreign policy for most of inter-war period. Only from 1939 did FDR begin to take a more active role with regard to Europe and the Far East. Only after the outbreak of war in Europe did he offer benevolent neutrality to Allies through Cash and Carry and Lend Lease. Alternatively, answers may argue that FDR's presidency marked a break in continuity. Some may portray FDR as an internationalist, wishing to aid China, intervene in Latin America and oppose dictators in Europe.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

11 How far was share speculation on the stock market the main cause of the economic depression in the United States from 1929? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on the causes of the depression.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates could mention that share speculation resulted in the Wall Street Crash of October 1929, which was the catalyst for the economic depression. Weaknesses on the stock market exposed major weaknesses in the USA economy. In particular, large-scale share speculation by 'high street' banks. The Stock Market collapse led to the collapse of part of the US banking system, thereby undermining the entire economy. Alternatively, candidates could mention other factors such as the under-consumption by the US economy in the 1920s. This was due to mal-distribution of wealth exacerbated by Federal government tax policy. They may also mention overproduction. Modern industrial technology allowed mass production. The protectionist policies of USA and other countries limited the amount of world trade and with it the limitation of market opportunities. Candidates may also mention the dislocation of the world trading system caused by the First World War.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

12. 'The United States Supreme Court was F.D. Roosevelt's biggest problem during the New Deal.' How far do you agree with this view of the period 1933 to 1941? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate on FDR's major problems.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates may start in 1935 when much of the legislation of First New Deal was declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court. This included the NIRA (National Industrial Recovery Act) and the AAA (Agricultural Adjustment Act). Following his landslide victory of 1936 FDR attempted to reform the US Supreme Court by 'packing' it with his nominees. This attempt alienated Congress, created a conservative coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans against the New Deal. After 1937, the reforming pace of the New Deal slackened enormously and FDR lost considerable Congressional support. Counter to this view, answers might argue that the scale of the economic situation was FDR's greatest problem – so much so that many of the alphabet agencies that FDR created failed to aid the USA's move out of depression; the NIRA is an example. By 1941, the USA was still facing high levels of unemployment and industrial unrest. Also, FDR's decision to reduce Federal spending in 1936-37 led to the 'Roosevelt Recession' of 1937-38.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24

13(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C about the extent of popular support for the Bolsheviks in 1918. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both Passages agree that there was some popular support. Passage B says the economic decrees won popular approval as well as the prominence of the working classes in the government ranks. Passage C adds that in areas where they were well known the Bolsheviks achieved good results in the election. Equally both Passages suggest that Bolshevik power was not that strong, 'fragile' in Passage B and winning only a quarter of the total vote in Passage C which suggests they were not popular. Passage C indicates that the Social Revolutionaries [SRs] were more popular, especially with the peasants, while Passage B refers to issues which made the Bolsheviks unpopular in the towns, so implying agreement. Passage C refers to Bolshevik strength in the army and Passage B says that overthrowing the Bolsheviks was unlikely. Both agree that economic issues (decrees in Passage B and the programme on land in Passage C) kept the Bolsheviks popular.

Differences: Passage B refers to reduced resistance, disunity and low morale among the opposition, but Passage C shows the extent of SR support which suggests a strong level of resistance.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Bolshevik control was seriously threatened in 1918. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

All the Passages contain references to the threats which beset the Bolsheviks. In Passage A they are compelled to carry out another coup. In Passage B their existence is threatened. In Passage C their share of the popular vote is only a quarter and in Passage D there is serious and worsening opposition to be repressed. On the other hand, Passage A provides evidence of the unrepresentative nature of the Constituent Assembly and the policies it opposed were broadly popular ones. This is backed up by Passage B. Passage C argues that the elections may not be an accurate view of Bolshevik support at the time. Passage D, however, with its detail about the extent of opposition and the amount of repression needed to defeat it, suggests there was a real threat. Against this, Passage B argues that for various reasons, the Bolsheviks were not really threatened which is supported by Passage A. Other evidence referred to by candidates might include: the foreign aid given to the

Whites in the Civil War, the continuing threat from other parties, the challenges within the Communist party, the discontent of minority national groups in Russia. The alternative interpretation could be supported by evidence from the soviet view that the revolution was a popular and progressive change.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

14 'Lenin made only a limited contribution to the October Revolution.' How far do you agree with this view? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate about Lenin's role in the October Revolution.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Answers may outline various interpretations of the part played by Lenin. They may well discuss the April Theses and his pressure for an armed uprising. The view that he was an opportunist who seized power with considerable shrewdness and ruthlessness could also be considered. There may be consideration of the significance of Trotsky as the real decision maker and organiser. Answers may consider the degree of opposition to Lenin within the Bolshevik party. The view that the masses rose up with little influence from Lenin may also be evaluated. There is considerable debate on this subject and candidates do not need to analyse every possible interpretation.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

15 Assess the view that the description of Lenin as a ‘Red Tsar’ is exaggerated.
[45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate about whether Lenin was a relatively benign figure or a violent dictator of the Tsarist type.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Candidates can argue that Lenin reversed some of the reforms of the Provisional Government and moved back to a situation similar to that prevailing under Tsarism. Repression of opposition and the setting up of the Cheka might be used as examples. Requisitioning of grain and the policies of War Communism could be cited. Harsh repression in the Civil War could be another trait similar to Tsarism. Some could cite the ‘New Exploitation of the Proletariat’ to show that even the NEP was seen as oppressive. Candidates might discuss how far these attitudes were integral to Bolshevism. The alternative argument could be that the working classes were given far more of a role under Lenin than under the Tsar and that they fought for the Bolsheviks. The introduction of the NEP could be claimed as a desire by Lenin’s government to take note of working class concerns, or at least to be prepared to moderate terror tactics. Candidates might point out that Lenin’s personal life was far from being on the same scale as the Tsar’s. Alternatively, candidates might try to justify Lenin’s totalitarian approach with reference to the emergencies he faced.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-39

16(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D about the foreign policy of Austen Chamberlain. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Passage B praises Chamberlain for Locarno – a major step in bringing European peace; Passage D says at least that it appeared a triumph; that the agreements were amicable and seemed to offer peace and reconciliation. Passage D refers to German acceptance of frontier agreements and Passage B speaks of British support for these in Eastern Europe. Austen took a different line from that of Neville. Differences: Both have a sense of perspective – Passage B by comparing Austen's policy favourably with later policy and Passage D by looking ahead and seeing Austen and Neville as sharing illusions. Passage D sees problems merely being shelved; by implication, Germany is hostile to Poland and the peace initiatives are pointless, whereas Passage B sees a realistic policy of promoting real European peace. Passage B praises Chamberlain personally while Passage D considers him merely deluded.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that British foreign policy towards Germany from 1925 to 1929 was ineffective. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

There is quite a marked difference in interpretation between Passages A and B which look favourably at Locarno and Austen Chamberlain and Passages C and D. The debate is about whether, conscious of losses in war, public opinion in Britain and the Empire and the costs of defence spending, British statesmen put too much reliance on meaningless pacts and wilfully ignored clear signs that Germany would seek to regain lost land and power. At the time, it seemed that the 'natural' British policy of avoiding a continental commitment was being restored in the face of unreasonable French attitudes and mounting imperial responsibilities. Passage A's attitude to Germany is positive, even sentimental and Chamberlain is being praised. Does the cinema may indicate a slight degree of external show as opposed to reality – the

covert German rearmament and the preparations for war were ignored; Locarno offered little to eastern European frontier security, despite Passage B's statements. Candidates might be sceptical of the favourable views in Passages A and B, particularly with the 10-Year Rule leaving Britain unprepared. Passage C sees only false and illusory security being obtained – but is this with hindsight? At the time, Germany was moving into a stable period of prosperity; Stresemann was trusted and had established good relations with Briand, and Britain had pressing economic and defence concerns elsewhere. Passage D confirms the picture of illusion not effective policy and agrees with Passage C about German hostile attitudes being revealed and ignored. Both are sceptical about reliance on international conferences and agreements and this could be supported by knowledge about British failure to back up the League (Chamberlain would not agree to the Geneva Protocol). 'Own knowledge' used in answers might include issues such as: the nature of Locarno, further evaluation of German infringements of Versailles.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**.
Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

17 How far were British relations with Germany from 1918 to 1937 governed by problems of defending both Britain and its Empire? [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate about the factors shaping foreign policy.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The debate here is about the relative importance of different causes of the 'appeasement' of Germany. By 1936, the Defence chiefs were pointing out the impossibility of defending Britain and the Empire from Germany, Japan and Italy at the same time. Additionally India and the Middle East, particularly Palestine were absorbing resources and the Dominions would be unlikely to join in a war to prevent Germany taking over territory in Europe. In the context of economic problems (serious in the 1920s and acute in the early 1930s), it was seen as difficult to fund ever-increasing defence costs. However, set against this were wider issues of public opinion and concern not to repeat the carnage of World War I, especially now that air warfare was coming to be seen as likely to be devastating. There were also concerns about French policy and the rights of Versailles and the political personalities involved in British decision-making. There is plenty that can be discussed here, but

the focus needs to be on national and imperial defence through the period. A narrative with comments is **unlikely to reach Bands II or I**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

18 Evaluate the view that ‘Chamberlain’s policies towards Germany in 1937 and 1938 showed a successful move away from the muddle and lack of clear intentions of British foreign policy since 1933’. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate about the relative success of Chamberlain’s policies compared with those of his predecessors.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

Chamberlain’s ‘high appeasement’ was defended as being a much clearer and intellectually rigorous policy than that which had hitherto existed. The clear intention was to discover German grievances and how they could be met within a structure of negotiated settlement, rather than as had supposedly been the case before to appear to be rigidly opposed to treaty revision and then, in practice, condone it. The loss of Italian goodwill over Ethiopia was seen as the classic error of this approach, with policy being guided too much by public opinion and lip service to the League of Nations rather than by British interests and having an open mind towards the aspirations of a dictator. The question involves more than a consideration of just 1937-38. How far the change of policy was a success must be engaged with.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Stalin and the Development of the Cold War in Europe 1941-55

19(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and B on the reasons for Stalin's determination to ensure the security of the Soviet Union in 1945. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both passages highlight Stalin's legitimate security concerns. Both stress how much the USSR had suffered as a result of the German invasion in 1941. Passage B argues 'Stalin had one foreign policy objective that overrode everything else: to build a buffer zone along his country's western border. He wanted to ensure that Russia would never be invaded from Europe again'. Passage A asserts that Stalin's 'primary task' was 'defending his country's interests in a hostile world' and that Stalin was determined 'never to be caught out again'.

Differences: Passage A stresses the suffering of the USSR during the War: 'The German invasion of 1941 very nearly destroyed all that Stalin had achieved since 1929. The manner of the Soviet Union's eventual military recovery by 1945 exhausted the country economically' and the USSR's 'vulnerability'. Students may regard it as a 'revisionist' interpretation. Somewhat differently, Passage B implies that Stalin was taking control of Eastern Europe in a cold and brutal manner. Despite seeing his main objective as protecting the USSR, the main implication is that Stalin set about ensuring 'pro-Soviet regimes' with grim determination: the use of language such as 'henchmen' and 'kidnapped in the dead of night'. Students may characterize Isaacs & Downing (Passage B) as 'orthodox', but the 'orthodox' school would have taken issue with their view that Stalin was acting to secure the USSR from invasion rather than expanding his evil empire.

Band I answers will focus on the similarities and differences in the interpretations offered in the two Passages in a sustained, coherent comparison.

Band II answers will do most of this, but in a less developed way. There may be some unevenness. The answer may be less coherent.

The comparison in **Band III** answers will be evident and have a sense of structure, but there may be more description or extraneous knowledge used irrelevantly.

Answers in **Band IV** will be relevant but may show a limited understanding of the comparison, miss some points and will tend to be sequential. There will be little structure.

Band V answers will make a basic comparison and show a basic understanding of both Passages, but major items will be missing.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Stalin's take-over of Eastern Europe from 1944 onwards was justified. [30]

What matters is not the conclusion that candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. A sense of discussion needs to be evident and that needs to be related to the debate set out in the Passages.

This question asks for an overall assessment as to whether Stalin's take-over of Eastern Europe from 1944 was justified. All four Passages agree that Stalin had genuine security concerns which led him to want to take control of Eastern Europe. Passage A argues that 'He set himself the primary task of defending his country's interests in a hostile world. He never lost his deep fear of a Western invasion. Stalin never ceased to regard the Soviet Union as vulnerable'. Passage B claims that 'Stalin had one foreign policy objective that overrode everything else: to build a buffer zone along his country's western border. He wanted to ensure that Russia would never be invaded from Europe again'. Passage C holds that 'His chief objective was therefore to guarantee the future security of the Soviet Union by creating a belt of friendly states on its western perimeter'. Passage D argues that 'The USSR planned for peace on the assumption that weakening Germany and creating a secure zone on the USSR's western border were to be the key elements of policy'. Passages A, C and D highlight the 'devastating' impact of the Second World War on the Soviet Union, and how Stalin's lack of trust in his wartime allies had an impact on his policies. Passage B suggests a significantly more sinister and cynical view of Stalin's takeover, with non-communists being purged to facilitate Soviet control. This is in marked contrast to Passage D which suggests that the satellite states retained control over their internal affairs. In terms of own knowledge, candidates may show how Stalin's take-over of Eastern Europe can **both** be viewed as a response to the need for future Soviet security, **and** as a deliberate expansion of Russia's empire. They may also consider differences and disputes between the Grand Alliance which fuelled their mutual suspicion by 1945.

Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages have a **ceiling of Band III**.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question.

Answers in **Band I** will be reasonably balanced between evaluation of the various views in the Passages and use of own knowledge.

Answers in **Band II** will also use both but there may be some imbalance and less careful evaluation.

Answers in **Band III** will be mostly secure and represent a substantial attempt to answer the question, but may mix valid comments with description. Imbalance between use of Passages and own knowledge may be more significant.

Band IV answers will provide a basic argument, but will miss a lot of the possible areas of discussion and may focus largely on the Passages or own knowledge with little evaluation.

Band V answers will show some elements of an answer, but responses will be poorly directed to the question and lack coherent structure.

Band VI answers will, at best, be poor paraphrases.

Band VII answers will be incoherent and may be fragmentary.

20 Assess the factors influencing US foreign policy towards the USSR in the period from 1945 to 1948. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate about factors influencing US policy towards the USSR.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

An understanding of a variety of factors influencing US foreign policy towards the USSR must be displayed and many answers may consider why the USA developed the policy of the containment of communism, for example by launching the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan in 1947. Knowledge as to how the developing foreign policy of the USA has been subject to various interpretations, both at the time and by subsequent historians should be evident. Candidates may discuss issues such as: the significance of both Roosevelt's death and Truman's inexperience, Truman's personality. Candidates may evaluate the influence of 'hardliners', such as Kennan. The impact of Kennan's telegram of February 1946 and the 'Mr X' article of July 1947 on the development of policy may be demonstrated. Candidates may deal with a range of significant events, from (for example) the Soviet take-over of Eastern Europe, to Churchill's 1946 'Iron Curtain' speech, to the British withdrawal from the civil war in Greece. Candidates may discuss alternative interpretations of the Marshall Plan, from giving selfless help to the needy West Europeans, to preventing the spread of communism (basically the financial clout behind the Truman Doctrine) to dollar diplomacy - an attempt by the US to implant an informal 'American Empire' in Europe.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

21 Discuss the view that the USSR was winning the Cold War in the period from 1948 to 1955. [45]

Focus: evaluation of the debate about who was winning the Cold War.

What matters is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

An understanding of a variety of reasons for the differences and disagreements between the allies must be displayed. An understanding of reasons why many Americans believed that they were losing the Cold War may be displayed. An understanding of how this range of setbacks was interpreted in the USA may be clearly understood. Candidates may be aware that these setbacks fuelled the influence of right-wing anti-communist groups in the USA, ultimately leading to McCarthyism. Such 'setbacks' might include, for example, the failure to 'roll-back' communism in Eastern Europe, the Czechoslovakian coup of 1948, the explosion of the Russian atom bomb in 1949. The USSR may not have been winning the Cold War in this period, but to many Americans it felt like they were. Candidates may choose to argue against the assertion in the question by reference to such events as the failure of the USSR to dislodge the west from Berlin and to prevent the unification of West Germany. The formation of NATO and the USA's nuclear and economic superiority may well also be referred to, for example.

NB This option has an exclusively European focus so candidates do not need to refer to events in Asia (e.g. the communist seizure of power in China in 1949, the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950) but, of course and as always, any such material used relevantly is to be credited.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I answers will deal with a good range of issues (although there can be some imbalance) as they focus clearly on the demands of the question. Analysis or explanation will predominate. There will be a clear focus on historical debate and on appropriate evidence in support of the argument.

Band II answers will do most of this but, although mostly sound, will be uneven in patches (missing some points and/or evaluating the debate less well).

Band III answers will pay attention to assessment, but may be very descriptive or the approach taken may be narrow and lacking in supporting evidence. There will be more unevenness than in Bands II or I. There will be valid comments, but answers will be patchy and address the question less well.

Answers in **Band IV** will be mostly relevant and will try to argue but may miss major points.

In **Band V** there will be some elements of an appropriate answer and a sense the candidate recognises the issue in the question, but analysis or explanation will be rudimentary. There may be significant inaccuracy.

Band VI answers will not be properly focused on the key issue in the question. There might be limited relevance and no sense of debate.

Band VII answers will show no ability to get to grips with the key issue. They may be fragmentary.

Mark Scheme 2590
January 2006

Unit 2590**England 1066-1228****The Government of England 1066-1216****1 'The role of the crown was more important than the role of the Church and administrative officials.' To what extent do you agree with this view in relation to English central government in the period from 1066 to 1216?**

Focus: assessment of the relative importance of the crown in government compared with that of the church and of officials.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Central government in an age of personal monarchy could not function without some involvement of the crown. Throughout the period, kings appointed officials and gave impetus to the developments which took place in government. Effective government came closest to breaking down in periods of royal weakness, especially in Stephen's reign. However, some candidates may argue that the role of the crown was less important than that of the Church and officials. The period saw much absenteeism with the monarch abroad on the continent, and government was developed to take account of this so that it continued to function efficiently. Officials became increasingly important as their functions developed, particularly the chief justiciar. From its origins with Ranulf Flambard in the reign of William Rufus, the office of chief justiciar had become a great office of state by the time of Hubert Walter, running the country in the king's absence and investigating administrative, financial and judicial areas of government. Later the chancellor played a vital role. At another level officials were essential to the smooth day-to-day operations of government, for example sheriffs being held to account at the Exchequer and efficient itinerant justices being necessary to the development of centralised justice. Many of these officials were themselves churchmen: lesser churchmen often acted in the royal secretariat while Flambard, Roger of Salisbury (justiciar), Longchamps (justiciar and chancellor) and Walter (justiciar and chancellor) were all bishops. Candidates might also discuss the other important roles taken by churchmen in central government, e.g. Lanfranc's valuable contribution in helping William I establish Norman rule or Langton's attempt to mediate between king and rebels in John's reign.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

2 'The most significant development in English local government in the period from 1066 to 1216 was changes in the role of the sheriff.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: evaluation of the relative significance of changes in the role of the sheriff compared with other changes in local government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Although the sheriff remained a royal official throughout the period, and although his role grew for a while under Stephen, for much of the period the sheriff was declining in importance. Increasingly he was held to account regularly at the Exchequer and the great inquests of sheriffs in 1170, 1194 and 1213 made it clear that he was under royal control. As his power diminished his routine business grew. On the other hand, for example, the role of the itinerant justices in the shire developed. In the Norman period they went on general eyre, carrying out a range of judicial duties and reporting local information to the Exchequer. In Henry II's reign and again in Richard's, they were used to investigate all royal officials in the shire, including the sheriffs. Candidates may wish to argue that this was more significant. These changes, however, are symptomatic of a larger change taking place in local government: the attempt by the crown to centralise it and bring justice, finance and administration more firmly under royal control. Already by Henry II's reign royal government had firmly laid its stamp on the shires and this grew under Richard and John. Some candidates may argue in favour of this as the most significant development.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

3 'The continental possessions of the crown made their greatest impact on English government in the reign of Henry I.' How far do you agree with this view in relation to the period from 1066 to 1216?

Focus: assessment of the impact on English government in the reign of Henry compared with other periods.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Arguably the main impact of the continental possessions on English government was the need to find a system of government which functioned in the absence of the king abroad. The battle of Tinchebrai in 1106 brought the whole Norman inheritance into the hands of Henry I and under him the office of chief justiciar, part of the mechanism of this system of government, was developed. A further result of owning the continental lands was the need for systematically controlled and exploited finances and again this reached its Anglo-Norman height under Henry I. However, candidates could also point out that both of these aspects originated in William Rufus' time when he acquired Normandy as a mortgage in 1096 and that Henry merely continued their development. These developments should be set against those in the reign of William the Conqueror when the main impact of the continental possessions was the establishment of a feudal state and the import of Norman ideas, and against Henry II's strategies to deal with absentee kingship and the expense of maintaining the Angevin lands: increased centralisation, rigorous royal justice and strict government. Some candidates may wish to argue that the main impact is seen in the reigns of Stephen and John when tensions caused by continental possessions played a part in baronial revolt.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228

4 'The main turning point in the relations between kings and their archbishops of Canterbury in the period from 1066 to 1228 was Anselm's time as archbishop.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: assessment of the relative importance of Anselm's time as archbishop as a turning point in royal-archiepiscopal relations compared with other events.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Anselm's relations with William Rufus were much worse than Lanfranc's with William I. The initial argument over a variety of issues, e.g. taxation and the quality of the Canterbury knights, was heightened when Anselm's return from exile in 1100 exposed England for the first time to the full force of the Investiture Conflict. This led to the dispute between the king and the archbishop of Canterbury over the power, authority and independence of the church, a situation which was in marked contrast to the relationship between William I and Lanfranc at the beginning of the period. Lanfranc had happily supported William on the authority of the church vis-à-vis the state and had enjoyed William's backing on the question of the primacy of Canterbury. In so far as this was the first clash of principle between archbishops keen to uphold the church's new insistence on its growing rights and independence and monarchs keen to defend their traditional rights, and in so far as this clash could also be seen to lie behind the struggle between Henry II and Becket and between John and Langton, then Anselm's archiepiscopate could be regarded as a turning point. However, there was not a permanent decline in relations even in Anselm's time as archbishop for he reached a compromise with Henry I over investiture in 1107. The Investiture Conflict itself did not cause further trouble in England after that and subsequent kings enjoyed periods of good relations with their archbishops, e.g. Stephen initially with Theobald of Bec, Henry II before the Becket affair, Richard I with Hubert Walter. When relations deteriorated again (as between Henry II and Becket, John and Langton), it was because of new conflicts over ecclesiastical versus royal rights, together with issues of personality, especially in the Becket affair, and papal pretensions in the reign of John. Candidates may wish to argue in favour of the importance of a particular turning point or that there was a series of equally important turning points in the relationship between kings and archbishops.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

5 To what extent did the power of the archbishop of Canterbury over the English Church change during the course of the period from 1066 to 1228?

Focus: Evaluation of the changing power of the archbishop of Canterbury during the period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

It is likely that candidates will focus on the archiepiscopates of Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket and Langton. In some ways, power remained the same. For example there was no unequivocal recognition of Canterbury's primacy throughout the period. However there were also marked differences. While Lanfranc enjoyed recognition of his personal primacy by York, Becket's position was undermined both by the transfer of papal support from himself to York and by Henry II's use of York in the coronation of Young Henry. Langton found the situation difficult and it could have been more so had not York encountered his own problems with his subordinates. Lanfranc had firm control over bishops in his own archdiocese whereas Langton had more difficulty imposing his authority. Becket had much more authority over his bishops at the beginning of his time as archbishop than when the controversy with Henry II was under way. He lost support of some of the bishops, notably Foliot, while Henry tried to assert his own authority over them. While Lanfranc remained in England, firmly stamping his authority on the church through reforming councils, Anselm's exile made it more difficult for him, Becket's exile undermined his relations with the church and Langton lost authority through his inability to enter England. Papal power also grew in the period, with deleterious effect on the power of the archbishop: Lanfranc resisted the papal summons to Rome but papal intervention increased later, as seen both in the Becket controversy and under Langton where the interdict and Langton's suspension by the pope demonstrated papal power at the expense of the archbishop. With the growth of papal power appeals to Rome also grew and that further impinged on the power of the archbishop. Overall, although Langton had less power over the church than Lanfranc, in estimating the extent of the change, candidates may well point out that there was not a steady pattern of decline through the period.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

6 'The main impact of the papal reform movement on the English Church was freedom from royal control.' How far do you agree with this view in relation to the period from 1066 to 1228?

Focus: assessment of the importance of one impact of the papal reform movement compared with others.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The papal reform movement was designed in part to lead to freedom of the church from royal control. This was especially true of its early manifestation in the form of the Investiture Contest. The compromise reached by Henry I and Anselm in 1107, in which the king renounced investiture with the ring and staff, helped to weaken royal control over the church. Later, ideas of separate ecclesiastical justice stemming from the papal reform movement led, following temporary conflict under Becket, to more freedom from royal authority. Increased appeals to Rome resulting from the growth of papal power during the period also undermined royal authority. However, whether this was the main impact is debatable. With the decline in royal control came increased papal control over the English church. While Lanfranc had resisted Gregory VII's summons to Rome, by the thirteenth century Innocent III was intervening in the Canterbury election, placing England under interdict and suspending Langton. The growth in appeals to Rome not only weakened royal and archiepiscopal authority but also strengthened that of the pope. Popes also used their growing power in the church to undermine primatial authority by, for example, supporting Henry of Blois to the disadvantage of Canterbury, or supporting York against Canterbury. Candidates may also point out that the growing power of the

church resulting from the papal reform movement was a factor in damaging relations between kings and archbishops.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

England 1485-1603

Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603

7 Assess the importance of enclosures as a cause of disorder in Tudor England.

Focus: Evaluation of enclosures as a cause of disorder.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Complaints about enclosures lay at the heart of disturbances in 1549 and 1596. The rebellions in Norfolk (Kett) and in counties in the south and east in 1549 were reacting to the limited success of Somerset's commission of 1548 in the face of severe economic conditions, whereas the Oxfordshire rising of 1596 reflected high prices and grain shortages after a spell of enclosures. Expect candidates to discuss the importance of enclosures in these two instances but better responses should also consider how enclosures contributed to the social and economic disorder evident in the 1536 Pilgrimage and the 1549 rebellions. Of course, not all disturbances were caused by enclosures. Although most candidates may go on to examine more important causes, better answers should point out that enclosures did not provoke rebellions between 1485 and 1536 and that Elizabethan legislation in the 1570s and 1580s in part prevented any disturbances.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should assess enclosures in the context of disorder in Tudor England – evaluating its direct and contributory impact, and its importance relative to other factors.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

8 How far do you agree that Tudor governments were never seriously threatened by rebellions?

Focus: Evaluation of seriousness of rebellions in respect of Tudor governments.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to argue that different rebellions presented different threats to each government in turn and that occasionally they amounted to a very serious threat. This was the result of various factors acting in unison: the speed which governments reacted, the time taken to suppress a rebellion, its proximity to London, the scope of its support, its capacity to extract concessions or to enlist the backing of nobles and clergy. No Tudor government was overthrown by rebellion (unless Lady Jane Grey is considered to have been a legitimate ruler) but Henry VII had to fight at Stoke to keep his throne, Somerset lost office partly due to the Western and Kett's rebellions and Mary hid in the Tower in the face of Wyatt's revolt. Arguably politically inspired rebellions would always present the most serious threat.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should consider a range of rebellions, address the demands of the question, especially ‘... never seriously ...’, and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

9 Explain the reasons why large-scale rebellions were more frequent in the period from 1485 to 1558 than in the reign of Elizabeth.

Focus: Explanation for greater frequency of major rebellions between 1485-1558 than between 1558-1603.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should compare the years before and after 1558 to consider why major rebellions were more frequent in the earlier period. A combination of political insecurity, factions, religious change, social and economic upheaval lay behind most of these disturbances. Elizabeth’s reign saw the end of feudal relations that had hitherto contributed to many large-scale disturbances as well as an improvement in relations between nobles and their tenants, the use of nobles to counter discontent in the provinces and paternalistic legislation in response to potential causes of unrest. Her long reign also gave the administration greater stability, and religious and dynastic issues were less significant after 1570. Of course, she faced rebellions and disturbances – the Northern Earls revolt, enclosure riots and Essex’s rebellion – but apart from the 1569-70 uprising, the other disorders lasted only a few days.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should provide an explanation that treats each period evenly and covers most rebellions.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603

10 How do you explain the changes in Anglo-Spanish relations during the Tudor period?

Focus: Explanation for the development of Anglo-Spanish relations over time.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Anglo-Spanish relations fluctuated in the course of this period and they were much more hostile in 1603 than in 1485. Expect candidates to consider the origins of the Anglo-Spanish alliance of 1489, how the relationship developed and changed under Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary I, and reasons for the breakdown in the 1570s that led to war. Most answers are likely to be chronological in format but some (perhaps better) responses will be thematic – Spain and England's relations with France; personalities, especially Elizabeth and Philip; impact of the Reformation and Counter Reformation; revolution in Scotland in 1559-60; the Dutch Revolt; English privateers such as Hawkins and Drake.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but

be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

11 Why were Anglo-French relations better in the reign of Elizabeth than earlier in the Tudor period? Explain your answer.

Focus: An explanation for better relations under Elizabeth compared with earlier periods.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Anglo-French relations until 1562 were consistently poor. Every Tudor ruler went to war at least once, and the personalities of especially Henry VIII, Somerset and Mary should be examined. France's staunch Catholicism and hostility towards Spain (England's ally) ensured relations were rarely cordial. Nevertheless, there were long periods of peace and *détente* before the 1560s [1492-1512, 1529-42] which candidates should point out and explain. The advent of civil war in France in 1562, however, destabilised France and led to a rapprochement between Catherine de Medici (and then Henry IV) and Elizabeth, which held until the end of this period. Events outside France played a key part in sustaining this friendship, and these should be considered e.g. the accessions of Philip II and Elizabeth and worsening relations between England and Spain; the Scottish rebellion which led to the expulsion of the French court from Edinburgh; England's secession of Calais in 1564.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

12 Assess the importance of economic factors in determining Tudor foreign policy.

Focus: Assessment of economic influences upon Tudor foreign policy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many are likely to examine the impact of economic factors upon policy making and to compare them with other factors. Included in this assessment could be finance, trade, industry, commerce and agriculture but most candidates are likely to dwell on finances and trade. Some responses may dismiss economic factors and instead write about other factors such as religion or personalities. While it is reasonable to expect candidates to compare economic with other factors, it is not acceptable for them to largely or totally ignore the key focus of the question. Candidates who write an essay based entirely upon factors other than economic should not gain a mark above **Band IV**; essays that largely ignore economic factors should be confined to **Band III** and below.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should consider a range of economic factors and link them to policies. They should synthesise economic (or, by comparison, other) factors across the whole period in determining foreign policy.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

England 1558-1689

The Development of Limited Monarchy in England, 1558-1689

13 Explain why, with the exception of Charles I, monarchs were not called upon to fight a civil war in the period 1558 to 1689.

Focus: Explanation for Charles's civil war compared with other rulers in this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Charles I fought a civil war because of his inflexible temperament and untrustworthy nature, his unpopular ministers and policies and parliament's determination to defend their religious and political principles. Neither Elizabeth I, James I, Charles II nor James II fought a civil war because Elizabeth handled her parliaments skilfully and faced few of the problems that confronted Charles I (although answers may note the growth in tensions in Elizabeth's last years, which fed through into James I's reign). James I had more problems but they were embryonic, as was the idea of opposition to the crown. Fear of civil war recurring was a key factor in explaining its absence after 1649, although Charles II was a very skilful politician as he showed during the Exclusion Crisis. It may be pointed out that James II was confronted with an armed invasion/uprising in 1688 and that he sent troops to crush it, but his unwillingness to stand and fight meant that a possible civil war could not occur.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should focus on Charles I and compare reasons why he had to deal with a civil war but other monarchs in this period did not.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

14 How far did the powers of the monarchy change between 1558 and 1689?

Focus: Assessment of the changing and developing power of the English monarchy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The powers of the monarchy changed in the course of the period: Elizabeth, James I and Charles I ruled like proto-absolute monarchs. In theory they could call parliament at will, appoint ministers, judges and bishops, make war and peace, raise taxes and arrest subjects arbitrarily. Indeed the monarch as head of state enjoyed unrivalled secular and spiritual power until the civil war curtailed the monarchy's authority. In practice, the monarchy often bridled its powers to retain the support and respect of political groups – something that Charles I failed to appreciate. Monarchs after 1660 could still call/ dissolve parliament, make war and peace, appoint ministers, judges and bishops but no longer could they impose arbitrary taxes or arrest subjects without trial (at least not in theory). Parliament also constrained the monarchy's spending power, its regularity of calling parliament, its right to change the country's faith and its control of the army. However, Charles II and James II ignored many of these constraints e.g. the Triennial Act, Test Act, Habeas Corpus and expanded the army and navy, developments that led to James II's 'abdication' and further restrictions upon William III in 1689. Candidates may well approach this question in a variety of routes, and not all elements of the monarchy's powers are likely to be assessed.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should chart the developing power of the monarchy, explaining how and how far its independence came to be compromised, thus showing a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

15 How far did social changes affect the development of the monarchy in England between 1558 and 1689?

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of social changes upon the English monarchy.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The most prominent social development in this period was the growth of a politically interested gentry, who entered the House of Commons in larger numbers and emerged to challenge the crown's authority in the law courts and parliament. Conversely, the established aristocracy, the crown's natural ally, came under increasing threat for economic and political reasons. At a religious level, a larger electorate and growing non-conformity led to an attack on the monarchy's Divine Right. The crown's capacity to dispense patronage enabled it to buy support but this compromised its independence and wasted its financial resources. After the civil war, many nobles and gentry identified their interests with the monarchy in their desire not to see local disorders turn into something more serious. Changes in the relation between classes therefore strengthened the monarchy by reducing the incidence of rebellions after 1660. Expect many answers to want to move away from social factors on to religious, financial and political issues. This is a fair approach provided some consideration has been given to social changes.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should evaluate the impact of social changes.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689

16 'The Interregnum (1649-1660) marked the most important turning-point in the development of English Puritanism in the years from 1558 to 1689.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of the importance of the Interregnum in the development of Puritanism compared with other turning-points.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are required to assess the period 1649-60 in the light of the preceding and succeeding years and to make a judgement about turning-points. Most Puritans wanted to remain within the established Church of England – their aims and conduct were moderate, seeking to reform the Prayer Book and services from within the Church and Parliament. Radical separatists were persecuted but mainstream Elizabethan Puritanism was conservative. Disappointment at the king's response to the Millenary Petition led to some Puritans becoming more aggressive and entering Parliament to attack Arminianism. Between 1625 and 1649, Puritanism reacted against Arminianism and Laudianism, and puritan success in the civil war brought radicals into the political and religious arena. Between 1649 and 1660, Puritanism revealed a broad spectrum of radical sects only to be censored and restrained by the quest for order. This decade saw the flowering of Puritanism and some groups, notably Presbyterians, Quakers and Baptists, survived in sufficient numbers after 1660 to play a prominent role in national affairs and act as a bulwark against Anglicanism. In 1689 the Toleration Act acknowledged their existence if not their right to be treated equally. Expect candidates to compare 1649-60 with at least one other argued turning-point.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

17 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Church of England in 1558, in 1660 and in 1689.

Focus: Evaluation and comparison of the Church of England in 1558, 1660 and 1689.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Hopefully, the majority of candidates will compare the state of the Church of England in 1558 with 1660 and 1689, but some may produce a chronological account. How candidates assess ‘... strengths and weaknesses ...’ will probably determine the quality of their answer. Defender of the monarchy, guardian of the Protestant faith, upholder of moral standards, increasing involvement in high politics were all strengths but set against these developments were continuing low salaries of the lesser clergy and an excessive work load. Some candidates may compare Anglicans with Protestant non-conformists and Catholics; as the Church of England grew in influence, other faiths declined but this was not an even development particularly between 1625 and 1660.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

18 Explain why English governments treated dissenting Protestants and Catholics intolerantly for most of the period from 1558 to 1689.

Focus: Explanation for government intolerance towards dissenters.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Almost all early modern governments believed that religious uniformity was a prerequisite condition of a united society both religiously and secularly. Dissenters were heretics and a threat to the spiritual well-being of Christians. The Elizabethan Church Settlement was the bedrock of the English Church and faith: it was broadly Protestant and made no allowance for radical Protestants or Roman Catholics. Presbyterians, Puritans, Quakers and Baptists were subsequently persecuted because their independence challenged the authority of the monarchy and its control of society. Roman Catholics, on the other hand, through their allegiance to Rome were perceived as a threat to the life of the monarch as well as to the authority of the established church. War against Spain in the 16th century and the tremors caused by the Thirty Years' War in the 17th added to a general fear of Catholicism. Governments treated dissenters inconsistently: James I, Charles II and James II were more tolerant than Elizabeth or Charles I, and their particular motives could be usefully discussed by candidates. Cromwell was intolerant of Catholics but relatively tolerant of dissenting Protestants (unlike his Parliaments).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should examine and explain the reasons for government intolerance, and identify periods of increased uniformity.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Europe 1498-1610

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610

19. Which groups in society benefited most from French governments during the period from 1498 to 1610? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of French society to see which groups did and did not benefit.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Among the indicators that candidates may suggest are: religious changes, rising taxation, political stability, internal peace and security, living and working conditions. They should recognise that such circumstances changed over time and that not all subjects benefited equally. Most suffered during the civil wars of the second half of the 16th century, but so did many during more peaceful times if the monarch was too autocratic. Better answers will look at various groups of subjects, such as: the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, the clergy, urban workers, the urban poor, the peasantry, the rural poor.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers should consider a range of groups. They will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

20 Were economic or social changes more important in developing the nation state in France from 1498 to 1610? Explain your answer.

Focus: Comparison of economic and social changes in the development of France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many candidates are likely to say that economic changes were more important - if only because they will know more about population levels, inflation, taxation, patterns of trade, industry and farming than, say, the continuing influence of aristocrats and nobles, the expansion of state officials, clergy and merchants, and rising numbers of urban poor. Of course, both economic and social influences played an important part in the development of the nation. Keep an open mind as to how candidates treat these factors and whether candidates compare them with other factors, such as religious uniformity, administrative reforms, growth in royal authority. However, this question is about economic and social changes and these issues must be treated effectively if candidates are to access **Band III or higher**.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

21 Assess the impact of religious divisions in France upon the development of the French nation state from 1498 to 1610.

Focus: Assessment of religious groups and conflicts on the development of France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Religious divisions weakened the monarchy, economy and society during the years of civil war (1562-98) and so hindered the development of the nation state after considerable advances towards a politically centralised, religiously uniform and socially united country had been made under Louis XII, Francis I and Henry II. However, religious differences, such as disagreements between humanists, Lutherans, Catholics and ultramontanes, existed well before 1562 and their effects upon the development of France should also be considered. Some answers may suggest that revisionist historians have claimed that the dislocation caused by religious divisions has been exaggerated and that the civil wars actually strengthened the authority of the crown in the long run.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should examine the nature of religious divisions in church, state and society, and show how they affected the development of France.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

The Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century

22 Assess the significance of any two turning-points in the development of the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century.

Focus: Assessment of two critical moments of change in the condition of the Catholic Church during this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should consider the significance of two turning-points which in their judgement significantly affected the development of the Catholic Church. Among turning-points chosen may be: the Lutheran affair and Protestant Reformation; the sack of Rome 1527; the pontificate of Paul III; the foundation of new orders,

especially or solely the Jesuits; the publication of the Tridentine Decrees. How particular moments of change are linked to the development of the Catholic Church will probably be the key to a successful answer but examiners must keep an open mind as to candidates' choice of turning-points.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

23 To what extent did the Catholic Reformation achieve its aims in the course of the sixteenth century?

Focus: Evaluation of successes/ failures in respect of the aims of the Catholic Reformation.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The main aims of the Catholic Reformation were to reform the ranks of corruption and restore the public's confidence in the clergy; to counter Protestant movements, especially Lutheranism and Calvinism, and recover those who had defected; to issue a clear and uncompromising statement of faith that would re-affirm the Papacy as its leader; and to strengthen the Church by withstanding present challenges and attracting new members in the future. Many of these aims had been achieved by c.1600 and the foundations of success established – most notably in Spain and Italy – but progress was geographically uneven: e.g. little headway was made in France, Austria and Germany.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should evaluate the aims in terms of success/failure and discuss the potential and real developments in the Catholic Church between 1500 and 1600.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

24 'Other rulers contributed more to the revival of the sixteenth-century Catholic Church than did the papacy.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: A comparison of secular rulers and the papacy in contributing to the success of the Catholic Church's revival.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The contribution of other rulers was of great importance if the Catholic Church was to combat the growth of Protestantism in Europe, and Charles V, Mary Tudor, Philip II, the Guise in France, Maximilian of Bavaria and the Duke of Milan led the way in pressing for reform or implementing it in their own lands. However, some 16th century rulers did little to advance the revival, notably the later Valois and most German princes, and Henry VIII and Philip II were often in conflict with the papacy. The papacy, on the other hand, did little before Paul III's pontificate (encouraging reforming bishops, appointing reformers as cardinals, setting up the Council of Trent, recognising the Jesuits, establishing an Index and Inquisition, and leading by example in reforming Rome and the Vatican), but a great deal thereafter. Expect candidates to compare secular and spiritual leaders.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Europe 1598-1715

The Decline of Spain 1598-1700

25 To what extent did social factors bring about Spain's decline as a major power during the seventeenth century?

Focus: Evaluation and comparison of social and other factors as a cause of Spain's decline.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may well focus on a range of social factors e.g. recurrent disease and a falling population, disparity between wealthy and poor groups, privileged and unprivileged, rural poverty, urban unemployment, low levels of literacy and the effects of the inquisition and Church on education. They are then likely to look at other factors e.g. military conflicts, financial/economic problems, political incompetence, and the extent to which Spain was a major power at various times in the 17th century. Candidates who pay scant attention to social factors should not gain a mark above **Band III**; if they ignore them altogether and instead write about other factors, then a mark **beyond Band IV will not** be possible.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should consider a range of social factors.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many social factors in their analysis/ explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but

be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

26 Explain why Spain suffered serious economic problems throughout the seventeenth century.

Focus: Explanation for Spain's consistent economic difficulties.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Inherited debts and *juros* payments, cost of waging war, high taxation, falling population, limited industrial investment, foreign competition, failure to develop and protect the transatlantic trade and world empire, medieval farming practices, were all problems in 1600, most of which worsened as the 17th century progressed. However, the 17th century also saw the expulsion of the moriscos, a decline in bullion, repeated debasement, unrelenting warfare, unsuccessful attempts at reform and corrupt administrations. Expect the best candidates to argue that there were periodic improvements e.g. in European trade after 1660, population levels after 1680, and that industrially the NE region fared better than other areas. The 1610s, 1620s, 1650s and 1660s were decades of retrenchment.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should consider a range of economic problems, explain their causes and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period. They should do more than discuss finances.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period; they may well give too much attention to finances); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

27 Which seventeenth-century Spanish monarch did most to hasten the decline of Spain as an international power during the period from 1598 to 1700? Explain your answer.

Focus: Comparative assessment of three monarchs in hastening Spain's international decline.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

It is likely that many candidates will hold Charles II most responsible and Philip III least responsible for Spain's international decline, if only because Charles II was a physically and politically weak king who presided over the near collapse of the empire. His reign saw military defeats in war and rebellion, loss of lands to France and Portugal, unprecedented levels of bankruptcy, and a total inability to defend Spain's frontiers. On the other hand, candidates could argue that Spain's international decline owed much to the rise of France after 1665, that many of his foreign difficulties were inherited and a great deal of political damage had already occurred under Philip IV: revolts, rebellions and wars at home and abroad, inept policies and poor leadership, and international defeats at Munster and the Pyrenees. Some candidates may also hold Philip III responsible for entering the 30 Years' War and encouraging a renewal of war against the United Provinces, both of which doomed Spain; and some may blame Philip II for bequeathing a poisoned chalice although he falls outside the specification. We must keep an open mind.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period. They must compare all three kings and, by inference, their governments, before reaching a judgement.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They are likely to pay less attention to '... an international power ...' and perhaps focus (almost) entirely on other factors. Alternatively, answers may lack a balanced treatment of the three rulers. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or

a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/ or continuity in Spain's international standing and attempts at an argument will be made, though perhaps poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support. They are likely to discuss only one or two kings, and demonstrate little understanding or knowledge of the whole period.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. They will display a limited awareness of Spain's international condition. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance. They will know little about the role of the monarchs/ministers and instead write about the decline of Spain with little reference to its international decline.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715

28 How far were French nobles able to retain or expand their social and political privileges during the period from 1610 to 1715?

Focus: Assessment of social and political noble privileges during this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should compare the social and political privileges enjoyed by nobles in 1610 with those of 1715, and trace developments in the years between. Nobles were exempt from direct taxation throughout the period, and had accompanying social advantages over their tenants and third estate. They held governorships, military offices, which increased as the army expanded under Louis XIV, legal privileges, some of which Richelieu challenged, and received patronage at the royal court. Versailles became synonymous with their social privileges. Their political power, and with it many privileges, fluctuated: 1610-30, and 1642-53, when the crown was ineffective, several nobles flouted their privileges only to see them subsequently curtailed by Richelieu and Mazarin respectively. Thereafter, nobles could not expect to advise the king unless he approved; and, as Louis XIV asserted his power, noble privileges declined. By 1715 they were a shadow of their status in 1610.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will be less assured on either social or political issues but at the top end will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a

synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

29 'Richelieu made the most important contribution to the development of French ascendancy in Europe.' Assess this view of the period from 1610 to 1715.

Focus: Evaluation of Richelieu in the context of 17th century France.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may argue that either Richelieu or Henry IV laid the foundations of French greatness but few should dismiss the significant contributions made during the period 1624-42. The Huguenots were pacified, most nobles domesticated, alliances established and steps taken to weaken Spain, trade companies encouraged and the monarchy strengthened. Problems, however, remained not least weak finances, noble resentment, a large number of Huguenots and a commitment to war on several fronts. His successors Mazarin, Colbert and Louvois, all went some way to solving these problems and, together with Louis XIV, deserve a lot of credit for strengthening France thereafter. They also brought their own problems and these should be taken into account when making an overall judgement.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They are likely to focus on Richelieu and to set his work alongside his inheritance and legacy.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance. They are likely to say very little about Richelieu or how France developed in the 17th century.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

30 To what extent did the French monarchy become absolute during the period from 1610 to 1715?

Focus: Evaluation of absolutism in France during this period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The alleged absolutism of 17th century French monarchy rested on medieval ideas. Candidates might begin by stating the extent to which absolutism existed in theory and in practice in 1610. Limitations in imposing and collecting taxes, raising troops, enforcing laws, controlling the Church and dissenters, commanding obedience from over-mighty subjects all restricted Louis XIII for much of his reign. Louis XIV championed absolutism figuratively and practically, and came as close as any contemporary ruler to being absolute but he still faced obstacles e.g. governing a vast country, subjects eager to preserve their privileges and rights, waging war on several fronts simultaneously, arguments with the papacy over regalian rights.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical. They should look at the theory and practice of absolutism in France, contrast its changing condition throughout the period and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Europe 1661–1796

From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661-1796

31 Explain why the idea of enlightened despotism became more influential during the period from 1661 to 1796.

Focus: Assessment of the development of a political idea over a prolonged period

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The question asks ‘Explain why ...’ and answers should provide a series of reasons – stronger answers will give some indications of priority. The question is based on the part of the description of the Key Theme that states that ‘The theme examines the concept of enlightened despotism’. Answers should explain the concept of ‘enlightened despotism’, preferably explicitly. Strong rulers should use their power for the good of their states and subjects, with a respect for reasoned principles rather than for personal satisfaction. Among the reasons that might be examined is the greater popularity of Reason as a justification for a more ‘scientific’ approach to political thought. There was more criticism of religious tradition and authority. The Specification mentions Diderot, Rousseau and Voltaire as political thinkers but candidates should also be able to discuss the absolutism of Louis XIV to cover the required extended period. Was it ‘enlightened’? They might refer to Bossuet, whose views stressed the divine right of kings, and perhaps even Fénelon, whose views of Louis XIV were more critical. Many answers may concentrate on France – such answers can merit any mark Band if explained sufficiently well. Some might mention Austrian and Russian rulers (Maria Theresa, Joseph II, Peter and Catherine).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

32 'The most serious threat to absolutism in France came from the nobility.'
Assess this claim in relation to the period from 1661 to 1789.

Focus: Assessment of the threats to French monarchy over an extended period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Louis XIV believed that the great nobles were his greatest threat and took steps to nullify their powers. However, they still played an important part in public affairs, especially because of their influence in the localities. By the mid-eighteenth century, office holders who had entered the nobility were a conservative influence, especially through the *parlements*. They managed to frustrate the attempts of successive ministers of Louis XV and Louis XVI to implement reforms. Candidates might examine different groups within the nobility. The Third Estate was influential in 1789 but had not previously represented a serious threat to absolute monarchy. Some might discuss other sorts of threat, e.g. dangers from financial instability although this factor can be partly linked to the nobility. The personality of the Bourbons might be discussed, e.g. weakness of Louis XV and Louis XVI. Some might examine the extent to which the new political thinkers (the *philosophes*) represented a threat, although some may argue the significance of their impact can be exaggerated.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

33 Assess the claim that the power of Catherine the Great of Russia was weaker than the power exercised by Peter the Great.

Focus: Assessment of the changes to the power of Russian rulers over an extended period.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Catherine was weaker personally than Peter. She was a woman and a foreigner who had succeeded in dubious circumstances. But even another man might find it hard to emulate the personal strength of Peter. On the other hand, her theoretical powers were probably as extensive. The restraints on her were more practical than constitutional. The power of Peter should not be over-estimated. Many of his reforms existed only on paper and he had to battle against the dead weight of Russian traditions and powerful conservative groups. Answers might be planned in one of two ways. Some might be organised purely thematically, taking issues one at a time and comparing the two rulers. Alternatively, answers might consider the rulers sequentially. The first approach might find it easier to access Band I but the second should not necessarily be relegated to a lower Band when the sequential approach contains firm and sustained comparison and contrast.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

**Mark Scheme 2591
January 2006**

Unit 2591**Britain 1793-1921****Britain and Ireland 1798–1921**

1 'British governments changed their policy towards Ireland during the period 1798 to 1921 only because they were under pressure to do so: How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: assessment of the reason for changes in British policy on Ireland.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many may argue governments changed policy under pressure. The Act of Union itself was a result of French Revolutionary threats and the Wolfe Tone rising; Roman Catholic Emancipation the product of the Roman Catholic Association and fears generated by the Clare election. Irish MPs put electoral pressure on Whig governments in the 1830s and on Liberal ones in the 1880s and 1910s with some success. The 1880s also saw Land League pressure over tenant issues, whilst German activities before 1914 and US pressure after 1918 plus the Anglo-Irish war contributed to British changes over the Union. However, it is possible to challenge this view. Many Liberal Tories and Whigs backed Catholic Emancipation before 1829. Peel in the 1840s was determined to resist pressure from O'Connell's Monster Meetings and move on his own terms over land and religious issues. Gladstone's mission to pacify Ireland could be seen on its own moral terms, the result of a liberal conscience, although equally one could argue he was bombed into it by Fenian violence. Home Rule could either be seen as the result of electoral pressure brought to bear by Parnell or by Gladstone's moral conversion. Conservative economic and local government reform was the result of agrarian pressure, but was also carried out to strengthen the Union by Wyndham and others. However, it is difficult to see post-1916 governments as anything but under pressure to partition Ireland.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

2 How far was Irish constitutional nationalism a failure throughout the period 1798–1921? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of constitutional nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may stress failure throughout the period. The main aim, the campaign for Home Rule, clearly was never achieved except for the unwanted Home Rule for Ulster in 1921. 1800 saw the end of Grattan's Parliament, the '1782' experiment and an early defeat for the 'Patriots'. In the 1840s, the Repeal movement of the Union also failed. Before 1879, constitutional nationalism was unable to pressurise governments sufficiently to consider reform within the Union although post Lichfield compact the Whigs did reform under such pressure. Even when Parnell had fashioned a disciplined and effective parliamentary group, two Home Rule Bills failed, whilst Redmond was unable to have much influence on the 3rd. As an electoral force it began to lose out, first locally and then nationally, to Sinn Fein, a process complete by 1918. However, looking at other aims, the picture is less bleak. Constitutional nationalism created a moderate tradition through O'Connell, Parnell and Redmond by fashioning a parliamentary party in the 1830s and 1870s that forced British governments to negotiate. Parnell ably linked this with land agitation to transform the legal position of tenants and focussed the attention of Britain on Ireland. They were able to mobilise large numbers, especially in the 1820s, 1840s, 1870s and 1880s. Reform within the Union was achieved, e.g. Catholic Emancipation, and they made themselves an integral part of mainland parties until 1918.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

3 To what extent did the Famine of 1845–49 change the direction of Irish economic development during the period 1798–1921?

Focus: evaluation of the role of the Famine in Irish economic development.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers need to establish the broad direction of Irish economic development over the period: export of labour; the tendency to maintain subsistence agriculture but with a decline of the Cottier class and rise of more substantial Catholic tenant farmers; the development of linen, shipbuilding and engineering industries in Belfast; decline of the large estates. In terms of continuity, famines were not unusual – a severe one occurred in the 1810s and more substantial tenant farmers were already emerging. The Devon Commission was called before the Famine and concluded small plots were unsustainable. The Famine merely hastened the shake-up of land. Emigration was also well underway before it, 1½ million leaving 1815–45, whilst hunger had always been a feature. The west of Ireland remained a poor area before and after the Famine. However, it is also possible to stress change, especially with reference to the scale of the disaster. The population, after a massive increase from 3 to 8 million during 1770-1840, stabilised after 1845 at 6 million. The Cottier class were wiped out and along with them the end of seasonal unemployment as the potato became less important and mechanisation grew. Larger tenant farmers were able to modernise agricultural slowly. Government became more interventionist in and after the Famine via public works, workhouses and a new insistence landlords bear the brunt of the poor rates. This led to more eviction and a new post-1850 phase where tenant rights became the central issue. Governments encouraged land sales through the Unencumbered Estates Act 1849. Agriculture became less tillage and more pastorally based. Labourers' wages and housing improved. Cities were more affected by the cholera epidemic of 1849-50 whilst Ulster benefited from Free Trade after 1846, and from being less affected by the Famine. The type of emigration also changed. Pre-famine, the emigrant had some capital; after, they were very poor. Emigration remained very high until 1921, 2½ million leaving 1850-1921. Given the development of the Catholic tenant farmer, a turning-point of equal gravity to the Famine was the Great Agricultural Depression of 1879, in turn stabilised by government action to 1914. Better answers will put the Famine into the context of change from 1798 to 1921.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview

with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

War and Society in Britain 1793–1918

4 Why were some army and naval reforms more effective than others during the period 1793 to 1918? Explain your answer.

Focus: comparison of the effectiveness of army and naval reform.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers need to consider a variety of reforms across the period: Middleton and Collingwood on the Navy in 1793; sporadic reform mid-century (enlistment 1847; Aberdeen and the Navy 1853; the creation of a Naval Reserve 1859; discipline 1859, 1867, 1870); recruitment and the standard of the Officer Class in Cardwell's reform; Childers at the Admiralty 1870; spending in the Naval Defence Act 1889; General Staff and War Office 1890s and the committee for Imperial Defence 1903; Haldane's reforms and finally conscription and the work of Kitchener, French, Haig and Jellicoe during 1914-18. Crucial to a successful answer will be consideration of relative effectiveness and candidates need to establish criteria to judge this – constraining factors such as British traditions of liberty and fears of an effective standing army. Finance was an important factor limiting even the Navy's ability to respond in the 1820s, 1850s and 1870s (ships built for foreign navies had to be quickly bought up). Government commitment and expenditure were also an issue (Lloyd George's impositions of convoys on a reluctant Admiralty was a glaring example; reactions to the Crimea more typically slow and niggardly). Whether a reform worked in practice (winning wars) could also be considered. Is administrative reform more effective because it is cheap or were reforms ignored in jurisdictional disputes, as so often in the Napoleonic Wars, when re-organisation was not achieved? Did an effective reform require the necessity of war or a public scandal or campaign to succeed? Some of the least effective reforms pre-Cardwell were on recruitment and discipline as private initiatives and piecemeal enterprise (counties and patronage) prevailed. Enlistment (1847) failed because reduced service precluded a pension. Cardwell was successful in abolishing purchase of commission, but economy prevailed on recruitment and the reserve ensured an army only really suited to imperial conflict (and problems remained here, as the Zulu Wars and the Boer Wars showed). Childers' work at the Admiralty was a complete failure given the concern for economy and a pressured administrator. Naval attempts to improve pay and conditions in 1853 came too late for the Crimea, but it at least made it effective given the need to deal with new technology. The Edwardian debate on 'survival' aided the success of Haldane's administrative reforms and clearly the Great War demanded initiatives. Effective reforms were often so because of the constant reissuing of standards, sheer need and public scandals. Costs issues explain the less effective.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

5 How far would you agree that the most important reason why the recruitment, re-organisation and resources of the army were limited in the period from 1793 to 1918 was because of their impact on civilian society?

Focus: assessment of the reasons why the army's recruitment re-organisation and resources were limited from 1793 to 1918.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Limits on recruitment, reorganisation and resources were more often because of cost cutting, economy and retrenchment than anything else. Answers might point to the army's limited European role 1815–1914 which kept it small with little incentive to change. The shock came with the Crimea where a 'colonial' army tried to fight a European war. However, historically the army's impact on civilian society was considered a negative one, an unconstitutional force (c.f. the navy) which, within an industrialising society, was a disruptive threat, taking men from looms and ploughs and demanding large taxes. However, the relationship with civilian society was more complex than this. The army was linked to the aristocracy which meant it came in for radical attacks (Crimea to 1914), but that also discouraged change to organisation and recruitment. This meant it was linked to land, not growing cities where it was often distrusted by Nonconformist authorities. Recruitment was especially limited by civilian reaction. In the Napoleonic Wars, Britain hired mercenaries, paid bounties and resorted to pressure, including kidnapping, but post-1815 such methods became unacceptable. The Crimea was the first 'voluntary' war and such a system was fiercely defended to 1916 when conscription was again resorted to. The Army was appalled by urban recruits (Second Boer War), but took to urban recruitment in 1914

when new techniques of persuasion were so effective that some Liberal MPs challenged the recruitment of the under-aged. During the volunteer stage, there were various crises of recruitment, 1860s and 1870s seeing Cardwell's limited attempt to make 'service' more attractive fail just as Howick's 1847 Enlistment Bill to make service less a life sentence had done. Neither could stomach paying the going rate for labour and so merely fiddled with conditions. Here cost again provides the main reason. The Crimea required 90,000 extra men, but only 4,500 materialised. There was more integration with civilian society later in the century thanks to medical advances, the heroics of Empire and paternal officers. However, governments feared a large army on law and order grounds. Reorganisation was limited and slow given the nature of 'patronage' government and the social system. There was no will to change the confused administrative system of overlapping jurisdiction until 1854-55. After that, the Liberals feared an unconstitutional force that would waste money and threaten government. Even Cardwell had to dress-up his reorganisation as an international liberal police force. Change was usually the result of cost cutting and the need to merge battalion in reserve or expeditionary forces. Resources were clearly more a question of cost outside war itself, although the army between 1815 and 1914 saw marginally more reserves than the Navy, perhaps a reflection of constant colonial wars. The balance of discussion between the three areas of the army need not be dealt with in equal proportions, but patterns need to be established and the balance of factors other than civilian impact needs to be considered.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

6 To what extent did British interests show continuity during the period 1793 to 1918?

Focus: an assessment of whether British interests changed in the period.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many may argue for constancy, with some significant exceptions (which will require explanation). Some might approach this chronologically, often through the interests themselves – achieving a balance of power in Europe to stabilise trade and avoid continental entanglements, encouraging British trade, securing and defending the Empire, containing Britain's most serious enemies (Russia, France and latterly Germany) and securing the defence of the Home Islands. A balance of power was achieved at Vienna in 1814-15, (assuming that to have been a key interest in the French War) and maintained until the Crimea. Britain was reluctant to admit to an 'alliance' Europe as an alternative or substitute for a balanced one, preferring 'Splendid Isolation'. However, change was recognised through the *Ententes*, although neither involved specific commitments. War in 1914, as in 1793, was in part fought to establish another 'balance' in Europe. Arguably, trade remained a constant, Britain usually taking action to open it up (e.g. to destroy the continental system post-1806; to open Latin American markets in the 1820s and Chinese markets in the 1840s and 1850s; to keep Atlantic routes open during 1916-17). The only exception, where trade was to be closed, was slavery. Empire did change, assuming greater importance in the second half of the period (a new aggressive interest or a defence of existing threatened interests?). Another area of change was the containment of Russia and France whose 'threat' varied to 1900. Britain worried about the French colonial threat. Russia was seen as a more constant threat – in the Balkans, the Straits, the Near East and the Middle East, especially in the 1830s and 1870s-1880s. Both, however, receded in the face of a militarised Germany, a former 'friend' becoming a potentially lethal enemy in Europe and the world. The most unchanging interest was basic: mainland defence. Britannia always mobilised to prevent invasion, real or feared (1803–04; Palmerston's follies in 1859–65; scares in the 1870s, 1914) and always prioritised the importance of the Low Countries.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Britain 1834-1996

Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948

7 'The biggest influence on the treatment of the poor by governments during the period 1834 to 1948 was the work of social investigators (e.g. Chadwick, Beveridge).' How far do you agree?

Focus: assessment of influences on government policies on poverty.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many may argue that the social investigators were influential, but other factors shaping government policies need to be considered. Broad interpretation of the term 'social investigators' is permissible in answers. Many may consider Booth and/or Rowntree as well as the two investigators identified in the question, but there were others who may be brought in (e.g. Mayhew, Dickens, Disraeli, Tout, Orwell, various royal commissions, charities, trades unions). These individuals or groups revealed much about the causes, extent, nature and consequences of poverty over time, and certainly seemed to have had a substantial impact on social policy. However, their efforts should be measured against the significance of other political, economic and social factors (such as wars, the rise of the labour movement, economic competition, rising living standards and expectations, the changing role of women).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

8 To what extent were reforms to the education system the result of concerns about the use of child labour throughout the period 1834 to 1948?

Focus: assessment of reasons causing educational reform.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The state of the economy and the need for cheap labour, and hence young workers in abundance, was prevalent throughout the period. The wants and needs of employers was a factor that constantly influenced policies on education, especially in regard to issues of the extent of provision and attendance. Thus answers might agree that certainly before 1902, the development of an education 'system' was limited due to vested business interests. Provision for the masses before 1870 was done on a voluntary basis and Forster's Act simply 'filled in the gaps' and created a 'dual system'. The 1902 Act was certainly something of a turning-point, with the acknowledgement of the need for more intervention due to economic competition from Germany and the USA. Both the 1918 Fisher and 1944 Butler Acts also seem to have been partly motivated by the need for economic reconstruction, based on a more educated workforce. Even then, there was still great concern over raising the school leaving age too quickly. However, answers need to consider other factors that influenced educational reformers, such as: political change (e.g. extensions in the franchise), social trends (e.g. the rise of the mass media), religion, wars.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

9 'Laissez-faire thinking was the main influence on government policies concerning welfare issues throughout the period 1834 to 1948.' How far do you agree?

Focus: assessment of the factors influencing government welfare policies.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many may argue against the assertion, possibly suggesting an evolutionary move towards the creation of a welfare state which was the ultimate form of state intervention and the end of individualism. Thus, there might be much discussion of the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act, Liberal welfare reforms pre-1914, inter-war developments, the impact of the Beveridge Report. Strong answers will point to elements of continuity as well as gradual change, e.g.: 1906-11 Liberal reforms were limited in scope, inter-war policies on unemployment were still influenced by notions of the deserving and undeserving poor, the welfare state set up after 1945 was not quite the optimum form of provision for the poor that at least some had expected.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992

10 How far were the results of general elections during the period 1868 to 1992 determined mainly by the political abilities of party leaders?

Focus: assessment of factors determining general election results.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many answers may argue for the assertion, claiming that strong, charismatic leadership was essential for victory. There is plenty of material to support such an argument, ranging, for example, from the efforts of Gladstone and Disraeli to Baldwin, Attlee, Macmillan, Wilson, Thatcher. Stronger answers may point out that different leaders had different political abilities, although there were common attributes (e.g. flexibility, astuteness, administrative ability, personal appeal).

However, the question demands that other factors be considered. These might include: the changing political context (weak oppositions e.g. Labour 1983, 1987, 1992), external issues (e.g. economic performance, war 1983), the rise of the mass media (especially television), the changing role of women in society, educational developments, changes in electoral methods. One interesting contrast that some might exploit is the defeat in 1945 of the highly able Churchill by the 'modest' Attlee.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

11 Did the changing role of prime ministers do more to strengthen or weaken attempts to develop democracy from 1868 to 1992? Explain your answer.

Focus: evaluation of the impact of the role of prime ministers upon democracy.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers will need to be clear how the role of the prime minister has changed, making reference, for example, to the management of parties and parliaments, dealings with monarchy, control over the cabinet, responsibility for war, the disposal of the secret fund. It could simply be argued that prime ministers strengthened the democratic process by carrying out the above functions with an increasing degree of skill, whilst having their power 'checked' by a range of institutions (e.g. political parties, the House of Lords, pressure groups, the judiciary, the media). A counter argument might be that democracy was weakened as prime ministers became too powerful, and examples cited might include Lloyd George and Thatcher. Stronger answers may show awareness of the need for prime ministers to adapt to change. There might be discussion of Prime Ministers Questions, appointments to key political positions, the creation of a collective decision-making cabinet, a willingness to use new technology (e.g. Baldwin), control over Cabinet meetings (e.g. Thatcher),

influence on the Budget, the absolute right to remove ministers (1903 onwards), the power to determine when to call elections, planning for war (e.g. Thatcher).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

12 How far may the growth of trade unionism be regarded as a necessity for the development of democracy from 1868 to 1992? Explain your answer.

Focus: assessment of trade unionism in the development of democracy.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Many answers may take the view that without trade unionism, the voice of working people would never have been heard. This, it might be argued, was especially true in the earlier part of the period as changes to the franchise were limited and it seemed that only through trade unionism would progress be made for the masses. The argument that unions continued to act as important pressure groups throughout the Twentieth Century may feature strongly, but is open to challenge. Instances of how union activity might be considered to have hindered democracy should be considered, possibly via reference to industrial action (e.g. 1880s, 1914-18, 1926, 1960s-1970s and noting that general elections in 1974 and 1979 were fought at least in part on 'who governs Britain?', the Thatcher governments battles with unions). Stronger answers will take note of 'a necessity' in the question, with some focus on the changing nature of unions in relation to legal, political, economic and social developments.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Britain 1834-1996

13 'The mass media have consistently preferred to entertain rather than inform the British people.' How far do you agree with this view of the mass media during the century from 1896?

Focus: assessment of consistency/change in the aims/roles of the mass media.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The roles traditionally attributed to the media have been to educate, inform and entertain. Here successful answers will need to weigh up the performance of one specified role against another, and the key is to recognise that this is a comparison question which requires direct, integrated comparison and therefore an appropriate structure. A largely separate discussion of evidence of entertainment and informing, however well done and informed, is **unlikely to rise above Band V**. Candidates will need to be familiar with many actual examples of the printed and broadcast media and analyse their content carefully, as well as considering the publicly declared or covert aims of broadcasters, newspaper editors and owners, and journalists. The perception of audiences and readers may be considered too. Stronger answers may show awareness of fluctuations and the importance of circumstance (e.g. if there is a national crisis or a war in progress) in influencing the emphasis the media employs. Some answers may also make the point that an apparent 'entertainment' can be a vehicle for information (especially true of radio in World War II).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

14 How far do you agree that the impact of the press on popular culture declined during the century from 1896?

Focus: assessment of consistency/change in the press' impact on popular culture.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Examiners should be prepared to accept a wide range of interpretations of 'impact' (such as 'role in', 'influence on', 'importance to', 'hold on') and indeed should reward candidates who discuss its interpretation. Good candidates may well stress that it is hard to attribute any specific causes to most changes in popular culture, so that assessing the media impact raises difficulties. Similarly, expect a demonstration of a good basic understanding of what we mean by popular culture and the ways in which popular culture and society have changed over the century since 1896. For example, the class structure and attitudes to class; the role of women and attitudes to them; the growth of leisure and how people choose to spend their time – all these would be useful areas of discussion. But at its heart this question is asking whether the impact of the printed media declined and naturally the question of whether the emergence of the broadcast media had an effect is likely to be a feature of answers. Successful answers are likely to identify criteria by which 'decline' can be measured (such as falling circulation) and adopt a coherent structure for their answers by doing so. Explanations of decline (if it is argued to have occurred) are not relevant unless they are carefully adapted to the assessment of extent of decline.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

15 To what extent did the role of the mass media in times of national crisis change during the century from 1896?

Focus: assessment of consistency/change in the media's role during national crises.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are not expected to have a detailed knowledge of any of the national crises in this period, but they are expected to be able to demonstrate an understanding of the role the media played in a range of crises. Both World Wars, the 1926 General Strike, appeasement during the 1930s, Suez 1956, the Falklands War, and the 'Troubles' in Ireland from 1969 are all specified in the syllabus and it is reasonable to assume that candidates should be able to use evidence from a range of these but, of course, other crises may also be referred – such as: the Second Boer War; the pre-World War I suffrage campaign, industrial unrest, Irish unrest; the Depression of the 1930s. Expect answers to refer to a range of media, and better responses to assess the extent their roles may have changed during national crises.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Europe 1792-1919

The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1918

16 How far were governments involved in the organisation and conduct of war in the period 1792-1918?

Focus: evaluation of the extent of mobilization of the state in support of war.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers need an understanding of what constitutes state involvement in the organisation and conduct of war, although some leeway is expected on the part of examiners. Good responses will set down criteria and then evaluate them in relation to the evidence. The mobilization of resources in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods might concentrate on the French Republic and Empire, its successful conscription of manpower in the military and economic infrastructures. Napoleon's organisation of France and her empire would be a good example. The industrial and financial power of Britain and its empire throughout the period would be another, although the Crimean War 1854-56 might well be part of a negative argument. The mobilization of the state in the support of war in Bismarck's Prussia might be contrasted with the more haphazard effort of both France and Austria. The First World War as the first industrial war with mass mobilization of military manpower, labour and resources, etc. is an obvious candidate for discussion. Candidates might chart the speed at which the states involvement in war changed as the First World War developed. For candidates wishing to use the American Civil War, the might of the Union is an obvious example of the state involving itself in the conduct of war to a high extent; the same could be argued for the Confederacy, but with the caveat that the economy of the south was not up to the task.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview

with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

17 'Waging war successfully in the period 1792-1918 depended mainly on the help of allies.' To what extent do you agree with this view?

Focus: evaluation of the effectiveness of alliances in warfare.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Credit should be given to those responses which draw on examples from across the period. One might expect analysis of the various coalitions formed to contain Revolutionary and Napoleonic France. The isolation of certain enemies of France in this period would be useful to the answer, examples might be Prussia in 1806, Austria in 1809. The power of France in this period to wage successful war on her own is a valid point, as is her tendency to form alliances – forced or not – with minor powers such as the Confederation of the Rhine or the Italian states, or with defeated great powers such as Prussia and Austria in 1812. The power of the anti-Russian alliance of the Crimean War – Great Britain, France, Piedmont and Turkey – to project power into the Crimea and defeat an isolated Russia on home territory would be a valid area of discussion. Another example might be Franco-Piedmontese alliance of 1859 in the war against Austria, especially if contrasted with the failure of the Italians to inflict defeat on Austria earlier in the century. The Austro-Prussian war could be used for both sides of the argument, either by pointing to Prussian success on her own or by emphasising the alliance of minor states both major combatant powers formed around themselves in this war. For Franco-Prussian War the isolation of France could be contrasted with the Prussian led German alliance. The alliance systems of the First World War are obvious areas for discussion. Should the candidate seek to use the American Civil War the diplomatic isolation of the Confederacy might be advanced as a cause of the victory of the larger and more industrially powerful Union.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

18 To what extent did industrialisation determine victory or defeat in war during the period from 1792 to 1918?

Focus: evaluation of the impact of industrialisation on the conduct of war.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Responses will need a sound understanding of what is meant by industrialisation and its impact on conflict. Two axes of advance might be expected – neither being exclusive – the scale of production and the effect of industrialisation on the means of waging war in the form of technological development. The extent of the industrialisation of Britain in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars might be contrasted with France. The limits of industrial capacity outside Britain in the same period, although candidates might point to proto-industrial processes linked to warfare on the continent. The limited ability of industrialised states such as Prussia to sustain long term wars in the middle century, the increased demand for munitions and Prussia's inability to replace munitions in the Franco-Prussian War is an example. On the other hand, the power of industrialised Prussia might be compared to her opponents in the wars of 1866 & 1870-71. Candidates might refer to the technology produced by industry but this must be linked to the specific demands of the question set. Also, the development of mass armies and the need to equip them in wars that increasingly used up military resources in double-quick time. The scale of warfare as a result of industrialisation and its destructiveness would be valid areas for discussion.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but

be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815–1919

19 Assess the reasons for the growth of German nationalism in the period from 1815 to 1919.

Focus: evaluation of the reasons for the growth of German nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers need to focus on the dominant factors in the development of German nationalism during this period, from the reasons for the growing emergence of the nationalist movement after 1815 to the reasons for the development of more radical nationalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The development and impact of various ideas on the emergence and development of nationalism may be explored. Answers may also explain the importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussian leadership of Germany. Candidates may understand how developments in the economy by the 1850s paved the way for the Prussian military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870-71. Candidates may explain how Prussia's dominance over the German states from 1866, and the ambitions of Bismarck and William II, distinctly shaped the course of German Nationalism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

20 Assess the view that the accession of Kaiser William II in 1888 was the most important turning-point in the development of German nationalism during the period from 1815 to 1919?

Focus: assessment of the relative significance of key factors influencing the development of German nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the phrase ‘most important turning point’ in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the accession of William II in 1888 as the most important turning point, but must do so comparatively in the context of other turning points. What follows is not an exclusive list, but obvious consideration could be given to 1815, 1848-49, 1866, 1870-71, 1890, 1914 and 1918 (and/or 1919). Clearly answers of the very highest quality can be written without considering all of these potential turning points, but the most able candidates will demonstrate a breadth of vision and a good understanding of the moments that shaped the destiny of German nationalism. Any answers that are limited to the importance of William II, however full and accurate, are severely flawed and may not be awarded more than **Band III**. Candidates may of course choose to exemplify the importance of William II by reference to events such as his ‘dropping of the pilot’, his failure to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia and through explanation how his pursuit of ‘world power’ and specific policies like Bulow’s Naval Bills made the possibility of conflict more probable. Candidates might argue that his real failure was to encourage Germany’s leaders instead of restraining them at a time when German expansion made some form of conflict with the established great powers inevitable. They might contend that William II’s posturing led Germany to eventual defeat in 1918 and her punishment at Versailles in 1919: arguably the nadir of German nationalism.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

21 To what extent did the aims of German nationalism change during the period from 1815 to 1919? [60]

Focus: evaluation of the degree of change in German nationalism's aims.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on change and continuity in the aims of German nationalism during this period. Candidates may demonstrate understanding of the debate about *Grossdeutschland* or *Kleindeutschland* in the period 1815–71 and the reasons for the development of more radical nationalism in the remainder of the period. The extent to which German nationalism was subverted by Bismarck and the creation of the Reich, and became institutionalized in Wilhelmine Germany as the Kaiser grasped at 'world power' could be considered. The impact of defeat in 1918 and humiliation in 1919 should also be understood.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Europe 1855-1956

Russian Dictatorship 1855–1956

22 How far do you agree that the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in 1881 was the most important turning-point in the development of Russian government in the period from 1855 to 1956?

Focus: assessment of the relative significance of points in the development of Russian government.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers will need to focus on the phrases ‘**most** important turning-point’ and ‘the development of Russian government’ in their answers. Alternative turning-points considered in the relative evaluation may include: 1855, 1866, 1905-06, February 1917, October 1917, 1924, 1928-29. Answers may argue that the end of centuries of Romanov rule was the most significant turning-point, but they may go on to argue that ultimately this led to the replacement of ‘Romanov Tsars’ by ‘red Tsars’. Many candidates will undoubtedly argue that October 1917 and the triumph of Bolshevism was a far more important turning point than the abdication of Nicholas which may have simply paved the way for the development of parliamentary democracy in different circumstances. Candidates may argue that the assassination of Alexander II and his replacement by Alexander III was the defining moment in Russian history in this period. They could suggest that the assassination marked the end of any hope of meaningful reform from above by the Romanov dynasty, and set the Romanovs on course for revolution and their downfall. Arguably, Alexander II’s earlier abandonment of the reforming spirit of the early 1860s marked the actual return to (albeit ineffectual under him) repressive autocracy. Some may consider that the replacement of Lenin by Stalin as the most significant turning point, perverting the ‘true’ course of the Russian Revolution, but this may be countered by the more recent archival evidence which suggests that there was significant continuity between Lenin and Stalin.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

23 'The need to modernise their backward economy was the most important reason why the rulers of Russia introduced reforms.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1855 to 1956?

Focus: assessment of reasons why the rulers of Russia introduced reforms.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the reasons why the rulers of Russia introduced reform in this period. Some may argue that war was the 'locomotive of history'; arguments in support could include how significant reforms followed defeats in war. The Emancipation Edict followed defeat in the Crimea and the abandonment of War Communism followed the Civil War. Stalin justified introducing the Five Year Plans because 'old Russia was ceaselessly beaten' and must never be again. Candidates may argue that Russia's backward economy led to these defeats and that the rulers of Russia were faced with a need for modernization throughout this period. Candidates who make strong links between the backward economy, defeats in war and consequent reforms are likely to be successful. However, some reforms, such as Witte's 'Great Spurt' may have had military imperatives but were introduced when Russia was not facing any immediate threat of hostilities. Specific problems, such as famine in 1891 or 1921, may also be seen to be the catalyst of change. The extent to which ideology, particularly from 1917, led to reform may be usefully explored. To what extent were Lenin and Stalin committed to reform to transform Russia along communist lines? Some may suggest reform was often a reaction to difficult circumstance: e.g. the 1905 October Manifesto or the introduction of the NEP (1921).

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

24 How far do you agree that a study of Russian governments in the period from 1855 to 1956 suggests that Russia simply exchanged one form of autocracy for another after 1917?

Focus: assessment of the nature of Russian governments during 1855-1956.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should focus on the similarities and differences between Russian government under the Tsars and the Communists. Similarities would obviously include autocratic/dictatorial government, the use of terror & centralized control of the economy. Both regimes tended only to reform under pressure. Comparisons could be made between rule by Divine Right & the cult of the individual. Comparisons could be made at a personal level, for example between Alexander III and Stalin. The regimes were similar but there are differences of scale (e.g. in terms of economic progress & the use of terror). Candidates may consider why constitutional democracy did not emerge in 1917, nor a Marxist utopia thereafter. Good candidates should consider the period of Lenin's rule and direct their attention to the reasons why the emerging Bolshevik state owed remarkably little to Marxist principles. The best candidates will focus on 'simply'; to what extent did the Bolshevik leaders, Lenin in particular, aim to set up a harsh dictatorial regime? Was Lenin a dictator by intent or was he driven into maintaining dictatorship by unfavourable circumstances? A case could be made for arguing that the Russians 'swapped' an increasingly ineffectual and superannuated form of authoritarianism for a more ruthless and efficient Twentieth Century variant.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

America 1763-1980

The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877

25 To what extent was the conflict between federal and state authority the most important constitutional issue in the period 1763 to 1877?

Focus: evaluation of the major constitutional issues.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers may consider conflict between central (British) government and state (colonial) authority in the period 1763 to 1783: the lead up to and course of the American Revolutionary War. They may consider the debate on the Articles of Confederation of 1783 to 1787. The Constitution of 1787 split political authority between federal government and state governments. The 10th Amendment of 1791 implied that powers not expressly given to federal government were state government rights. That issue became a major source of federal/state conflict during Jackson's presidency of 1829-37. The issue of the Second Bank of the USA and South Carolina raised the issue of an interposition of the state between the individual and the federal government. The most obvious issue was sectional conflict between North and South which resulted eventually in civil war. Some answers may balance this assertion against other factors such as: the development in the power of the presidency or the creation and role of the US Supreme Court.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

26 Assess the view that presidential power in the United States expanded more in the presidency of Abraham Lincoln than during the period of office of any other president in the period 1789 to 1877.

Focus: evaluation of the key eras in the growth of presidential power.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Lincoln's role as president needs to be compared with others in the development of presidential power. Lincoln stands out because he acquired powers during the Civil War (e.g. raising troops without Congressional consent, removal of civil rights, deportation of individuals he deemed suspect such as Vallandigham of Ohio). It might be argued that Lincoln permanently extended presidential power as commander-in-chief. A counter-thesis might argue that the unprecedented crisis of Civil War demanded temporary unprecedented powers. Other impact of other presidents will need to be evaluated in significance against the impact of Lincoln's presidency: perhaps Washington and the definition of the role of president from 1789 to 1801; Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase of 1803; Jackson and the 'Trail of Tears' and Second Bank of the United States incident during the 1830s.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

27 How far was the Missouri Compromise of 1820 the major turning-point in North-South relations in the period 1787 to 1877?

Focus: evaluation of key points in influencing North-South relations.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The Missouri Compromise maintained the balance between Free and Slave states within the USA. It allowed Missouri to enter as a slave state but this was balanced with the creation of the free state of Maine. The compromise between North and South maintained the delicate balance within Congress until the 1850s. The Compromise of 1850, which allowed California to enter as a free state, may be seen by many answers as bringing that balance to an end. The subsequent accession of Minnesota (1858) and Oregon (1859) as free states may be argued to have reinforced the end of parity North-South. Some answers may argue that the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 brought to an end compromise between North and South. Some may see the Civil War (the outbreak in 1861 or the South's eventual defeat in 1865) as the key turning-point. Some may argue that the end of Reconstruction in 1877 re-established the concept of compromise between North and South.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980

28 'The civil rights of African Americans improved but their social and economic position deteriorated.' Assess this view for the period 1865 to 1980.

Focus: evaluation of changes in AA civil rights compared to social/economic position.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers will need to consider both civil rights and social and economic rights. They may mention that, at the beginning of the period, African Americans were granted full civil and political rights equivalent to Whites within US society. However, from 1877 to 1920s, African Americans civil rights deteriorated with the establishment of legal segregation in the South and de facto segregation elsewhere within the USA. However, from 1940s, African American civil rights improved, in particular during 1950s and 1960s, as a result of Supreme Court and Presidential action and pressure from the Civil Rights movement. Answers may argue that, by 1980, African Americans had acquired in reality what they had been promised in 1865-70 with the three Civil War amendments to the constitution. Strong answers may contrast this development with the social and economic position of African Americans. They may mention, for example, the work of Booker T. Washington in the 1880s and 1890s and Marcus Garvey in 1920s. By 1980, the bifurcation of African American society had occurred. Many had used the development of civil rights to advance socially and economically. Others remained in inner city ghettos or in rural poverty.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

29 'The concept of the "melting pot" did not apply to Native Americans throughout the period 1865 to 1980.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: evaluation of the significance of the melting pot for Native Americans.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will need to understand 'melting pot' as it applied to US history in the period (the concept that the USA successfully integrated people from a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds into the mainstream of US society). Answers may mention

that, at the start of period, Native Americans stood outside US society. US governments regarded each tribe as an independent, sovereign nation. As a result, Native Americans did not have civil rights like other Americans. Other points that may be mentioned could include: in 1887, the Dawes Act gave citizenship to the Plains Indians (such as Oglala/Dakota Sioux and Cheyenne); after 1887, attempts were made to integrate some Native Americans into US society through church schools; many Native Americans were confined to Tribal Reservations; in 1924, all Native Americans were granted the right to claim US citizenship; however, social and economic exclusion remained – an issue picked up by American Indian Movement in the 1960s-70s; by 1980, some Native Americans had integrated into US society, but others remained on the Tribal Reservations.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

30 'Together, Kennedy's "New Frontier" and Johnson's "Great Society" were the major turning-point in the development of civil rights in the USA.' How far do you agree with this view for the period 1865 to 1980?

Focus: evaluation of key turning points producing change in civil rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Answers may refer to advances in Hispanic Rights through Johnson's Immigration Act of 1965. They may mention the advances in African American rights with the desegregation of education at the universities of Mississippi and Alabama; the desegregation on inter-state bus travel and lunch counters. They may also see the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 and the Voting Rights Act 1965 as major landmarks in granting all Americans full civil and political rights. In labour rights, they may mention the development of the minimum wage and Federal programmes to aid

the unemployed as part of 'New Frontier' and 'Great Society' attacks on poverty. Candidates may compare the 1961-69 era with other periods as eras of major increases in civil rights. The New Deal may figure prominently as the major alternative possibility, but there could be others. Some may pick out for comparison a period when civil rights deteriorated, such as the 1880s-1890s.

Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.

Band I and II answers should consider a range of issues, address the demands of the question and show a good level of ability to synthesise elements across the whole period.

Band I answers will be well organised, clearly structured and consistently analytical.

Band II answers will be focused on the demands of the question with some unevenness, particularly in coverage of the whole period, but will still have synthesised many elements in their analysis/explanation.

Band III essays will be less aware of continuity/change but, at the top end, will still address most of the period. They will demonstrate a synthesis of some elements but be more descriptive or narrative. Answers may lack balance (e.g. a good overview with inadequate factual support or a good factual account with only a partial explanation across the period); they may gloss over some areas.

Band IV responses will be markedly uneven. Essays will show some awareness of change and/or continuity and will attempt to make an argument, though perhaps they will be poorly structured and descriptive with limited factual support.

Band V essays may be very descriptive, have few points of analysis or explanation, and display a limited awareness of change/continuity. Facts will be given on a few relevant topics but with little attempt to link them to the demands of the question.

Band VI answers will show no understanding of continuity/change. Attempts to synthesise will be unsatisfactory. Answers may be fragmentary or poorly organised, with very limited relevance.

Band VII essays will be completely unsatisfactory. There will be no understanding of change/continuity and no attempt to answer the question set. Answers are likely to be very fragmentary, irrelevant and display very inadequate knowledge.

Report on the Units January 2006

Chief Examiner's Report

General Comments

This Report can be read in conjunction with the Mark Schemes that are available from OCR and Centres are encouraged to discuss the Report with their candidates. The amount of detailed comments in the reports on the Units varies because some questions attracted many answers whilst some were attempted by few or even by no candidates. This reflects the candidature in January. Centres who have taught topics on which there are no or brief comments are advised to read other parts of the Report because Principal Examiners try to make general as well as particular comments on questions in their Units.

In most cases, January entries continue to rise every series:

Unit	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
2580	11	63	139	239	276	307
2581	195	905	1259	1492	1460	1329
2582	999	2506	3760	3966	4885	5044
2583	323	1208	1746	2139	2440	2762
2584	312	1455	2521	2604	2816	2949
2585	123	602	656	881	1087	1149
2586	595	2378	3609	4129	4062	4733
AS Total	2258	9119	13690	15450	17026	18273
2587	n/a	39	57	72	58	69
2588	n/a	474	588	735	763	849
2589	n/a	1712	1802	1962	2061	2205
2590	n/a	n/a	240	315	368	398
2591	n/a	n/a	462	726	784	631
A2 Total	n/a	2225	3149	3810	4034	4152

OCR welcomes new Centres. They are advised to read the Newsletters that are published biannually and to consult the OCR web site. Many of OCR's published documents are also available on the AS/A2 History section of OCR's website – look under the 'Publications & Materials' tab:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/showQualification.do?qual_oid=2047&site=OCR&oid=2047&server=PRODUKTION

The range of topics that were studied was satisfactory, especially in the light of concerns that have been expressed elsewhere about the narrow concentration of topics in A Level History and especially about the high proportion of candidates who focus on Henry VIII and especially Hitler's Germany. The range of topics in this January examination was not as wide as in the larger summer cohort. However, the topics that have been the subject of concern do not loom too large across the Specification as a whole. Nazi Germany 1933-45 is clearly the most popular Study Topic in Unit 2582 (Document Studies) but Henry VIII's reign comprises a small part of Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58 in Unit 2581 (Document Studies). Periods that are linked to these did not dominate answers to questions in Unit 2583 (English History Period Studies) and Unit 2586 (European and World History Period Studies) and examiners did not note a concentration on questions linked to similar topics in the A2

Units. Interest remains high in the Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella and, in British history, in Peel and the period from 1900 to 1914. Many candidates study the Theme on Russian Dictatorships from 1855 to 1956. More centres appear to be studying American history. The number of answers to questions on post-1945 topics in British and European history is increasing. The number of candidates who answered questions on English and European medieval history, from Alfred and Charlemagne to the twelfth century, remains small but not insignificant and were sufficient to be able to make comparable assessments between their scripts and the work of candidates who had studied more popular Study Topics.

Reference is made elsewhere in this Report to the revised Specifications that the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) is requiring all awarding bodies to introduce in every subject. OCR hopes to introduce new options that will stimulate interest in other areas, as well as safeguarding those Study Topics that are not only popular but very worthwhile in their own right as A Level courses.

The overall quality of candidates' work was satisfactory and very similar to the standards of previous January examinations except that the number of scripts that deserved the higher Mark bands in Unit 2588 (Historical Investigations 1556-1725) was disappointing. The examinations provided an appropriate level of assessment for AS and A2 candidates. Most candidates could deal with the primary and secondary sources that are the basis of Units 2580-82 (Document Studies) and Units 2587-89 (Historical Investigations). Most candidates were able to write the extended essays that are required in Units 2583-86 (Period Studies in English and European/World History). Most A2 candidates were able to take the broad view that is required in Units 2590-91 (Themes in History). This was encouraging. Principal Examiners point out the ways in which candidates can improve their performance in individual Units but candidates are reminded of the need in all Units to write relevantly, to give a priority to arguments and to support these arguments with appropriate knowledge or references to the sources and passages in the Question Paper. Success in meeting these requirements is the common factor in all good answers, although some Units also have their particular requirements. Weaknesses also tend to be common. They include a lack of organisation, vagueness and especially a failure to answer the Question that is asked. This does not reveal itself in complete irrelevance; very irrelevant answers are rare. More frequently, answers ignore the key instructions such as 'Compare', 'Assess', 'How far was...?', or 'How important was...?' Centres might pay particular attention to advising candidates about the appropriate ways to tackle these key instructions. For example, a factor that is common to all of them is that high marks require candidates to consider alternatives

Answers to all of the questions in the examination require formal writing and Centres should remind candidates of the need to write accurately. Points made about spelling, punctuation and paragraphing in previous Reports are worth reiterating. There is a growing tendency to use abbreviations, especially of names. This should be avoided. Abbreviations are undesirable even when candidates face the pressure of examinations. It does not take appreciably longer to write Disraeli than 'Dis' and Louis XIV would be displeased to be described as 'L14'.

A significant proportion of candidates in all Units use the January examinations as an opportunity to re-take their assessments and improve their marks / grades. However, it may well be that some Centres use the opportunity of the January examinations to enter candidates for one AS examination in order to avoid the pressures of having to sit three examinations in one timetable slot in the summer. OCR is sympathetic to this problem but it is one which is not in its control. OCR hopes that the problem will be remedied when the new Specifications are introduced.

There were very few complaints from the large number of centres that entered candidates and the number has decreased consistently since the introduction of the new Specification. There were complaints from three Centres about different Questions in Units 2582, 2585 and 2589. They were each given serious attention by OCR in standardisation meetings and at the grade award meeting when candidates' performance is reviewed in order to set grade boundaries.

Particular problems that are noted by examiners are examined at the grade review meeting. For example, two scripts that were almost illegible were deciphered by a group of examiners; candidates are reminded of the need to write legibly. An answer that had been crossed out by the candidate was read to see if a mark could be awarded. These examples are worth pointing out to reflect the way in which OCR is anxious to give credit to candidates when it is possible and justified.

Up-dated Resource Lists

The 5th edition went live on OCR's website in November

http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Teacher%20Support%20%26%20Coursework%20Guidance/AS_A_Level29092.pdf

Past Papers On-line

OCR has started to pilot making its question papers on-line. The range of papers available will be expanded, with papers being published on the website nine months after the examination. This delay allows centres to use the papers as practice assessment material before they become more widely available. Once published online, the papers will remain available for two years, after which they will be removed. The pilot includes Unit 2586's paper for January 2005:

http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/QualPubs.do?qual_oid=2047&oid=2047&server=PRODUKTION&site=OCR&filter_type=1123&x=7&y=3

INSET & Teacher Study Days 2006-2007

Details of next academic year's programme will be sent to centres at the usual time (i.e. in June 2006). Guided by feedback from centres, we intend to offer a new focus for the INSET meetings: teaching for the specification. These meetings will also include an update on specification changes for September 2008.

Teacher Study Days will again take forward our dedicated support for 'minority' syllabus areas.

No other Board comes close to the matching the face-to-face support that OCR offers its AS/A2 History teachers; two offered none at all during 2005-2006.

Update on the June 2005 Report, p.294

GCE History - future change

The 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper of February 2005 promises:

1. a reduction in the number of assessment units for most GCE subjects from six to four [paras 8.24-8.25]
2. greater “stretch and challenge” in A2 for all GCE subjects [para 8.15]. During 2006-07, the QCA will pilot how best this should be done.
3. a review of requirements for coursework within GCE [paras 8.10-8.12 & 8.27]
4. a pilot of an extended project within GCE [paras 8.16-8.17]. This will take place during 2006-07.

and specifically for GCE History

5. action to provide better progression [para 8.26]

Further, the QCA's *Futures: Meeting the Challenge. Subject Report in History* (2004) http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/11462_futures_history.pdf identifies the need for better sourcework within GCE and a “continued disquiet over what is seen as the gradual narrowing and ‘Hitlerisation’ of post-14 History”.

The QCA reviewed the GCE criteria for every subject during autumn 2005. These criteria determine the fundamental requirements that every specification in a subject must observe (e.g. for Curriculum 2000: a six-unit structure, the study of a minimum 15% British & a minimum 15% Foreign History, study of change over at least 100 years, the precise text of History's Assessment Objectives). The current History criteria will be found at: http://www.qca.org.uk/12687_1712.html Revised criteria will thus provide the basic building blocks with which all new AS/A2 History specifications will have to be constructed. The new criteria are due to be signed off by ministers at the end of April 2006.

At the time of writing this Report, awarding bodies await decisions from the QCA about the framework and regulations of the new syllabuses. The timetable to which QCA is working for all subjects is:

- Publication of the approved subject criteria by QCA: April/May 2006
- Submission by Boards of their new specification to QCA: Spring 2007
- Publication of the approved new Specifications: by September 2007
- First teaching of the new Specifications: September 2008

To keep up-to-date with developments, Centres are advised to:

- 1) read all future editions of this Report and our Newsletter during 2006-2008
- 2) check periodically QCA's website: www.qca.org.uk
- 3) subscribe to OCR's E-Community. The Subject Officer will use it to keep OCR's History teachers informed about plans, developments and meetings during the entire process.

Why not be an Examiner?

OCR is working with the National Assessment Agency(NAA) to recruit new examiners, moderators and markers in England and Wales. The NAA highlights the professional experience to be gained from being an examiner, and the benefits and insight it can bring into the classroom. The NAA also funded increases in fees for the majority of examiners and markers, and an increase in the teacher release payment made to schools and colleges.

Teachers who become examiners say that the experience they have gained has improved their teaching as well as their assessment skills. You can read some of their stories on the NAA website <http://www.examinerrecruitment.org/>

If you are interested in examining History for OCR:

- New examiners are given training.
- New examiners are given a smaller allocation of scripts to mark.
- All examiners work under the guidance of an experienced Team Leader who is willing to give continuing advice during the examining period.

Please see the home page of OCR's website, under 'Examiners and Moderators':
<http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/examiner/examiner.jsp>

OCR History's E-Community could help **YOU**

Our e-community currently has 151 members. Some valuable exchanges have taken place – e.g. about how to resource 2588 Oliver Cromwell & how to teach and resource 2591 Russian Dictatorship. OCR's e-community could **help you in your classroom** - especially if you teach a less popular options not well supported by publishers.

The community unites classroom practitioners. Every message submitted is delivered to every other subscriber. Membership is free. To join or to obtain more information, go to: <http://community.ocr.org.uk/lists/listinfo/history-a>

The more teachers join, the better it will work so, over to you ...

+

**THE SUBJECT OFFICER WILL USE THE
COMMUNITY TO KEEP OCR's HISTORY
TEACHERS INFORMED ABOUT
SPECIFICATION DEVELOPMENT
DURING 2006-2008**

**Advanced Subsidiary & Advanced GCE History 3835/7835
January 2006 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2580	Raw	120	91	82	73	65	57	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2581	Raw	120	91	82	73	65	57	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2582	Raw	120	91	82	73	65	57	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2583	Raw	45	37	32	27	23	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2584	Raw	45	37	32	27	23	19	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2585	Raw	45	35	31	27	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2586	Raw	45	35	31	27	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2587	Raw	90	66	59	52	46	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2588	Raw	90	66	59	52	46	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2589	Raw	90	66	59	52	46	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2590	Raw	120	89	79	69	59	50	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2591	Raw	120	89	79	69	59	50	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

Specification Aggregation Results: 3835 AS History

Threshold marks (in UMS)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3835	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total aggregating candidates
3835	15.02	41.98	73.04	90.61	98.29	100	586
difference from January 2005	-3.28	-2.82	+1.54	+1.41	+1.69	-	- 68

The mean mark was 200.64 (out of 300) which represents a fall of 0.16 marks.

Specification Aggregation Results: 7835 A Level History

Threshold marks (in UMS)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
7835	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of aggregating candidates was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total aggregating candidates
7835	26.61	60.55	80.73	91.74	97.25	100	109
difference from January 2005	+7.91	+5.25	-3.87	-3.36	-1.95	-	- 14

The mean mark was 419.18 (out of 600) which represents a rise of 0.98 marks.

Outcomes per Unit:

Unit	A	B	C	D	E	Mean mark (max raw mark)	Candidates
2580	25.90	47.54	73.12	85.90	93.12	79.73 (120)	307
2581	22.52	47.59	71.61	86.82	93.60	79.51 (120)	1329
2582	20.51	39.94	62.40	77.37	88.52	76.63 (120)	5044
2583	18.93	44.99	71.08	86.65	92.87	30.10 (45)	2762
2584	25.71	54.48	77.48	88.84	92.81	31.53 (45)	2949
2585	23.61	44.25	66.03	82.32	89.90	28.99 (45)	1149
2586	18.22	42.04	67.51	85.08	92.10	28.95 (45)	4733
2587	21.74	50.73	59.42	72.46	86.96	55.60 (90)	69
2588	17.20	34.16	53.71	71.14	85.04	52.80 (90)	849
2589	19.06	38.93	64.47	79.81	89.29	55.20 (90)	2205
2590	18.09	37.44	60.55	82.92	91.46	73.67 (120)	398
2591	16.64	30.90	50.83	67.83	82.25	68.39 (120)	631

Units 2580-2582 (Document Studies)

General Comments

Centres are reminded that the January 2006 exams were the last with the Unit 2580-2582 question papers in their present format. For details of the new format (two sub-questions) plus links to a full set of exemplar papers and the revised generics, see <http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/newsandupdates/ShowQualNewsDetail.do?server=PRODUKTION&site=OCR&oid=2047&newsitemoid=23057>

The total entry for these three Units was much the same as in the previous January, though there were slightly fewer candidates for 2581 and slightly more for 2580 and 2582. Previous Reports on the January exams have expressed concern about the readiness of some candidates to take Unit 2582 at this point. Performance this year confirmed our view: some Year 12s are entered before they are ready: 104 (2%) scored 40 marks or below. We therefore repeat our advice to Centres not to enter under-prepared candidates for Units 2580-2582 after just one term's teaching.

Several examiners commented on the comparatively small number of very good scripts. This was at least in part because candidates always find it difficult to sustain a high level of attainment across all three sub-questions. The demands, both in terms of time management and deployment of a range of skills, are considerable, and this is one of the main reasons for the advice above. The problem of time management should be alleviated by the decision to discontinue part (a) from the coming June examination, but the paper will remain demanding in terms of skills. To set against the difficulty of sustaining the same level across the sub-questions, the possibility of counter-balancing weakness in one part question with a slightly better performance in another helped weaker candidates.

The areas of weakness which lead to under-achievement and to which attention should be given in preparing candidates have been discussed at length in previous reports. The remarks which follow comment on the main problems in relation to the work seen this January. This report is not intended to be an exhaustive analysis. Centres are referred particularly to the report for the June 2004 examination, where these weaknesses are discussed at length with examples.

As this was the last occasion on which **part (a)** questions were set, comments will be brief. A significant number of candidates spent too much time on this part, thus handicapping themselves when they came to part (c). Linkage to the source was often weak. Some candidates attempted to establish linkage simply by quoting a sentence from the source with little or no explanation of **how** it was linked to the reference. What was required was an explanation of how the reference fits into the argument of the Source. The weakest answers came from candidates who simply did not understand the reference, particularly in 2582, Q.4. Sometimes candidates who were able to explain the context well failed to explain the reference itself. This happened for instance in 2581, Q2, where candidates focused on indulgences but not the building of St Peters, and in 2582, Q.7, where they discussed Hitler's style of government but omitted to explain the role of Himmler. Once again, a significant number of candidates wasted time by diverting to provenance and evaluation, which are not required for this question.

In **part (b)** questions the focus is on comparison. Without explicit comparison candidates will not get above Band IV. A substantial number of candidates still adopt a sequential approach, and others limit themselves to a low Band III by confining

their comparisons to a brief conclusion after a sequential analysis of the two Sources. Nevertheless it was heartening to note that the number of candidates who avoid this trap and attempt a continuously comparative approach seems to be gradually increasing. Candidates should, however, not assume that a comparison is established simply by the introduction of comparative words and phrases such as 'whereas', 'on the other hand', 'by contrast', or by setting points from the Sources alongside each other. Similarity or difference of content has to be demonstrated in relation to a point which is genuinely comparable, either because both Sources refer to it or because one draws attention but the other ignores it. Likewise comparison of qualities other than content requires assessment of the same qualities in both Sources. Many answers which avoided a sequential approach nevertheless only achieved a modest Band III mark because they did not compare like with like. Another common weakness was failure to realise that comparisons are only relevant if they relate to the issue raised in the question. Comparison of provenance and reliability was generally less satisfactory than comparison of content. There were many answers which discussed the provenance or reliability of one source but then failed to make a comparison with the other.

With the discontinuance of (a) in June, **part (c)** will have a higher share of the total mark, so it is even more important for candidates to be aware of the criteria and to practise them. The focus in this part is on judgement in context, based on the set of sources and own knowledge. This is a demanding exercise requiring a number of skills. Note that **both** source analysis **and** own knowledge are required. Candidates should be aware that the absence or minimal use of either will lead directly to Band IV because of clear imbalance. Only in rare instances of exceptionally good source analysis may answers which display such imbalance be awarded Band III. Use of own knowledge was often poor. Too often it was generalised and lacked supporting detail. Equally it was often not linked with source analysis but 'bolted on'.

This latter fault often arose from a formulaic approach to the question: a sequential discussion of the Sources followed by a section of own knowledge. This inhibited the development of a coherent and focussed argument. While there is no one formula which fits all questions, a more appropriate general rule for candidates would be to think in terms of argument and counter-argument. They should consider the evidence to support the view offered in the question and then the evidence which supports an alternative argument (or arguments). Such evidence should come primarily from analysis of the sources, since this is a Document Studies paper. Own knowledge should be integrated with source analysis and used to substantiate, qualify or add to the evidence derived from the sources. Such an approach requires grouping and cross-referencing of sources, whereas the sequential approach treats them in isolation. While the sequential approach remains widespread, the work seen in this session suggests that an increasing number of candidates are attempting to group the sources. Many, however, still have little understanding of how to use grouping to structure their answers. It is not sufficient to group the sources in the introduction and then describe the content of each source. The grouping identified needs to be followed through in an appropriate way in developing the argument. The June 2005 report suggested ways in which this can be achieved.

An equally common and equally faulty alternative was the answer based on generalised own knowledge which used brief references to the Sources to illustrate the argument. In the worst cases, this involved a single sentence about each Source introduced by phrases such 'As Source A says', 'As mentioned in Source C'. Not infrequently, a rather awkwardly inserted remark in the final paragraph attempted reference to a previously neglected source. One could almost hear the candidate ticking off the Sources and realising that one had been missed.

Some appear to misunderstand the way in which Sources can be used to judge the issue raised in the question. They should not necessarily expect to find in the Sources an opinion about the issue raised a part (c) question. For example, in 2581 Q 1(c), none of the Sources directly addresses the question of Edward IV's responsibility for the crisis of 1469-70. The Sources provide some of the evidence upon which a judgement can be formed – own knowledge is then to be used to develop this.

Evaluation of Sources continues to present problems. 'Stock' evaluation remains widespread. Bias is asserted on the grounds of the attribution of the source without any attempt to support this claim from internal evidence. Only the best candidates seem to realise that a biased source may be useful. To take a random example, 2581, Q.3, Source A is clearly biased but is useful because it tells us what Spaniards thought of the English in the 1550s. There are many other examples in all three units. The work of modern historians is commonly dismissed on the grounds that they were not contemporaries. Hindsight (commonly mis-spelt, e.g. 'heinsite') is regarded as a bad thing, with no recognition of the distinction between the self-justificatory hindsight of an actor in the events described and the informed hindsight of the historian working from the records. Where evaluation is explicitly attempted, it is not uncommon to find it only in a 'bolt-on' paragraph which does little for the argument. The point of evaluation of the Sources is not to tick a box in an assessment grid but to determine the value of the evidence provided by the source for the argument. Nor is it necessarily best achieved by discussing provenance. Previous Reports suggest other ways which may be more appropriate in some cases.

A significant number of responses were too short to meet the requirement of part (c). Sometimes, this was because candidates had spent too long on the other questions. But in many weaker scripts, it was hard to believe that candidates did not have time to write more and one could only conclude that they did not fully realise what was expected. It is not possible to write a good answer in a single side consisting of 6-8 lines (2 or 3 sentences) on each source. From June this part question will carry two-thirds of the marks. To earn them, a substantial answer is expected.

Comments on Individual Questions

Unit 2580

All three questions were attempted. Alfred and The Crusades predominated over the Normans. 38 Centres entered a total of 307 candidates, 30% of whom were retaking. No complaints were received about the question papers. The overall standard was somewhat higher than for the other two Units of the group.

1 The Reign of Alfred the Great 871-899

- (a) This was generally well answered, sometimes very well. Most candidates were able to provide appropriate contextual information. Most used the source itself, though not all were sufficiently precise about the 'school'.
- (b) Most answers adopted a comparative approach, and sequencing was not much in evidence. The sense of the urgent need for reform was usually conveyed, with references to both the external threats and the internal problems of the Church in organisation and teaching. Most answers engaged with the issue of provenance. Some candidates picked up the differing tone of the Sources and the contrasts between Fulco and Asser were drawn, without too much unnecessary comment upon the latter's possible unreliability. Indeed, candidates handled Asser better than on past occasions, picking up his role and his importance as a purveyor of Alfredian success. Some weaker

candidates thought Source B did not show Alfred's concern for reform because they failed to understand the link between education and reform.

- (c) Most were able to construct an argument and counter-argument, often concluding the needs of government (political and military) were the key, but some argued for the reverse. Good answers usually blended the religious and the secular, often with good knowledge levels. Sources were handled fairly well, but grouping would have provided an easier base for argument/counter-argument. The best made the link between Sources A, B and D, supporting religious zeal as the explanation, with C and D providing contrasting views.

2 The Normans in England 1066-1087

- (a) Few linked the reference, feudalism and feudal matters. Some commented little on 'revenues'; more focussed on this part of the reference at the expense of explaining fiefs. Better answers saw the linkages of lands, military service and rewards in the context of the Conquest and settlement of England.
- (b) Some answers drew in too much topic knowledge at the expense of comparing what the sources actually say. Some dwelt too much on provenance and stock evaluation was prevalent. More detailed comparison of content would have strengthened many answers. The different treatment of the north and south reported in Source C was missed – indeed relatively few candidates referred at all to rebellions in the south. The approach was more often sequential than comparative and few effective comparisons were read. Sometimes simple paraphrasing or summarising was offered.
- (c) This was not well answered. Attempts were made to argue/counter-argue, but Source-handling was often weak, sequencing and paraphrasing too common. Grouping of the sources was very weak and evaluation was often limited to stock points about reliability or bias. Imbalance between source analysis and own knowledge was common, with own knowledge either predominant or else excluded in favour of a simple recital of what the Sources said. Even when an attempt was made to argue around the question title, not enough was made of the actual wording and the key issues raised.

3 The First Crusade and its Origins 1073-1099

- (a) This was tackled effectively with due emphasis on both the Sepulchre and the vows. In some cases, the vows were understood but the significance of the Holy Sepulchre was missed. The source itself was often well used to contrast the fulfilment of the vows with the massacre which preceded it.
- (b) This produced many effective comparisons. Comparison of content was handled well in the main, with a good sense of the focus of the question. Not all spotted the critical nature and tone of Source B and more could have been made of language. More could also have been said about the value of Source D in some answers. Better answers selected key words and phrases rather than paraphrase. Provenance tended to be evaluated in a rather stock way all too often but some got beyond that level. A few answers focused too much upon the Crusaders and their actions rather than the Muslim divisions.
- (c) Most answers did attempt to argue and counter-argue, drawing in factors other than the military skills of the Crusaders both from the sources and from topic knowledge. In some answers, however, own knowledge predominated to the detriment of source analysis. Grouping was attempted but often answers tended to lapse into sequencing after initial grouping. Some tried to turn the question too much into one on religious zeal. Sound answers noted the value of Sources B and D as against A and C, often with some sense of the over-arching nature of D. Evaluation was attempted, though often less via linkages of Sources and knowledge, more by analysis of provenance issues.

Unit 2581

The candidature was down on the corresponding January session last year (1329 compared to 1460); 66% were retaking. The standard of the work was somewhat higher than for Unit 2582 but not as high as for Unit 2580. Qs 2 and 3 continued to attract the greater number of candidates, followed by Q1 and Q4. A small minority answered Q5. No complaints were received about the question paper.

1 The Wars of the Roses 1450-85

- (a) Few had any difficulty in identifying 'the favourites of the King and Queen' as the Woodville family. Contextual information linking the reference to Warwick's difficulties was also commonly offered, but relatively few candidates took up the direct link in the source to the complaint about heavy taxation, which it claims was the direct cause of the rebellion.
- (b) Many candidates noted that both Sources refer to the role of Louis XI in promoting a reconciliation between Margaret of Anjou and Warwick to restore Henry VI. The key to a successful comparison, however, was the dates of the two Sources: they refer to different stages in a deteriorating relationship. Thus Source B provides an explanation for what is described in Source D. The minority who appreciated this were rewarded accordingly. Some wasted time on the first part of Source A [not relevant to this question]. It is important to remember that part (b) questions focus comparison on a specific issue and this means that often some parts of a source are not relevant to the comparison (though they will be relevant to the part (c) question). Candidates should also note that, while it is important to consider the provenance, and hence the reliability, of the two Sources, they should not allege unreliability on specious grounds. There was no reason to doubt the factual accuracy of either, even though one is from foreign observers and the other a self-justificatory manifesto.
- (c) Most balanced the responsibility between Edward and Warwick, ignoring Louis XI and Margaret. Many indeed focussed only on Edward, thus producing a limited and unbalanced judgement. Some appeared to expect to find in the Sources explicit views about Edward's responsibility. This misunderstands their purpose: to provide the material upon which, along with the candidate's own knowledge, a judgement may be formed. Many candidates adopted a sequential approach, which did not produce a clear analysis of the relevant factors. What the best did was to group the evidence in the Sources to provide such an analysis. Sources A, B and C provide evidence of the discontent caused by Edward's marriage, while Sources B and D (and, less directly, C) indicate Warwick's growing alienation from and eventual rebellion against Edward. The Sources do not indicate whether Warwick was more sinned against than sinning: own knowledge was needed to reach a judgement. The Sources alone, except D [in any case self-justificatory] suggest Edward was mainly to blame.

2 The German Reformation 1517-30

- (a) Answers tended to focus excessively, sometimes exclusively, on the issue of indulgences. This was admittedly an important element in explaining the context of the reference but the reference itself was about the importance of St. Peter's. Surprisingly, many candidates failed to pick up the link in the source to the need to 'keep safe the bones of St Peter'.
- (b) Many candidates failed to note the two-fold significance of Source B as evidence for attitudes towards indulgences: it demonstrates both their popularity among the ordinary Germans and the disapproval of Myconius, whose view may be regarded as typical of reformers. On the other hand it was pleasing to see that many candidates perceived that Zasius (Source

C), while critical of Luther's views about the pope, hints that he does have doubts about indulgences – a point which was convincingly compared with Myconius's open criticism. Source C's view that other abuses were more urgent was properly contrasted in many answers with the strong line taken by Myconius in the last sentence of Source B. A pleasing number of answers pointed out that both Sources are dated to only two years after the 95 Theses, and many noted that the two Sources represent the two sides of the debate, though more could have been made of the fact that Zasius was not only a Catholic (as indeed Myconius would have described himself in 1519) but a humanist – a term not generally understood. Moreover many candidates ignored the information in the introduction that his account is described as balanced.

- (c) Although there were some very good answers, many candidates found difficulty in relating the Sources to the rapid spread of Luther's ideas. This was partly because they confused this issue with the broader issue of the success of the Lutheran Reformation. They might have found a clue to what was required in the title of the question: the **popularity** of Luther's teaching. The Sources indicate that his attack on indulgences attracted attention and indeed sympathy among religious leaders of a variety of views. They also provide evidence of other reasons for the spread of his ideas. Many mentioned printing ('his pamphlets are everywhere') and the appeal to nationalism, hinted at in both Source A and Source B. Fewer noted anti-papalism (Source C) and corruption (Source D).

3 Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58

- (a) This was generally well answered. Most were well informed about the events of 1553 but some were tempted to provide more narrative detail than was needed. The main fault was weak linkage of the reference to the source from which it was taken. The point of the reference was that Mary's response to the attempted coup showed that in 1553 she was 'strong and decisive', in contrast to later weaknesses.
- (b) There was considerable variation in the quality of answers to this. There were some very good answers which distinguished between the hatred of the Spanish described in Source A and the fear of Spanish control suggested in Source B. Such answers also commonly noted the different tone of the two Sources and related it to their provenance. On the other hand, some paid too little attention to the focus of the question, which was on English attitudes towards the Spanish rather than the other way round, and yet others made no distinction between the authors of the Sources, lumping both together as Spanish (despite the information that Renard was the Imperial ambassador) and therefore 'biased'. Few noted that Renard is actually reporting opinions circulating among the English.
- (c) This was not well answered on the whole. The best answers identified Mary's objectives at the outset and used Sources and own knowledge to discuss the opposition Mary faced and assess her success. A good answer could be produced in this way from consideration of the issues of gaining the throne, restoring Catholicism and the Spanish marriage (on all of which the Sources are helpful). Many, however, answered largely from own knowledge or alternatively trawled through the Sources sequentially, thus producing shapeless, unfocused answers. Few noted that the date of Source C is important in assessing Mary's success: as Source D points out, her weaknesses became more apparent as the reign progressed.

4 The English Civil War 1637-49

- (a) This was generally soundly answered, but there were also many that did not link the reference to the presence of the Scottish army in Newcastle or which failed to point out that Slingsby's remark can only be understood against the background of the dissolution of the Short Parliament seven months earlier [which Slingsby actually refers to in his first sentence].
- (b) Most noted that both see the meeting of Parliament as an opportunity for redress of grievances. Most also saw that Source B urges a more cautious approach than Source C. Discussion of provenance was, however, often unsatisfactory because candidates failed to take account of the fact that Source C is an account of two speeches, so the views that are being compared are not those of Rudyerd and Peyton but Rudyerd, Rous and Pym (and, by implication, Peyton as well).
- (c) Candidates were generally well informed about the grievances which had built up during the Personal Rule, particularly over religion, and many attributed Charles's difficulties in 1640 to these. There is good evidence in the Sources to support this view and where answers used this as well as own knowledge, sound marks could be gained. However, the focus of the question is on money and many answers were weakened by a tendency to ignore, or at best make only passing reference to, the suggestion in the question that money was the root cause – in spite of the direct statement in the first line of Source A. Candidates are, of course, expected to make their own judgement and there is a good case for the view that money was the immediate but not the main cause of Charles's difficulties.

5 Louis XIV's France 1661-1693

- (a) This was soundly answered by most. What distinguished better answers was the way in which they exploited the rest of the source to enlarge upon the reference and to show how Louis' attention to work fitted into a strictly regulated routine which was at the heart of his image of kingship.
- (b) Candidates found it easier to assess Source D than Source B. Most not only drew attention to the hostile view expressed in D but also noted the significance of the fact that it was written by a Huguenot exile. Comparative analysis of Source B proved more difficult for some because they were unsure how to interpret 'a general outburst of anger and indignation'. Only a few noted the apparent contradiction between this and the comments in Source D on the lack of freedom of expression. As a result discussion of Source B sometimes tended to paraphrase.
- (c) While there were few very good answers to this, most candidates worried away at it with reasonable success. Apart from some weaker candidates who trawled through the Sources sequentially, most saw that broadly speaking Sources A and C could be grouped on one side of the argument and B and D on the other. Only a few probed deeper to note subtler points, e.g. the oppression which Source D complains about would be seen by many contemporaries as beneficial because, in the words of Source C, it 'destroys heresies'. Source C was commonly misinterpreted as Veryard's own view rather than his report of what the clergy taught. Many noted the importance of the fact that Source D comes from a Huguenot exile, but only a few discussed the provenance of the others.

Unit 2582

The entry was up a little on January 2004 (4885 to 5044); 54% were retaking. As usual, the great majority answered Q7. A much smaller but significant number

answered Qs 3 and 4. The other options attracted smaller numbers. One complaint was received about Q4(a).

1 The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-92

- (a) Most candidates managed to identify this as a reference to the declaration of a National Assembly and/or the Tennis court Oath. Many, however, were not clear about the precise chronology of events in the early summer of 1789 and the storming of the Bastille was often included as one of the revolutionary movements referred to in spite of the date of the letter. Another common mistake was to attribute the remark to Necker himself when he was in fact reporting what the Minister for War said.
- (b) Most candidates had some success in comparing the content of the sources. The basic contrast between Source A's advice to work with the Third Estate and Source C's report that many courtiers wanted the King to dissolve it was commonly understood. Fewer candidates, however, noted that Source C also reported that Louis was reluctant to accept the advice given by the courtiers. Comparison of provenance was less satisfactory. Some candidates interpreted the attribution of Source A as meaning that it was by a priest, while many assumed that Source C was written by Marie Antoinette – her memoirs rather than memories of her by d'Adhémar. Despite the introduction, some thought Saint Priest was a priest. Some did not know how to read the attribution and thought Source C was written by Marie Antoinette.
- (c) This was generally well answered. Most succeeded in extracting from the Sources evidence of Louis' indecision, with Source D providing the material for a conclusion that he lost the opportunity to establish 'a creative partnership' with the Third Estate. Producing an effective counter-argument proved more difficult. Better candidates saw that there is material in the Sources to suggest that the fault lay at least in part with some ministers and courtiers, though, as some argued, ultimately it was up to Louis to decide which course to follow. The most effective answers used own knowledge to set the Sources in the context of the wider causes of the crisis of 1789. Some did not know how to read the attribution and thought that Source C was written by Marie Antoinette.

2 The Condition of England 1832-53

- (a) This was soundly answered. Most explained the reference in terms of workhouse conditions post-1834, sometimes with graphic detail. It was a pity that more did not specifically relate this to the reference to the 'less eligibility principle'. More important in distinguishing the best answers, however, was linkage to the precise point made about the 'rigours of the 1834 system', namely that they were not intended by Chadwick for the 'impotent' poor. Such answers were then able to make the further link to the government's failure to carry out Chadwick's intentions.
- (b) This too was soundly answered by the majority of candidates. The contrast between the two Sources over the reason for the increase in poor rates and their very different tones in describing those in receipt of poor relief were identified by most candidates. Many also saw that this could be explained by their provenance. What distinguished the better candidates was their ability to probe more deeply into the Sources. They saw that Source A is not the simple attack on agricultural employers that one might expect. It agrees with Source B in blaming 'the idle able-bodied', but also, unlike Source B, blames corrupt officials.
- (c) Weaker candidates had some difficulty with the focus of this question. Most were able to find evidence in the Sources of economic

considerations, though these were more often concerns about the rising cost of the poor law than concerns about the economic problems of the poor. The cost of the Old Poor Law thus became the main focus of the argument in many answers. The aim of reducing pauperism and forcing the poor to obtain work was also discussed by many but unfortunately it was often not related as clearly as it should have been to the idea of moral judgements about the poor. A fair number took 'moral judgements' to mean that the government or the well-to-do had a moral duty to the poor rather than the idea of reforming the morals of the poor.

3 Italian Unification 1848-60

Several examiners reported that this was the best answered option on Unit 2582.

- (a) Most linked the reference to Piedmont's defeats by Austria in 1848-49, and some also mentioned failed revolutions in other states. Many noted the point of the reference was that it explained why many in Piedmont looked to France for help. Fewer, however, developed links with other points in the source— Victor Emmanuel's belief that French support was needed and the presence of exiles from other Italian states, looking to Piedmont to defeat Austria and believing foreign help was needed for this.
- (b) There were some very good answers which showed excellent understanding of Piedmontese politics. Most candidates successfully identified the main points of comparison between the two Sources, though some confined their answers to the essential points: agreement that Piedmont was the main hope for Italian unification, but disagreement about the need for foreign help. Only the better candidates explored in detail their views about Piedmont's strengths and weaknesses – its armed forces, its independence, its constitution. Many made useful points about the provenance of the two sources and their usefulness as evidence. As is often the case with Sources taken from modern historians, there was a tendency to stock evaluation of Source D, but there were also answers which sensibly argued that the ability to use hindsight to assess Piedmont's position strengthened Beales's judgement.
- (c) Some interpreted the question as being about whether unification could be achieved without foreign support rather than whether Italians believed this to be the case. On the whole, however, answers were well focused. Support for the proposition in Sources B and D was noted by most, as was the contrary view in Source A. Source C was handled with less confidence, with some candidates misreading it as supporting entry into the Crimean War in order to win the support of Britain and France – perhaps because they knew that this what actually happened. Ignoring the question, some took their answers well beyond the 1850s.

4 The Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61

The federal nature of the US Constitution is a central issue for the understanding of the Civil War and there were some sharply focused, well-explained responses which showed clearly that the issue is not beyond candidates at this level. Nevertheless, some found this question difficult. The problem was that they confused a federal constitution with the present day use of the term Federal to describe the administration in Washington. Consequently, many who understood the different views of South and North about the relation between the states and the Union got the terms used in the Source the wrong way round. Since this did explain the central issue, though in a rather muddled way, some credit was given for such answers.

- (a) Answers to this were also rather mixed in quality. Most understood clearly Source A's view about the right of secession and explained why a Southern state should take this view. While most saw that Source B

contrasts with Source A, Lincoln was not well understood. Some, noting he does not specifically mention secession, argued it was not possible to compare the two Sources. Others quoted his words about ballots and bullets without convincing examiners that they really understood them.

- (b) While there were some very good answers which used the Sources and own knowledge convincingly to examine whether the underlying issue was state rights (the nature of the Union) or slavery, many lacked a clear focus on this issue. It was clear that many would have been happier with a question about slavery as the cause of the Civil War, so they tended to concentrate on this aspect – for which, of course, the Sources provided some support, along with the candidates' own knowledge. Indeed, many answers made more effective use of own knowledge than of the Sources. Own knowledge was, for example, used to suggest that the election of Lincoln was the main factor and also to argue that the South misunderstood Lincoln's intentions with regard to slavery. Handling of the Sources, on the other hand, was in many cases less satisfactory, particularly Sources B and C. Some, misinterpreting his words about 'the great lesson of peace', failed to see that Lincoln in Source B was expressing his determination to preserve the Union, by force if necessary.

5 The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93

- (a) Most correctly identified this as a reference to the activities of the Land League. Linkage to the Source was more variable. The reference should have led to an explanation both of Parnell's role in the agitation of 1879-80 **and** of why he wished to distance himself from rural violence in 1886, but many confined themselves to what happened in 1879-80.
- (b) Many found Source C complex and difficult to relate to the focus of the question. Source B was generally understood as showing that Parnell would blame agrarian unrest on the defeat of the Bill. Weaker candidates often paraphrased Source C rather than produce a genuine comparison. This resulted from a failure to understand that it shows Parnell working with the leaders of the Plan of Campaign but keeping his distance from them and thus in effect using it to promote the campaign for home rule.
- (c) The main problem revealed in the less successful answers was identifying alternative views about Parnell's skill as a politician. Answers thus tended to lack any counter-argument and conclusions were unconvincing. Part (c) questions offer for discussion a view to which candidates can be expected to find alternatives either from the Sources or from their own knowledge. In this case there was one clearly stated alternative offered in Source B – that Parnell was 'a master of parliamentary debate' – and this was supported in D, even though this source concluded that it was not his main skill. This was moreover a view which candidates could have developed by using their knowledge of Parnell's effective parliamentary tactics during Gladstone's Second Ministry. In the event many answers were limited to a maximum of Band III because they simply used the Sources to illustrate how Parnell made use of agrarian unrest, concluding that the proposition in the question was correct.

6 England in New Century 1900-18

- (a) Few had difficulty in recognising reference to the militant tactics of the suffragettes. Most provided examples, sometimes at excessive length. One or two were enough, leaving time to explain that the point of the reference in the context of the source was the contrast with the suffragists and the question as to whether the WSPU helped or hindered the cause.

- (b) Most produced satisfactory answers. Thoughtful answers appreciated that Cremer drew opposite conclusions from the same premise – that men and women have different qualities. Surprisingly few noted the patronising tone of Source A, but most discussed typicality. Some misinterpreted Source B as saying Mrs Fawcett was favoured ‘separate spheres’.
- (c) Some had problems with the focus of this question. Many devoted much of their answer to arguing that it was their role in the war which won the vote for women. This is a widely held view, but it was not the point of this question. The focus of the question was on the period before the war. Weaker candidates also had some difficulty with evaluation of the Sources. The view presented is essentially a historian’s view and Source D was therefore a good starting point. Many, however, seemed to be under the impression that secondary sources are less useful than primary (this was also evident in answers to many other question within this unit). What candidates were actually asked to do in this question was to evaluate three primary sources, two of them hostile to women’s suffrage and one advocating it, in the light of their knowledge and of the view of a modern historian who also happens to be an authority on this subject (though candidates were not expected to know this). Thus they had not only to explain views expressed in the Sources, which most did, but also evaluate their typicality, which only better answers managed.

7 Nazi Germany 1933-45

As always, virtually all the weakest answers were on this option.

- (a) Many saw this primarily as a reference to Hitler’s style of government and linked it with the structuralist/intentionalist debate. Weaker candidate tended not to understand the debate and were unable to attach the correct label to each Source. Properly explained, however, this was enough to earn marks up to Band II, though some candidates handicapped themselves for later sub-questions by explaining the debate at greater length than was necessary for a part (a) question. What many failed to do, and was expected additionally for Band I, was to link this directly to the Source, explaining why Himmler (and Goering) were given this task. A fair number confused Goering with Goebbels.
- (b) Apart from the significant number who discussed the Sources sequentially, most were able to find some relevant comparisons. Many saw that the Sources show escalation in anti-semitism during 1936-38. Many, however, having identified one of the similarities between the Sources, failed to probe deeper. Both Sources, in fact, provide mixed views about anti-semitism at the time, and better answers understood this. Source A tells us both that most Germans were relatively indifferent and that some had become ‘fanatical opponents of the Jews’. Similarly, Source C indicates that Maschmann was initially shocked by Kristallnacht and then accepted it. It also tells about the views of the policeman, a point noted by comparatively few. It was pleasing to see that many attempted to discuss provenance. Most, however, did so in a relatively simplistic way. It was noted that Source B was a SOPADE report, but many concluded that therefore it was ‘biased’ and ‘untrustworthy’. A worrying number confused SOPADE with the Nazis. In fact, these reports are valuable simply because they come from a non-Nazi source. Similarly, there is more to say about Source C than simply that because Maschmann was a member of the girls’ section of the Hitler Youth, therefore she had been subject to Nazi propaganda. Equally, the fact that her account was written in 1964 does not make it ‘unreliable’. More to the point, as some realised, was the fact that she was writing to a lost Jewish friend.

- (c) While there were some good answers to this, there were also many very weak ones, with a substantial number in between. Some answers were very generalised, virtually ignoring the question. The best demonstrated a clear grasp of German anti-semitism pre-1933, long-standing Nazi hostility and developing anti-semitism after 1933 alongside an awareness of the impact of war and conquest in the East. Many gave too little thought to the wording of the question. The terms 'long-standing' and 'widespread' needed to be defined, if not explicitly at least in the candidate's mind. Many simply looked for evidence of hatred and asserted in the conclusion that it was long-standing and widespread. Some claimed there was little evidence of anti-semitism before 1933, while others rooted it in the middle ages without any linkage to Germany in the 1930s. Some did not realise that, as in this case, the Sources may not all focus on the explanation given in the question but may provide material for a counter-argument. As a result, they struggled to find evidence in Sources C and D for long-standing and widespread hatred, failing to realise they supported the view that the decision to implement the Final Solution was taken in 1941 as a result of the evolving situation in the East. Another common weakness was a failure to distinguish between persecution of the Jews in the 1930s (Sources A and B) and the decision to exterminate the Jews. Some conclusions were out of step with the evidence supplied. Most commonly, this took the form of using A, C and D to show that the Final Solution was not based on 'long-standing and widespread hatred', but then asserting the contrary in the final paragraph. On the other hand, pertinent distinctions were made between 'long-standing' and 'widespread' and between the attitude of the regime and the people, correctly pointing out that these Sources provide evidence of long-standing hatred by the former. Many strong answers also distinguished between 'long-standing' and 'widespread'.

HANDY HINTS on Units 2580-2582

1. The Requirements

a) Comparison.

- Of content and context (provenance).
- As evidence of what?
- Avoiding sequencing and paraphrasing.
- Moving beyond bias, primary and secondary to witting and unwitting, secure and insecure evidence.
- Coming to a judgement.

b) Testing an assertion using sources and evaluating them via own knowledge.

- Issue based.
- Group and develop according to interpretation.
- Balance of Sources and own knowledge used for evaluation.
- Balanced argument and judgement.

2. The Lessons Learnt

- Avoid a formulaic and mechanistic approach that separates content, provenance and quality.
- Prevent a weak knowledge base with a mechanical reliance on Source content. Uncertain chronology often fails to pick up on change whilst own knowledge is often little more than is provided in the Sources.
- Avoid referring to a Source rather than evaluating it in part (b) – ‘A’ says, ‘B’ says etc.

a) Specific points on sub-question (a)

- Avoid sequencing and paraphrasing – Band IV is the best mark available if you do, Band III if you only compare at the end or at the changeover of sequenced content.
- Focus on the issues raised by one or both Sources.
- Beware a distorted focus:
 - Either on content, or
 - on provenance, ticking off Band 1 characteristics regardless of whether they ‘fit’ the Sources. Some focus on just one skill e.g. reliability and become ‘stuck in their approach. Utility is often the most helpful. Separating either out into respective paragraphs is also unwise. Content and provenance can condition each other.
- Useful provenance issues will vary according to the sources compared – dating, authorship, significant events and language and tone are the usual ones to watch for.
- Evidence for what? Don’t discuss Sources generally. Focus on the area demanded by the question - highlight it.
- Too simplistic a use of evaluative language – leading to too much ‘stock evaluation’.
- There are different ways of asking comparative questions – do not be put off by a different question formula.
- Don’t assume value and claim it without, very simply, establishing it.
- A judgement is expected – are they talking about different things, can you value the evidence of one more than the other?
- Own knowledge can divert and should be kept in check, used for ‘location’ and light ‘context’ only.

b) Specific points on sub-question (b)

- Examine the assertion in the Q – come to a balanced judgement on it throughout the answer, not just at the end.
- Start by getting the organisation right: group the Sources according to their 'view'. Take on the assertion. This will prevent a sequenced paraphrase (A, B, C, D with some 'bolt-on' own knowledge) that is content based and which draws away from the question. Thus 'B and C argue this whilst A and D take a different view ...' is much better.
- As you group, evaluate the evidence provided on this view using your own knowledge to locate, condition and extend the argument, confirming or questioning the Sources using dates, typicality, authorship etc. If you just use the sources for illustration (referencing) a word, a phrase, an example, then you fail to evaluate and Band III or Band IV is the best fit. Sources are not mines for a conventional essay. Using the word 'argue' may help (instead of 'says').
- It follows that 'own knowledge' is best used to evaluate the Source. A judgement will inevitably result and you will have integrated knowledge successfully.
- Watch out for the same Sources giving evidence for different arguments.
- Try to achieve a balanced argument – i.e. not just examining the suggested factor.
- Try to pick up on conditioning words – e.g. how 'seriously', 'mainly' etc.

Units 2583-2584 (Period Studies: English)

General Comments

These general comments apply to both Units 2583 and 2584. They have the same assessment objectives and are subject to the same grading standards. The overall standards were satisfactory. They were very similar to the standards achieved in previous January and summer examinations. All examiners read work that was excellent. A commendable number of candidates wrote answers that were very relevant, well organised and contained accurate knowledge. The quality of the most successful candidates was very high indeed. Examiners are instructed to use the principle of 'Best Fit' when awarding Mark Bands and their particular marks. The majority of answers meet most, but not all, of the requirements of a Mark Band and the awarded Band and mark represent the prevailing qualities of an answer. The most successful candidates met all of the requirements of Band I ('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 other extreme of the spectrum, there were some scripts that were weak in understanding and knowledge. Some answers were awarded Band VI but many of these answers showed some Band V qualities and might have deserved the higher Band with more care and accuracy. One can visualise most of these candidates producing work of at least Band V quality if they thought more seriously about the requirements of the examination. The most usual quality of Band VI answers was they did not answer the Question. Questions are not subtle and the most important requirement at AS Level, as indeed at A2 Level, is that candidates address them directly. Very few produced work that was of so little merit that the major effect was to deserve Band VII ('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.').

In the comments on individual questions, reference is made at several points to the Key Issues and associated Content of the Specification from which a question was drawn. Centres can compare the Specification and this Report to see the links. This might help them to understand how questions are prepared. OCR takes particular care to ensure that Questions in all Units arise directly from these Key Issues. Accordingly, Centres are encouraged to use the Key Issues and associated Content of their selected Study Topic(s) as the basis of their teaching.

The comments are sometimes repetitive, for example about the importance of studying each of the key Issues in the Study Topic(s) that Centres study. The repetition is deliberate, first to underline the fact that candidates tend to have the same strengths and make similar mistakes in different Questions, and secondly to emphasise that the same assessment objectives are used to mark all questions. Therefore it is worthwhile Centres reading all of this Report and not only the comments on the paragraphs that are relevant to their Study Topics.

The January cohort is smaller than the summer's and therefore it was to be expected that some Questions attracted few responses. The Questions that had the fewest answers were on the Study Topics in Social and Economic Issues in Unit 2583. The

range of Study Topics that was represented in the scripts in both Units 2583 and 2584 was otherwise wide.

Examiners do not know which scripts are from re-take candidates but it is possible that some of re-take candidates were prone to frame answers to Questions that had been set in the summer of 2005. There were a number of answers that were not irrelevant but were 'off-key'; they could have been directed more clearly at the terms of the Questions that were set. Whilst candidates are strongly encouraged to practise the extended writing that is required at AS Level, it is important that they appreciate the need to adapt the material that they have learned to answer different Questions that might be set in a Study Topic.

Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2583

The candidature was slightly up on January 2004 (2440 to 2762); 64% were retaking. No complaints were received about the question paper.

England 1042-1100

Q1 The Reign of Edward the Confessor 1042-1066

(a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'How effective a king was Edward the Confessor?: The personality of Edward the Confessor.' Examiners read some sound answers that considered the claim in the Question that the Edward's personality was the most important cause of his problems as king and compared it with other problems. Moderate answers tended to neglect the study of his personality and spend too much time on some general issues. The overall quality of the answers was satisfactory.

(b) There were fewer answers to Question (b) than to (a) but there was evidence of good understanding. Some excellent candidates were able to compare the strengths of the Anglo-Saxon Church in the early eleventh century with its weaknesses, coming to a clear judgement about the need for reform. Their answers contained appropriate examples to support the argument. Moderate answers were usually more general or they pursued a line of argument without exploring any alternatives.

Q2 The Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072

(a) Most answers were sound. Examiners read some convincing appraisals of Harold's problems in securing the English throne that deserved high marks. The tendency in moderate and weak answers was to tell a story about Harold in which the explanation was at most implicit. Many of these answers would have gained a higher mark if the candidates had used their knowledge to support an argument about Harold's problems.

(b) The Question arose from the fourth Key Issue, 'How did William I deal with opposition ...? William I's suppression of the rebellions, reasons for his success, his military qualities, the Harrying of the North, castle building.' Most of the answers were very satisfactory and some were very convincing, even for answers at AS Level. These showed an ability to discuss some of the particular rebellions and rebels against William I whereas some of the moderate responses were relevant but general.

Q3 Norman England 1066-1100

(a) There were some effective discussions of continuity, and by inference of change, during the governments of William I and William II. It was relevant to discuss their personalities but some weak essays were wholly based on this

factor. They were too narrow to deserve a high mark. However, examiners did read some perceptive and effective comparisons.

- (b) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

Q4 Society, Economy and Culture 1042-1100

- (a) & (b) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

England 1042-1509

Q5 The Threat to Order and Authority 1450-1470

- (a) The Question asked about Edward IV's success in dealing with the nobility during his first reign as king and the date (1470) was given to underline the relevant period. However, examiners noted that some answers went far beyond the relevant period to discuss Edward IV's rule until his death. Some considered other factors without linking them to the King's relations with the nobility. These answers were therefore limited by their lack of immediate relevance. On the other hand, examiners were pleased with the general quality of the responses. A good number of candidates focused on Edward IV and the nobility during the specified period. They considered individual nobles such as Warwick, and pertinent developments such as the King's controversial marriage were linked to the terms of the question.

- (b) There were fewer answers to this question than to (a). Centres can expect Questions on this Key Issue to be set as frequently as Questions on the other Key Issues. Therefore, Centres are reminded of the importance of studying all of the four Key Issues in a Study Topic. Kingship, the council, parliament and local administration form the indicative Content linked to the first Key Issue in the Specification. The few answers that examiners read were usually sound; they were adequately balanced between the two elements in the Question and tried to take a comparative approach.

Q6 The End of the Yorkists 1471-1485

- (a) This Question, on the opposition to Richard III, was answered very successfully by a large number of candidates. The best answers were fully explanatory, well organised and they considered a number of reasons for the King's unpopularity, including his alleged illegal accession. Some candidates devoted too much time to narratives of the story of the death of the Princes. It was claimed, either explicitly or implicitly, that this was the only reason for opposition to Richard III. More thoughtful candidates considered a wider range of reasons and came to a justified conclusion about which was the most important.

- (b) Some assumed that Henry Tudor was Richard III's most dangerous enemy because he defeated and killed the King in battle, thereby gaining the throne. This was a valid argument in itself but the more successful candidates went further to analyse the threat from Henry Tudor before Bosworth. There were some excellent essays that focused on his claim to the throne but also considered the dangers presented by other enemies to Richard III to put Henry Tudor into context. The best answers made some links between these. The overall quality of answers was very good.

Q7 The Reign of Henry VII 1485-1509

- (a) The discriminating factor that distinguished the most successful answers was their ability to define some aspects of Henry VII's character and link them to specific developments. They then considered other reasons why he

secured the Tudor dynasty by 1509. Less satisfactory answers tended to latch on to 'Henry VII ... succeeded' and they became general accounts of the reign, not linking issues that were potentially more relevant to the terms of the Question. Implicit relevance is given credit by examiners who will try to work out what a candidate is arguing but the awarded mark cannot be as high as in the essays which deal directly with the terms of a Question.

- (b) Most of the answers were able to consider both 'medieval' and 'modern' aspects of Henry VII's rule. Some candidates tackled the question sequentially; for example, the first half of the answer concentrated on 'medieval' aspects and the second on 'modern' features. The more successful answers appreciated that some issues were not cut-and-dried and analysed factors to see how far they fell into either compartment. Some answers contained accurate knowledge but did not address sufficiently the key aspects of the Question. However, these were comparatively few in number and examiners were mostly pleased with the quality of the responses.

Q8 Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509

- (a) & (b) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

England 1509-1558

Q9 Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509-1529

- (a) The most creditable candidates tried to define Wolsey's aims in foreign policy from 1515 to 1529 and linked them to his success or failure. A high proportion of answers were very sound and there were some excellent essays that were fully explanatory and well judged. Their claims were supported by appropriate factual knowledge and, in particular, the answers showed an awareness of all of the specified period. Most of the less satisfactory answers tended to contain partial treatment of Wolsey's foreign policy; they were often able to trace developments to the early 1520s but then stopped. Some could describe generally the uncertainties that arose when Wolsey sought alliances in turn with Spain and France but they were unable to support the claims with references to particular references.

- (b) The Question asked candidates to explain the reason why the Divorce resulted in Wolsey's fall. Some candidates deserved high marks when they were able to delineate the many different factors that came into play, for example, the attitude of Henry VIII, court factions and Wolsey's increasing isolation. The best essays linked these sections of the argument. Some weaker candidates were able to tell the story of the Divorce but could not explain as convincingly the reasons why it was so dangerous to Wolsey; the implicit argument was that he fell and therefore the Divorce must have been a serious issue.

Q10 Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529-1558

- (a) There were fewer essays to Question (a) than to (b) in this Study Topic and Centres are reminded to give equal attention to all of the Key Issues in their selected Study Topic(s). The quality of the answers that examiners read was satisfactory. Many candidates wrote confidently about the nature and impact of faction from 1540 to 1553. The most successful supported their claims with examples, including the Howard and Seymour groups that are mentioned in the Specification.

- (b) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'Who was the more effective ruler: Somerset, Northumberland or Mary I?' Examiners read many answers that were able to assess the success of all three. Some excellent answers were fully comparative, examining the strengths and weaknesses of each of the governors. Some moderate answers explained who was thought to have been the most effective and then excluded the others. The phrase 'more effective' requires a comparative approach in answers and these moderate answers could not merit a high mark because they were too incomplete.

Q11 Church and State 1529-1558

- (a) The Question asked candidates to consider Henry VIII's religious policies from 1529 to 1539: how far were they an attack on Catholic practices and beliefs? The quality of most of the answers was sound. A significant majority of the candidates wrote relevantly even if their knowledge and understanding were sometimes partial. These partial answers were able to gain a middle Mark Band. A high proportion of candidates were able to trace and assess developments throughout the specified period. They showed a good awareness of the implications of changes and reactions in royal attitude and policy. An alternative approach taken by some candidates was to argue that Henry VIII was not attacking Catholic beliefs but had other motives, such as money or that change were mostly the responsibility of Cromwell and Cranmer.

- (b) The Question asked candidates to consider the most important reason for opposition to Mary I's religious policies. In particular, was it the marriage to Philip II? Some candidates took an alternative approach by arguing that the extent of the opposition should not be exaggerated because most people accepted her policies. This was acceptable because examiners are reminded of the importance of considering valid alternative arguments. Most candidates agreed about the importance of Mary I's marriage but some could have linked it more to other difficulties faced by Mary. There were some very persuasive and well - supported essays.

Q12 Social and Economic Issues 1509-1558

- (a) & (b) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

England 1547-1603

Q13 Church and State 1547-1603

- (a) The Question was based on the third Key Issue, 'How serious was the threat from Roman Catholics to the Elizabethan church and state?' Some moderate answers tended to focus too much on particular periods, for example the condition and problems of Catholicism at the beginning of Elizabeth I's reign or the significance of the exile in England of Mary, Queen of Scots. However, a good number of candidates were able to take a wider view and look at Catholic decline and its varied reasons over a longer period, although only the most successful tended to explain the situation at the end of Elizabeth I's reign.
- (b) The Question asked 'How important were Elizabeth I's archbishops of Canterbury (Parker, Grindal and Whitgift) in dealing with the problem of Puritanism?' It was possible to argue that other factors were more important but marks in the higher Mark Bands needed at least an adequate discussion of the archbishops. However, Band I did not require an equally detailed study of all three. Examiners were pleased with the general standard of the

responses. A good number of candidates showed a high level of understanding of the roles of the archbishops and linked them to other relevant aspects of the topic. On the other hand, some candidates wrote relevantly about Puritanism but were less able to explain how Elizabethan government dealt with it.

Q14 Foreign Affairs 1547-1587

(a) The standard of most of the answers was sound. The most successful candidates did not limit themselves to accounts of the stay of Mary, Queen of Scots, in England but focused on the key issue in the Question: the reasons why she was important to foreign policy. For example, they examined the link between Scotland and France, the significance of Mary's claim to the English throne for foreign policy, and then the impact on foreign policy of her exile in England.

(b) The question was based on the second Key Issue, 'How and why did relations between England and Spain change between 1554 and 1585?. The marriage of Mary and Philip, the maintenance of good relations 1558-68.' Moderate answers were usually uneven in their understanding of the topic. They were able to explain clearly why Mary maintained good relations with Spain but were less confident when discussing the early period of Elizabeth I's reign. In contrast, the most successful candidates had a sound grasp of the period as a whole. Whilst appreciating the growing tensions between the countries, they were able to explain why Elizabeth I generally maintained good relations with Spain during most of the specified period.

Q15 Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558-1603

(a) Most of the answers to this Question about Elizabeth I's handling of her finances were relevant and examiners read few answers that were very poor. Some candidates went beyond the issue of finance to discuss poor law. The discriminating factors were the way in which candidates explained the nature and extent of the Queen's financial problems and their ability to look at the reign as a whole. 1603 was mentioned as the end point. Some perceptive candidates contrasted the government's comparative success to the outbreak of the war with Spain with the later decline in royal finances. A few answers contrasted favourably the situation at the end of the reign with the more serious problems faced by foreign rulers. This was not a required point for any mark because examiners could not assume that candidates had studied a parallel period in European history but it shows how candidates can sometimes use their study of other Units effectively.

(b) The temptation to less able candidates was to write generally and very descriptively about Elizabeth I's personality and gender issues. Such answers were given credit for their relevant elements but they often lacked the supporting factual knowledge that would have made the points convincing. The highest marks were awarded to answers that linked her personal characteristics to the issues of the monarch's power and prestige. They looked at specific issues, such as her handling of ministers or her defence of the royal prerogative. There were some good answers that argued that her gender was a disadvantage which the Queen turned into an asset. The general quality of the answers was pleasing.

Q16 Social and Economic Issues 1547-1603

(a) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

- (b) There were some successful answers to this question about governments' handling of the problem of poverty but some answers deserved a low or a middle Mark Band because they were incomplete. Some essays that were marginally acceptable were aware of the problem of poverty in the sixteenth century but were too vague about government measures. Answers in the middle bands sometimes limited themselves to the 1590s. The most successful candidates did not deal with all of the governments and their policies during the specified period but they were able to take a wide view and support their claims with some appropriate knowledge.

England 1603-1660

Q17 Politics and Religion 1603-1629

- (a) The quality of answers to Questions (a) and (b) confirmed that most of the candidates who had studied this period had a clear grasp of the salient issues. In answering this Question on foreign policy, a commendable number of candidates were able to examine the main factors in the Question from the points of view of James I and Parliament. Such answers usually deserved high marks. Answers in the middle and lower bands were usually uncertain about specific developments; they often wrote general accounts of religion during the reign of James I. However, most candidates wrote relevant essays and almost all candidates revealed at least a basic knowledge and understanding of the salient issue.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How serious were religious divisions in the country?' It asked Candidates to consider the period from 1603 to 1629 and one of the characteristics of the most successful answers was that they were able to discuss convincingly the development of religious divisions during the early years of Charles I's reign. Some less effective responses tended to be limited to the reign of James I. Another feature of the best essays was that they considered change and continuity to judge how far the religious divisions increased during this period. The answers in the middle and lower bands were usually more straightforward descriptions, especially on Puritanism.

Q18 Personal Rule and Civil War 1629-1649

- (a) The quality of the answers was uneven and many had similar weaknesses to similar Questions that have been set previously. It is worth printing the Question in full. 'Who was more responsible for the outbreak of civil war in 1642, Charles I or the parliamentary opposition? Explain your answer.' The Question arose from the second Key Issue, 'Why did Civil War break out in 1642? The short and long-term causes of the Civil War, the Short and Long Parliaments, the limiting of royal power, the breakdown of relations between King and Parliament, the resort to arms.' An adequate number of answers focused on the most relevant issue of the outbreak of civil war. They examined many of the most important developments from 1640 to 1642 and also examined the wider context. The most frequent weakness of answers was that they considered only long-term factors to 1640. Some made no mention of developments during 1640-42. Such answers were not irrelevant; the period to 1640 saw a deepening of suspicions of Charles I but Civil War was not inevitable in 1640 as some candidates implied. The absence of reference to developments immediately before the outbreak of the conflict prevented answers from gaining a very high mark. Because this problem has recurred and because the Question was based very clearly on one of the Key Issues, Centres who study this Topic are advised to ensure that they cover all four issues that are stated in the Specification.

- (b) Examiners were pleased with the quality of the answers. Most candidates showed good understanding and knowledge of the period from 1646 to 1649. The most successful answers assessed the King's role and responsibility for worsening relations; they also considered the importance of other factors, such as the army, Parliament and the Scots. Credit was given for effective analyses and judgements that compared the significance of Charles I and other groups.

Q19 The Interregnum 1649-1660

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What problems faced the Rump of the Long Parliament?' and most candidates showed confidence in dealing with relevant aspects. Some very successful candidates considered the issues that were mentioned in the Specification, 'demands for reform, the quarrel between the Rump and the army, dangers to the republic in Scotland and Ireland, war with the Dutch.' Answers awarded marks in the middle or lower Mark Bands could usually claim credit for relevance but they were usually more incomplete, for example concentrating exclusively on the Rump's alleged 'corruption'.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'Why was the monarchy restored in 1660?' The quality of the answers was encouraging. Many candidates could explain and assess the main issues that influenced events from 1658 to 1660. Examiners read some particularly clear accounts of the rival groups in the army. Few took the less effective line to argue that the Restoration was inevitable and described only the immediate events before Charles II's Restoration.

Q20 Society and the Economy 1603-1660

- (a) & (b) There were too few answers on which to base general comments.

Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2584

The candidature was slightly up on January 2004 (2816 to 2949); 60% were retaking. No complaints were received about the question paper.

England 1780-1846

Q1 The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783-1830

- (a) Candidates had to assess the assertion, not agree with it. When assessing answers to all such questions, examiners give full value to valid alternative explanations. However, a high mark required at least an adequate discussion of the stated explanation for a high mark. Most wrote effectively about George III's support for Pitt and supplemented this by considering other reasons for his dominance. Some weaker answers described some of his policies but were less sure of the reasons for his pre-eminence.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How Liberal were the Tory governments of 1822-30?' Examiners were pleased with the standard of the most answers. They examined the repression that was mentioned in the Question and they also considered more liberal tendencies such as economic reforms and the reluctant introduction of Catholic Emancipation.

Q2 War and Peace 1793-1841

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What were British interests in the period 1793-1841?' The least successful answers were often limited in

their explanations, for example dealing only with the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars against France. The answers in the middle Mark Bands were often able to describe some of Britain's main foreign interests but they did not explore the extent to which they changed. The most successful candidates focused on this important element of the Question ('How far did British foreign interests change ...?'). They were able to adapt the material that they had learned to tackle the Question that was asked.

- (b) Most successfully assessed the importance of the System to Castlereagh's foreign policy. The highest marks were awarded to the answers that considered arguments that might be used to support its importance and those that might contradict it. Some answers would have been awarded higher marks if they had spent less time merely describing the congresses, giving more attention to Castlereagh's attitudes and policies.

Q3 The Age of Peel 1829-1846

- (a) The discriminating factor that most frequently characterised the best answers was their ability to discuss Peel's attitude to Ireland throughout the specified period. Answers in the middle Mark Bands tended to be reasonably successful in discussing some aspects, such as Catholic Emancipation or the Famine of the 1840s, but also contained significant gaps. More successful essays showed an ability to handle a wider range of issues. They contained positive arguments that were well supported by factual knowledge. The general standard of answers was good.

- (b) Some very effective explanations of the reasons why the repeal of the Corn Laws proved divisive were seen. Some excellent answers examined the Tories' attitude to free trade, supplementing this with explanations of the views of other groups. Some could have given more attention to the issue of division and less to Peel's general reasons for supporting repeal. This was relevant, but the focus should have been on conflicting attitudes to repeal.

Q4 The Economy and Industrialisation 1780-1846

- (a) There were a number of disappointing responses to this Question on the importance of canals to transport from 1780 to 1846. The least convincing answers were often vague. However, examiners did read some very worthwhile essays that considered the relative opinions of canals and other forms of transport, especially turnpike roads and railways. Some answers were given high credit when they supported their claims by specific examples of each mode of transport.

- (b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'What were the popular responses to economic change?' and the related Content specifically mentions the artisans. It was therefore disappointing that a number of candidates who attempted this Question were either vague or misleading about what is meant by an artisan class in the specified period. Examiners read some answers that were very competent but few that were very good. Centres who study this Topic are reminded of the need to give equal attention to each of the four Key Issues.

Britain 1846-1906

Q5 Whigs and Liberals 1846-1874

- (a) An encouraging number of candidates explained convincingly what is understood by 'Gladstonian Liberalism'. The most successful answers

assessed the importance of a belief in free trade but supplemented it by considering other aspects. A few answers included extraneous material by discussing Gladstonian Liberalism after 1874 and candidates are reminded to note the dates in the Question. Some answers in the middle Mark Bands contained some effective points about Liberalism as applied to Gladstone's first ministry but they were incomplete because no reference was made to its development before 1868.

- (b) Examiners were pleased with the quality of the answers. The most successful answers were well organised. They provided suggestions about relative importance. These candidates not only described the nature of the reforms but also assessed their effects on the Liberals. This was the core of the Question ('the **most** impact on the Liberal party'). Less effective responses often deserved credit for their relevance but usually were limited to descriptions of reforms that were not presented in such an organised way.

Q6 The Conservatives 1846-1880

- (a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'Why was the Conservative party weak from 1846 to 1866?' It invited candidates to assess the importance of Derby and Disraeli. Therefore, whilst candidates could offer alternative explanations of Conservative weakness, they needed to discuss adequately the roles of Derby and Disraeli. Most who attempted the Question were able to write accurately about Disraeli but the most successful answers went beyond vague references to Derby. Their answers widened their argument to deal with issues such as the splits in the party after 1846 and unpopular policies. The general standard was sound and most examiners reported that they had read excellent responses.

- (b) The Question was based on the second Key Issue, 'Why did the Conservatives secure the reform of Parliament in 1867?' The discriminating factor between adequate and very good answers was candidates' success in considering the importance of popular demands for reform of the franchise as a reason for the Conservatives' support for the 1867 Reform Act. Candidates could deny its prior importance and suggest other reasons that were more influential but a high mark required candidates to deal adequately with the stated issue. The general standard of the answers was sound and examiners read some excellent essays.

Q7 Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846-1902

- (a) The Question was based on candidates' understanding of Britain's interests in the Eastern Question. This was the basis of the second Key Issue. Some answers were disappointing because they could discuss other aspects of foreign policy but were uncertain about the most important elements of the Eastern Question. Centres who study this Topic are referred to the indicative Content in this Key Issue; this sets out what examiners expect candidates to understand. Most of the answers were at least satisfactory and some were very good. The best put Britain's perceived interests into an order of priority.

- (b) The Question asked candidates to compare the importance of strategic and economic motives in explaining Britain's involvement in Africa in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The response from many candidates was pleasing; their answers were reasonably balanced and they provided convincing arguments supported by accurate knowledge. Some answers would have deserved a higher mark if they had been more balanced. Centres are referred to the published Mark Scheme which stated

that 'A focus on just one of the factors, however well done, will not be able to gain more than Band III.' The reason for this guidance to examiners is that the Question was based on a comparison.

Q8 Trade Unions and Labour 1867-1906

(a) This Question on the expansion of Trades Union influence and power during the period from 1867 to 1906 produced responses of a variable standard. The usual reason why answers were awarded a moderate rather than a high mark was that they described the development of the trade unions but gave too little attention to studies of the reasons. An adequate number of candidates were able to gain high marks but others wrote essays that would have been improved if they had been more analytical.

(b) The most frequent discriminating factor was the extent to which candidates addressed the key issue of the obstacles to the creation of a Labour party during the years from 1886 to 1906. Some answers were content to discuss the reasons for the rise of the party whereas the most successful appreciated the range of the problems it faced. Most candidates were able to show a basic understanding and knowledge of the topic.

Britain 1899-1964

Q9 Liberals and Labour 1899-1918

(a) The Question was based on the first Key Issue, 'What was the significance of the Liberal election victory of 1906?' Examiners were impressed with the quality of most candidates' answers. A very high proportion of essays showed the necessary qualities of relevance, explanation, organisation and knowledge to merit a high Mark Band. It was also pleasing that there were few very irrelevant or vague responses. Candidates did not have to agree that the Liberals' victory depended mostly on the weakness of the Conservatives but it was pleasing to read many answers that were assured about this aspect. The most frequent reason why answers deserved a middle rather than a high mark was that they focused only on the Conservatives as an explanation and did not put them into the context of other factors to assess its importance.

(b) Although there were fewer answers to Question (b) than to (a), the overall results were pleasing. Some moderate answers tackled the Question in a very chronological manner, surveying developments in Ireland, but a reasonable number took a more appropriate line by comparing the Home Rule Bill of 1912 and the Easter Rising of 1916. They did not leave the argument about which was more serious to a brief conclusion. A few candidates assumed that one was a more serious problem to the British government and did not consider the other.

Q10 Inter-War Domestic Problems 1918-1939

(a) Most of the candidates who attempted the Question could explain relevantly and convincingly Lloyd George's fall from power in 1922. It was encouraging to read many scripts that were successful in explaining the role of the Conservatives, even when answers argued that other reasons were more important. A minority were unable to discuss the stated factor convincingly.

(b) The Question was based on the fourth Key Issue, 'How successfully did the National governments of 1931-39 deal with their problems?' A satisfactory number dealt very successfully with the Question and deserved a high mark. A small proportion, however, lacked any knowledge and understanding of

the National governments; some wrote about the inter-war Labour governments. Some were clear about the problems facing the National governments but less confident about the means used to address them.

Q11 Foreign Policy 1939-1963

(a) Candidates needed to assess the importance of India and put it into the context of decolonisation from 1945 to 1960. Most were able to describe the reasons why India gained independence soon after the Second War but the most successful answers were better able to put Indian independence into the more general development of decolonisation. They were able to make links. More limited candidates tended to be able to explain stages of decolonisation but they did not write such cohesive answers.

(b) There were some perceptive accounts of the extent to which Britain sought an independent role in the Cold War from 1945 to 1953. The most creditable answers examined the arguments for and against a British independent role. They were clear about the main developments in the Cold War during the relevant period. Less successful answers were prone to descriptions and explanations of the origins of the Cold War but they lacked analysis of its development to 1953. They sometimes assumed that Britain did not wish to play an independent role without showing evidence to support the claim.

Q12 Post-War Britain 1945-1964

(a) There were some good explanations of Britain's economic difficulties after the Second World War and a sound number of candidates could supplement this with assessments of other factors that brought about Labour defeat in 1951. It was possible to argue that other factors were more important in the outcome of the 1951 election but some answers gave too little attention to the economy; a high mark needed an adequate appraisal of this issue because it was mentioned in the Question.

(b) The overall quality of answers was good. Most were able to explain effectively why the Conservatives enjoyed thirteen years of government after 1951. There were interesting examples and discussions of prosperity but fewer of social change. Some candidates went off a tangent to devote too much time to the reasons for defeat in 1964. Although examiners are encouraged to give full value to valid approach, such answers could not be given a high mark because the thrust of the Question was Conservative success. It was not irrelevant to discuss the reasons for their defeat but this should have been kept within limits when answering this Question.

Units 2585-2586 (Period Studies: European & World History)

General Comments

The Unit 2585 candidature was slightly up on January 2004 (1087 to 1149); 70% were retaking. One complaint was received about Q11(a). The estimated grades were 3.5% down for A and 2.4% down for A and B. The Unit 2586 candidature was significantly up on January 2004 (4062 to 4733); 59% were retaking. No complaints were received about the question paper.

General Comments

There was a sizeable candidature for both papers, of whom a significant proportion were re-takers.

Answers were seen at every level of the markscheme, with many excellent and informed scripts. As ever, question 6 on paper 2585 and question 16 on 2586 remain the most popular, but responses were seen on most of the questions set. On 2586 the post 1945 topics seem to be attracting more centres.

The qualities of the best answers include a tight focus on the question set, good organisation, a clear line of argument and a sustained evaluation of relevant issues substantiated by effectively drawn examples. At the bottom end insecure knowledge of the basic facts seems to be the biggest handicap to producing an effective answer rather than an inability to engage with the question. This is important as sound grasp of the factual material is the essential foundation for historical understanding and scholarship at this level.

One feature of this session was the large number of relatively short answers – only two or three hundred words (one and a half sides). It is very difficult to provide an effective answer to essay questions in that many words and inevitably most answers of that length scored poorly. Sometime short answers were accompanied by long and often ignored plans, suggesting poor use of time.

The quality of use of English continues to deteriorate. Examiners bemoan the increasing intrusion of colloquial language and the lack of formal writing skills. Poor sentence construction, imprecision of language, poor spelling, use of inappropriate abbreviation continue to impair effective communication. Too many candidates are also unable to spell key historical terms or names correctly.

Question instructions seem still poorly understood by many candidates and I would commend reference to previous examiner reports since 2002 for advice on these.

2585

There are no comments on questions where there were only a small number of candidates.

Question 3 The Crusades is a popular topic.

a) There were responses at all levels to this question. Better candidates discussed a range of factors and provided some well-supported analysis and discussion of the relative significance of factors and the ways in which they impacted on each other. Aspects of leadership and division featured strongly. Weaker

candidates tended to describe or provided limited explanations lacking effective development or support.

b) Rulers was interpreted broadly: some candidates focused legitimately on Richard and Philip, whilst others, equally legitimately, included discussion of local rulers and other prominent figures. Generally candidates were more secure writing about other than personal motives – such as religion.

Question 5

a) Weaker candidates had some difficulty with the term 'city states' and some ignored the term and wrote about other factors. Better candidates discussed the role of city states (or particular city states) in the context of other factors and influences.

b) There were some excellent responses able to balance the given factors against a range of motives. Some candidates had difficulty with the term self-glorification and wrote generally about glorification (of state, religion etc). Weaker candidates failed to recognise the question was about motivation of patrons.

Question 6 The most popular question

a) A good range of responses and an encouraging number of excellent answers. The latter showed a tight focus on the issue of establishing law and order and produced well supported discussion of success or failure in a range of aspects. There was a tendency amongst some of these responses and wither weaker answers to ignore the civil war even though the question asked about the whole period 1469-1516.

b) Whilst some candidates wrote effective answers on the issue of the desire for uniformity in religious policy, many more modest candidates reinterpreted uniformity as unity and ignore the religious steer – perhaps assuming this was simply a question about unification.

Question 7

a) There was a tendency in answers here to follow a chronological approach rather than focus on discussion of factors. Knowledge was often weak and so support for points made was often poor. Some answers focused on the fall of Constantinople, a relevant issue, but too narrow to be the sole focus of an effective answer.

Question 8

a) The question focuses directly on key issue 3 in the specification, with the emphasis on leading roles. Answers too often drifted into general motivation and offered little on the given factor of geography.

Question 9

b) Candidates for this question often displayed good knowledge of the topic but only limited capacity to use it relevantly to answer the question set. Some answers, for example, drifted into a long discussion/description of the power relationship between Charles and the princes and lost sight of the question focus. However, there

were good answers which sought to balance the actions and policies of princes against other factors and to show the links between them.

Question 10

a) Some good knowledge was displayed but was not always effectively used to answer the question set.

b) Many candidates found difficulty in focusing on the actual question, some writing everything they knew about 1516-21, whilst others focused on the issues surrounding Charles' accession. Few managed effective discussion of the period after 1521.

Question 11

b) Some reinterpreted the question to discuss the limited success of the government in stopping the development of Protestantism. Others seemed confused about the attitude of Francis. A few effective answers.

Question 13

a) Some effective answers which set the given factor against other stimuli. However, some weaker candidates produced lengthy accounts of the Council of Trent or lengthy descriptions of abuses with insufficient focus on the question set.

b) Answers tended to display sound knowledge here, Many of the more effective answers assessed the effectiveness of the Council of Trent on its own terms. Many weaker answers identified other agencies involved but tended simply to describe rather than analyse impact.

Question 16

a) There was a general failure to focus tightly on the question focus, particularly in relation to security. Discussion of financial and economic issues relative to prosperity tended to be more successful. Most answers tended to paint a very bleak picture of Spain at this point.

b) Answers here tended towards generalisation and lack of focus. Many contained little more than passing reference to Moriscoes or the Inquisition and virtually none at all to the Tridentine decrees. There was, however, better understanding of the importance of disagreements with the Pope in the context of the question.

Question 20

a) There were a lot of very good or excellent answers here, offering discussion of a wide range of reasons, well-supported analysis and clear focus on the question set. Weaker answers lack this sharp focus and tended to ignore the influence of Reformation or Counter Reformation or identify a range of different factors.

Question 21

a) Weaker answers simply identified strengths and weaknesses with some description; better answers provided a balanced and evaluative discussion.

Question 22

a) Some weaker answers did not effectively distinguish personal glory from general success, but better answers provided substantiated analysis of a range of aims to draw a balanced conclusion.

2586

Comments are provided only on those questions where there was a significant candidature.

Question 1

a) There were some very good answers which focused directly on the overthrow of the monarchy and discussed a range of factors. More modest answers often left out significant factors (such as the impact of war) or wrote more generally on the causes of the French Revolution.

Questions 2

b) Answers here were often disappointing with lengthy and not always accurate accounts of the 1812 campaign. Candidates seemed to know little of the developments in the period 1812-14. A few better answers focused on impact of defeat in Russia and set this against other factors.

Question 3

a) Candidates were often able to offer a discussion of longer and shorter term reasons for Charles X's overthrow and such discussion was often supported with effective explanation and examples. One more general weakness was a tendency to ignore the immediate context of 1829-30.

Question 5

a) Whilst lengthy discussion of the role of the Catholic Church was not expected to score well here, the level of knowledge and understanding displayed of the given factor was often disappointing and dismissed with a reference to the allocution. Knowledge displayed in weaker answers was often sketchy with some chronological confusion. However, there were some excellent and well-informed answers providing balanced discussion of a range of obstacles – unsurprisingly Austria featured prominently.

b) A good range of responses here with many effective answers. These tended to balance an effective discussion of the role of foreign help (including GB and Prussia and coverage of whole period) against 'Italian' factors, most typically the roles of Cavour and Garibaldi. Knowledge and understanding here was often very good.

Question 6

a) There was a tendency among many answers to stress the long term impact of economic factors, with weaker candidates over-egging perhaps the role of the Zollverein. Better answers balanced the role of longer term factors against the

developments 1862-66, especially the role of Bismarck, war and the international situation.

Question 9

a) Surprisingly much more popular than b). Whilst there was in most answers some appreciation of the general causes of war (and there were many long accounts of the the development of the issue of slavery), there was often insufficient focus on the issue of secession and, crucially, why the north could not accept it.

Question 13

a) Many weaker candidates could not resist the temptation to describe the events of 1905-6 with little reference to the question. The concept of stability proved difficult for weaker candidates, where knowledge of the period 1906 –13 was often patchy and confused. Stolypin was sometimes confused with Witte. However, there were many stronger answers which did focus effectively on a balanced assessment of the degree of stability after 1906 and discussing a range of areas and developments (agriculture, dumas, police, strikes and so forth).

b) There were some very good responses here with a sharp focus on the key issue, discussion of a range of factors and sound knowledge of the developments between February and October. Weaker answers sometimes tended to a general 'Why Revolution?' response or showed confusion over the events of 1917 and a limited grasp of the factors involved. Straight descriptive accounts of what happened proved irresistibly to some.

Question 14

a) There were a few excellent answers showing a sound appreciation of the nature of Austro-Russian rivalry and setting its role against other factors in bringing about war. However, there were many more modest answers. These tended to display a poor grasp of events or provided a largely descriptive account.

b) Tended to attract weaker candidates whose knowledge and understanding was generally superficial.

Question 15

a) There were some very good answers which showed a sound understanding of the impact of the First World War on Italy (not just in purely political terms, but economically, socially and 'psychologically' as well). The impact of war was set against the political situation in Italy and opportunism and skills Mussolini displayed in exploiting the situation. Weaker answers showed a weaker or confused grasp of the events of the period up to 1922 and tended to assert significance to factors identified rather than explain it.

b) Most candidates displayed a t least some sound knowledge of features of the economy and society of Fascist Italy – as might be expected the 'battles' featured strongly. More able candidates were able to focus on Mussolini's aims for a fascist state and the extent to which he succeeded - that is to say the issue of 'transforming' was addressed. More modest answers tended to ignore the key word 'transforming' wrote general assessments of 'success'.

Question 16

a) Whilst there were some effective answers to this popular question, there were many which were disappointing. Such answers tended to describe the terms of Versailles and then attribute everything (without argument) that happened in the 1920s to it.

b) Better answers, and there were many, here discussed the impact of the machinery of terror and balanced this against the impact of propaganda, indoctrination, and the 'benefits' of Nazi rule in terms of stability, economic recovery and (less commonly) restoration of pride and success in foreign affairs. More modest answers often limited discussion to the role of the SS and Gestapo as opposed to propaganda.

Question 18

a) There were a range of responses here, with better answers discussing success in terms of aims and outcomes, showing awareness of changing priorities and of the varied economic, social and political impact. Few went beyond the 1930s. Weaker answers showed only generalised knowledge and so were unable to support analytical points effectively. Issues related to agriculture were often omitted.

Question 19

a) The best answers here set the Berlin Blockade within the context of the Cold War and focused on its impact. Far too many answers, however, saw this question as requiring a detailed description of the Berlin Blockade and not much else. Such descriptions were sometimes flawed, confusing the blockade with the building of the Berlin Wall.

Units 2587-2589 (Historical Investigations)

Copied from the June 2005 Report, p.351

REMINDER

Changes to Unit 2587-2589 question papers starting with the June 2007 exams

The January 2006 exams are the last to have three sub-questions set per option in Units 2580-2582. For the Notice to Centres of June 2005 and details plus links to exemplar papers and revised generics, see

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/qualifications/qualificationhome/newsandupdates/ShowQualNewsDetail.do?server=PRODUKTION&site=OCR&oid=2047&newsitemoid=23057>

An exemplar question paper of every option in the new format may be found at http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/Data/Publication/Specimen%20Assessment%20Materials/AS_A_Level34722.pdf

Units 2587, 2588, 2589, Historical Investigations 768-1955

General Comments

Those who read these reports regularly will find that there is little in this one that is new to them. Examiners continue to comment, sometimes with some vigour, on the same failings among candidates. They also felt that the entry in this session was often lacking in mastery of the diverse skills which are needed to be successful. There was some feeling, in addition, that knowledge was not sufficiently substantial and some specific examples are cited in the report on individual questions.

In (i) candidates continued to refer to the provenance of the Passages sometimes at some length. It seems likely now that they will continue to do so until this question is removed from the paper after next January's session. They still write about the content of the first Passage, with no comparison emerging until the second Passage is mentioned or with only an implicit comparison or a comparison confined to the conclusion. The generic mark bands are clear that these responses cannot achieve above Band III at most. A point by point comparison focused directly on similarities and differences with a brief summative comment remains the ideal. The Principal Examiners' Report for June 2004 contains further advice and specimens of good and less good answers.

In (ii) candidates were more prone than usual to summarising the content of the Passages with minimal comment and less contextual knowledge or evaluation. The generic mark bands do indicate that contextual knowledge need not be extensive, but it is required. Equally candidates need to consider, that is comment on and discuss, the interpretations in the Passages in order to reach even Band III. This is what using the Passages means. Stating a view and then asserting that the Passages agree or reject that view, with no detailed reference to the interpretation in the Passages is a Band IV response and many of these were read. Examiners felt that answers to this question were weaker than to either the essay questions or the comparison in (i). Candidates were not eager to reach a judgement and some ended their answers by saying that it is all a matter of opinion anyway. The Principal Examiners' Report for

January 2005 contains advice about balance in these answers and what we mean by debate (pages 292-293).

In the essay questions techniques were usually better, although several Examiners commented on the tendency to produce a prepared response to a different question, in some cases the question from the previous session, which was rarely skilfully adapted for the actual question set. Prepared commentary about orthodox, revisionist or post-revisionist views continues to be vigorous and often counter-productive. All Cold War historians writing in the 1960s or 1970s were not influenced by the Vietnam experience while the opening of the Soviet archives after 1989 is similarly seen as having a universal impact on every historian writing after that date. Some good candidates, while making a strong and effective argument sum up weakly by saying that there are many factors and it is difficult to judge between them or something similar. They can also conclude that post-revisionist is best, without much justification. Essays do give candidates the chance to decide for themselves and make a considered personal judgement and Examiners appreciate reading such conclusions. Such conclusions can be strongly drawn without the use of the first person, generally felt to be best eschewed at this level.

One significant point was raised by Examiners could be passed on to Examinations Officers, please. This was that the instructions on the question paper are for the use of a 12 page answer booklet. In the vast majority of cases, this is more than sufficient. The use of a 16 page booklet is wasteful of paper and incurs higher postage/courier costs as well as making extra work for examiners as all pages in a booklet must be checked.

The issue of presentation again vexed Examiners. They deplored the lack of upper case usage, employment of abbreviations beyond those normally accepted and the proliferation of spelling errors and sentences constructed without verbs or even much sense of what a sentence is. Candidates who write inaccurately can be, and were, placed lower in the mark band to which their answers had been assigned. Others whose sense was shrouded in the obscurity of their expression were also likely to suffer. However, some Examiners were pleased to report that they had seen some excellent work, well focused on the question set, and, at best showing that candidates can think for themselves and reach original and unexpected conclusions, like the candidate who showed with a well-controlled argument that Catholicism was not doomed in Elizabeth's reign but was still entrenched in the hearts and minds of the common people.

The Principal Examiners' report for June 2002 has detailed advice on answering all the types of question (pages 32-41) and the report for June 2005 has examples of responses with comments from the Principal Examiner (pages 360-366).

Unit 2587

There were 69 candidates for this paper, 6% of whom were retaking. No letters of complaint were received about this paper. 28 candidates answered on Charlemagne and 41 on King John.

Charlemagne

1(i) Most candidates were able to find the clear differences between the passages although some did not notice that each Passage was using evidence from the capitularies but interpreting the material differently. Some missed the similarity in that both Passages suggested there was misgovernment, while disagreeing about its

extent. Weaker candidates tended to dwell on the Decomposition theory of Ganshof and to evaluate it, without making any comparison.

(ii) This question was aimed at one of the best known historical debates in Charlemagne's reign, but this led some candidates into a discussion of this debate which was not focused on the Passages. Imbalance of this kind tends to result in marks in Band IV. Better candidates identified the Passage which held the contrary view, namely Passage C, and then compared this Passage with the others. The Passages offered plenty of evidence for the interpretations and candidates did not need to include extensive amounts of contextual knowledge to score highly.

2 This essay was less well answered than question 3. Some candidates spent so long outlining the situation at Charlemagne's accession that they had little time left to discuss what Charlemagne himself achieved, let alone how far it was based on his inheritance. Others were well informed about his policies towards the peoples outside the Frankish lands, but did not focus their answers on the question set, often preferring to assess the extent of Charlemagne's success in these areas. There were some effective answers which analysed his policies clearly, showing which resulted from his inheritance, which arose from his own initiatives and which could be seen as doing both.

3 This essay attracted some high quality responses with good analysis of a range of reasons and an effective assessment of the relative importance of the different factors. Most candidates concluded that the expertise of the churchmen and the prestige conveyed by the Church were the key reasons. Some digressed into the exact role of the churchmen in government and evaluation of their impact, which are other valid debates, but not quite what the question was asking.

King John

4(i) Candidates often concentrated on a comparison of the final sentence in Passage A with Passage C and got no further. The provenance of Roger of Wendover was frequently discussed, despite many previous reports and teacher's INSET making it abundantly clear that such discussion is not required and gains no credit. The other points contrasting John's lack of action in A with total commitment in C were often missed. Too many candidates did little more than restate the content of the Passages in turn, with minimal effort at a comparison.

(ii) This question also led to many candidates outlining the content of each Passage and not identifying the interpretations they contained. Successful responses often began with the use of Passage C as the Passage which supported the statement in the question and then moved on to assess the views of the other Passages, citing such issues as the declining support given to John by his baronage, mentioned in all the other Passages. Contextual knowledge was usually good, with candidates able to support the comments in Passage B about the unpopularity of previous Angevin rulers or to rebut Wendover's criticisms with references to Mirebeau. There was some over-lengthy retelling of the Lusignan grievances to explain why the nobles were in rebellion and John's preference for spending time with his young queen was dwelt on in some detail.

5 Some candidates were very well informed about the issues of church reform in this period and Innocent's actions were put into this context and contrasted with John's defence of the traditional arrangements. But other candidates had clearly been looking at last summer's paper and answered a different question about why the conflict lasted so long. These responses rarely reached above Band IV as they were not focused on the key issue. They tended to move on to the Interdict and to

assert that John had anticipated increasing his revenue from the quarrel at an early stage. There were yet other candidates who knew little about the reasons for the conflict beyond the immediate triggers and so wrote a narrative of the events.

6 This question was not well answered by the few candidates who chose it. There was a good deal of description of schools of historians, not all of it very coherent or useful. There was evaluation of the role of Magna Carta, of how far John was to blame and of the results of the Charter, but not much emphasis on the unity or otherwise in the baronial class. Better candidates were aware of the part played by Northern barons and William Marshal generally enjoyed a good press. Some candidates judged the unity of the barons by referring to their attitudes after the sealing of the Charter and in the subsequent events, which was outside the focus of the question, which specifically stated *at the time that Magna Carta was agreed*.

Unit 2588

There were 849 candidates for this paper, 5% of whom were retaking. Most of the answers were on Philip II and Elizabeth I with a few on Peter the Great and a very small number on Cromwell. As a result, the comments on Cromwell are limited. No complaints were received about the questions.

Philip II

1(i) Generally this question was well answered. There were a good number of points of comparison, so it was not necessary to include them all, to reach full marks. Some candidates overlooked the economic and religious motives to concentrate on the narrower focus of security, imperialism and reputation. Candidates were able to distinguish between personal and national reputation and cross reference the mention of piracy in A with the Americas and Cadiz in D.

(ii) This question showed that the phrase *foreign strategies* was not understood by a number of candidates. The aggressive nationalism discussed in Passage A and signalled in the steer had not always been appreciated in the comparison question, so candidates could not build on this usefully. Candidates needed to take a moment to work out the interpretation of Philip's strategy put forward in each Passage. Without this focus answers often drifted into a consideration of Elizabeth's foreign policy, rather than Philip's. Candidates found Passage C hard to use as they could not follow its argument that Philip's poor strategy indirectly damaged relations with England once he needed to remedy it. Contextual knowledge tended to support the view that Elizabeth was equally to blame. Several examiners commented that evaluation was often poor, with candidates paraphrasing the Passages and using the steers as evaluative judgements.

2 This question was based on the key issue on how effectively Philip governed Spain. Many ignored the emphasis on *administrative system* and wrote instead about whether Philip was *absolute* or whether he was a *paper King* - aspects that have figured in previous exams. Some examiners felt that some candidates lacked specific knowledge about the way Spain was governed. The question referred to *mainland Spain*, but some candidates still drew examples from the Netherlands. This mistake appears with great regularity and candidates need to be clear about the status of the Netherlands in Philip's empire. The problems which arose were generally identified as Aragon and Moriscos, often described in some detail, with less full reference to finance, factions and slow communications. The Inquisition was brought in by some, but not in a relevant way. Candidates who could distinguish between the system and the way in which Philip operated it were likely to do very well.

3 Candidates usually had good knowledge on this question. Their difficulties arose from failing to identify Philip's *reactions to the spread of Calvinism*, one going so far as to assert that he resorted to iconoclasm to wipe it out. The best answers saw that the heresy laws, bishoprics plan and the sending of Alva were responses to Calvinism, but could also be seen as challenges to Dutch liberty or an attempt to Castilianise the provinces. Some answers drifted into a discussion about how far Philip II was to blame for the outbreak of the revolt and some used material outside the scope of the question which covered 1555-1572 but not Requesens, the sack of Antwerp or the Pacification of Ghent. A list of undifferentiated causal factors was another approach. Examiners commented on the misspelling of key words like Calvinism and Catholicism.

Elizabeth I

4(i) Candidates who made good use of the steers to the Passages were able to identify the different interpretations clearly. Others were confused by the reference to Marian bishops in B and equated them with Marian exiles and hence thought there was a similarity to C with its mention of pressure from Puritan MPs, whereas it was in reality a difference. Some candidates did not pick out the problems fully and missed references like *dangerous uncertainty, perilous international situation and unwavering opposition* in B to be compared with *personal and political reasons, aware of the importance and needed to convince and pressure* in C.

(ii) Many candidates did not find this question easy. Passages B and D could be used to support the view given in the question, B by arguing that the radical nature of the settlement suggested Elizabeth was not trying to conciliate Catholic powers and D by underlining the way the settlement prevented internal rebellion. Passage A was not well used although it could be cross-referenced with Passage C about the foreign threat and also with D about trouble from Catholics. Contextual knowledge from the nature of the settlement, usually well known by candidates, was rarely used to help in evaluation. Others did evaluate the reality of the threat from France and Spain, but some of this was highly speculative and some made use of much later events like the Armada. Candidates were often reluctant to come to a judgement. There was some evidence that some weak candidates did not know what was meant by *domestic* and that some confused Mary I and Mary Stuart.

5 This was a popular question and some very strong answers were seen. These were able to use their knowledge of the threats from the Catholics, linked with the government response, to show how far decline was or was not bound to happen. The main pitfalls seemed to be that candidates were hoping to write about the seriousness of the Catholic threat or why there was a Catholic threat and did not focus on how far it was *bound* to decline. Some made no mention of *decline* or *bound to happen* but concentrated solely on the threat. Plots abounded. Government policies which contributed to the degree of decline were less well covered. Some answers leapt from 1559 to the Jesuit mission with little recognition of intervening issues. The debate about the effectiveness of the seminary and missionary priests was usually outlined, but not always in a way which was well aimed at the question. The concept of changing degrees of decline was often missed. The Archpriest controversy was frequently mentioned and sometimes given more attention than it merited or placed in the early years of the reign as evidence for decline.

6 This question was answered by few candidates. They used it largely to write about any aspect of the reign which could be encompassed by *image* and some which could not. Theses also found it difficult to balance their arguments as the later years of the reign were less well known. One or two used the question as an opportunity to evaluate the extent of Elizabeth's success in other aspects of the reign

such as her relations with Parliament. However, there were others who were fully aware of the historical debate and able to marshal their evidence to good effect and to see the changing circumstances of the 1590s to present the negative aspects of the image.

Oliver Cromwell

7(i) Candidates identified the main comparative points quite easily and saw the contrast between *important role* in B and *slight regard* in C and the similarity between *military organiser* in B and *military renown* in C. The development of these points was more confused.

(ii) Candidates were happier dealing with Cromwell's military achievements than with his political ability and struggled to find contextual knowledge with which to evaluate B. The best answers grouped Passages A, C and D to explain his qualities as a military commander, using evidence from his victories to support their arguments and suggesting that the weight of this evidence was enough to disprove B. Some could also use the Self-Denying Ordinance, possibly as a result of the previous question paper.

8 Candidates often seemed to enjoy answering this question and were able to select relevant examples from Cromwell's career to illustrate bravery and badness and also to mount the alternative argument, for example citing the rules of war at Drogheda or that motive could be used to justify the regicide. One candidate misread the question and analysed how far Cromwell was a *bold*, bad man, which is not quite the same thing. One or two strayed outside the years specified in the question, which is a common failing in answers on Cromwell.

9 This question led to responses of high quality alongside those of hopeless confusion. The latter largely arose when candidates did not know what *conservative* meant or trawled through all Cromwell's policies arguing *this was radical* or *this was conservative*, often in a contradictory way. Other terms like *liberal* and *tolerant* were used in ways which demonstrated imperfect understanding.

Peter the Great

10(i) Many candidates could only identify the similarities between the Passages and missed the differences, such as the reference in A to *fence the country in with a high wall against all foreign influences* and in D to *an important channel through which western ideas flowed*. Some missed the mention of an elite in D and saw the Passage as referring to Russia as a whole.

(ii) Candidates tended to go astray because they assessed how successfully Peter dealt with problems generally and lost sight of the focus on the start of the reign. Some clearly did not know what was meant by *accession* and used phrases such as *during Peter's accession*. Evaluation was often weak and contextual knowledge thin and not used effectively. Early opposition was rarely mentioned, with examples being drawn more often from foreign policy. One examiner did see some creditable performances.

11 This was the more popular of the two essay questions. Some answers were well focused on the question and mounted an argument. They found it easier to analyse the opposition to Peter than to discuss the degree of support he enjoyed. His cronies were not much mentioned. They found it more difficult to decide on the attitudes of the peasantry but were able to identify some subtle distinctions between passive resistance and open revolt or compliance when Peter was at hand not exactly equalling support. Weaker responses focused on why there was opposition

and how successfully it was overcome. Some used the mechanical orthodox/revisionist/slavophile approach which was not appropriate in this question, where the debate lay between the interpretation that Peter was well supported and the alternative view that there was considerable opposition to his rule. Some judged the extent of support from examples beyond his reign, instancing the fact that St. Petersburg is still there. Some made extensive use of the material in the Passages and little else. The weakest narrated events with a minimal sense of debate.

12 This question was less popular. One examiner read some splendid and relevant answers using evidence to good effect and with accurate knowledge of the administration. Others were less successful as they focused on Westernization in general or looked at military reforms and little further. The word *merely* in the question passed them by. Again, some tried to use the Passages to answer the question, which is not the purpose of the Passages. They may give some peripheral guidance for the essays, but no more than that.

Unit 2589

There were 2205 candidates for this paper, 8.5% of whom were retaking. The estimated grades were 1.7% down for A and 1.1% down for A and B. One letter of complaint was received about the questions on the Chamberlain option.

Napoleon I

1(i) Candidates often found it difficult to isolate reasons for the Concordat from the material in the Passages. Some commented at length on the provenance of the Passages and the biased views they contained.

(ii) Those candidates who understood the term reconciliation were able to achieve a high Band but they were few in number. Equally not many candidates moved beyond the Passages so their evaluation was thin. Some preferred, on the other hand, to discuss the factors which allowed Napoleon to secure himself in power and lost focus on the Passages.

2 This was the more popular of the two essays and focused on a clear debate about why Napoleon came to grief. Some candidates could discuss the factors evaluatively but many simply described them without any differentiation. As Russia was mentioned in the question, a substantial paragraph was expected on the defeat there, but knowledge was often on a par with what might be seen on the booklet of a CD of Tchaikovsky's 1812 Overture, to quote one Examiner. There was more discussion about why Napoleon was defeated in Russia than on the impact this had on his downfall. The Continental System was often described at length.

3 Very few answers.

Gladstone and Disraeli 1846-80

4(i) Most candidates were able to make a clear comparison, but some missed the nuances in Passage B where there was some implied agreement with the more cynical view of Gladstone in C.

(ii) This was generally answered well. Some candidates reversed the question to examine why Gladstone was important to the working class. Some provided some good contextual knowledge about other factors helping Gladstone's success in a precise and focused way.

5 This was aimed at one of the clearest debates about Disraeli, but some candidates still preferred to consider how successful Disraeli's reforms were. Others knew about Disraeli's speeches and rhetoric and had some detailed information about the reforms and how they originated. Some of the evaluation was undeveloped: Disraeli was interested (number of measures); Disraeli was not interested (permissive legislation), followed by a list of Acts.

6 This was a popular topic, but many candidates did not keep to the focus on Europe. The Suez Canal, the Royal Titles Act, the problems in Afghanistan and South Africa all figured. Other candidates were confused and Disraeli was blamed for failures in the Crimean War and for Don Pacifico. The events of the Eastern Crisis of 1876-78 were rarely known in any detail and Gladstone's pamphlet was often the only example cited of his involvement in Europe. There were exceptions, with good comparisons based on knowledge of both the relevant ministries.

Bismarck and the Unification of Germany 1858-71

7(i) The comparison was generally well supported by reference to the Passages and most candidates could identify similarities and differences.

(ii) This question was mostly answered successfully with candidates using the Passages effectively and evaluating the interpretations from their own knowledge.

8 This was the more popular question and many wrote at length on the role of the Zollverein and general economic growth, with particular reference to railway expansion. Other factors were less well assessed. Better responses were able to link economic factors to military might and to place these against the role of Bismarck.

9 Few answers.

Roosevelt's America 1920-41

10(i) Candidates did not always focus on the *priorities* of US foreign policy and there was a good deal of paraphrase of the content of the Passages. Some missed the references to economic factors which appeared in both Passages. But there were some who did maintain the emphasis on *priorities* and made effective comparisons.

(ii) This was usually well tackled. Candidates had plenty of contextual knowledge. The main fault was a tendency to write a mini-essay and lose focus on interpretations in the Passages. Passage D was not always fully understood who were unsure about policy towards Latin America (or even exactly where that is).

11 This was a popular question but too often answers consisted of a list of factors which caused the depression with little evaluation of their relative importance. Some candidates had a confused understanding of the economics, or simply asserted, after a description of share speculation, that it caused the crash, without explaining how. Few responses had a sense of historical debate and if they did, it was often only in the final paragraph. There were better answers which showed how share speculation contributed to the Crash and hence to the depression and then broadened out to look at other linked factors which were evaluated.

12 Answers frequently turned into accounts of the opposition facing Roosevelt along with detailed descriptions of the measures of the New Deal again illustrating the use of prepared answers which were poorly adapted to the specific question. The question in these responses was seen as meaning how significant the Supreme Court was alongside other elements of opposition. There was a distinct lack of

knowledge about the Supreme Court and why it caused problems for Roosevelt. Candidates who could refer to the Republican dominance in the Supreme Court and the effect this had on New Deal measures or to the Court Packing controversy were few. Stronger candidates saw that the focus was on problems and analysed several, including opposition, but most concluded that the economy was the key factor.

Lenin and the Establishment of Bolshevik Power 1903-24

13(i) Most coped well with the comparison and were able to identify several similarities. Some did not see the reference to anti-Bolshevik groups in B and SRs in C. Different views about the extent and nature of support were less easily picked up and the distinction between urban support and peasant opposition was often missed.

(ii) Answers often achieved a good balance between interpretations and contextual knowledge, were well informed about opposition groups and recognised clearly that the extent of the repression reflected the strength of the opposition. This enabled them to give real consideration to how seriously. Some strayed beyond 1918 into the later events of the Civil War and even to the Kronstadt mutiny.

14 There was some good discussion of the debate about the centrality of Lenin in 1917 focusing on doctrine, leadership, inspiration and timing and referring to the role of Trotsky. Outlining of schools of history was less dominant and most candidates were able to reach their own judgements. Some delved into the background of Lenin's leadership, going as far back as 1902. Others wrote more about the shortcomings of the Provisional Government and the importance of the Kornilov Affair. There continue to be candidates whose knowledge of the events of 1917 can only be described as sketchy.

15 This question was drawn directly from the specification and is hardly a new interpretation, but it seemed to take candidates by surprise and they found the concept of a *Red Tsar* difficult. But there were some fine answers which compared Lenin's rule with that of Nicholas II and were well informed about repression under Lenin and the changing position of the working classes.

Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-39

16(i) The clear contrasts were noticed by most candidates. Some were confused by the two Chamberlains, although both Passages made their relationship clear.

(ii) Examiners reported that some candidates used contextual knowledge with a glance at the Passages and described British foreign policy in the period. Few of these focused on *ineffectiveness* and some went beyond 1929. There were better answers where criteria were established for judging how effective policy was and a clear judgement was reached. The use of the cartoon did not confuse candidates and they should be ready for such material on any topic, where it is appropriate.

17 The mention of *Empire* in the question led some candidates to focus on the problems within the Empire, such as Indian demands for independence, and to miss the emphasis on defence. Many candidates listed the considerations determining British policy, without any evaluation of their relative importance. Some moved beyond 1937. But there were candidates who could identify the problems of imperial defence and see how these impacted on British policy towards Germany as well as considering other influences. The Anglo-German Naval Agreement was often cited as an appropriate example. There was some description of Manchuria and Abyssinia.

18 This question was focused on Chamberlain's belief that, under Baldwin, British foreign policy had lacked clarity and that a pro-active policy to deal with

German grievances from Versailles would be a better idea. Candidates who grasped this concept wrote well and some wrote very well and questioned whether Chamberlain's policy was, in fact, any less muddled. This was another example of candidates reaching their own conclusions in a pleasing manner. But some answers were much less effective, lacking basic knowledge of the events of 1933-37, which made it difficult for them to compare the policies of this period with those of Chamberlain. Many answers moved into 1939, showing candidates had not read the question carefully. Others preferred to answer a question on how successful or how justified Chamberlain's policy was. Yet others gave their own opinion with little reference to evidence or simply quoted the different schools of thought. There was some marked lack of knowledge with Chamberlain as Prime Minister throughout the 1930s and Munich appearing in 1936 or 1937 as a response to the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. The change in policy in 1939 was manoeuvred into the question in some cases; in the worst, seen as the move away from previous muddled policies.

Stalin and the Development of the Cold War in Europe 1941-55

19(i) It was perfectly possible for candidates to identify the similarities between the interpretations in the Passages, namely Stalin's sense of vulnerability and fear of invasion, as well as the main difference, in that Passage B emphasised his desire to spread Communism in addition, which Passage A did not, without any mention of schools of thought. Not many of them managed to do so, however. Those who did largely described the content of the Passages in turn.

(ii) The emphasis on schools of historical thought often obscured answers. The focus on *justified* was lost. Good candidates had relevant contextual knowledge to use in evaluation of the interpretations. Less good candidates described events from 1944 onwards and made little use of the Passages, a Band V response.

20 Candidates tended to begin quite well, with several factors or personalities being identified, but then to lose momentum, sometimes after descriptions of the long Kennan telegram. There was a good deal of listing, as opposed to explaining and evaluating. Stalin's actions were assessed in terms of blame for starting the Cold War (probably the question for which some had prepared). Better responses could link domestic influences in the USA effectively to the making of foreign policy. Some candidates incorporated a paragraph about the debate which seemed to be their standard means of evaluation. In some cases it appeared identically in (ii).

21 Some discussed criteria by which *winning* could be judged and then assessed the evidence with these in mind. Such answers achieved depth in their analysis and showed a strong understanding of the issues and of the ways in which they have been interpreted. Others worked their way through events and concluded that each one did or did not show the USSR was winning, without much justification for the conclusion. There was some lack of knowledge of the chronology.

Units 2590-2591 (Themes in History)

General Comments

Just over 1,000 candidates took paper 2590 or 2591, representing 8% of the A2 candidature. This was a slight fall in entries compared with January 2005, with a rise on 2590 but a fall on 2591; 8.5% were retaking on 2590 and 13.3% on 2591. Both papers produced a range of performances, although very few scored really high marks, and a large number gained marks below Band V. Some 76 out of 180 Centres made single entries and the performance of these candidates was often very good. Indeed, there were several outstanding essays from candidates who defined their terms of assessment or explained in their introduction what the question required and how they intended answering it. These often planned their arguments thematically, developed their ideas and provided relevant supporting factual material. Each paragraph usually covered most of the period and its content was linked directly to the question. There was a real sense that they were in full control of their argument. Conversely, several Centres with large entries seem to have prepared their candidates with pre-packaged essays that in many cases did not fit the questions set. Many appear to have been under-prepared or lacked the maturity and skills necessary to tackle effectively a synoptic A2 unit at this stage. Overall, the quality of work was disappointing.

Planning an essay generally worked well for candidates but some plans were clearly too long or bore little relation to the question or indeed what was contained in the answer. Almost all candidates used their time well, producing essays of roughly equal length. In only a few cases did it appear that a weaker second essay was the result of insufficient time. Misinterpreting the question was however a common fault. Several questions asked 'how far' a factor or event was important yet many candidates responded by describing 'how' or 'why' something occurred. For instance, Q23 in 2590 asked 'to what extent did the Catholic Reformation achieve its aims in the course of the period' and not 'how'; and Q21 in 2591 asked 'how far was Irish constitutional nationalism a failure through the period' but several essays explained 'why'. Many candidates had problems with 'turning-point' questions (2590: Q4,16,22; 2591: Q20,22,27,and 30). They tended to list or describe important events and had difficulty assessing short/long-term consequences. Improvements in technique are required as this type of question is always likely to appear in the Themes paper. Similarly, comparative questions that focus on the 'most important' factor need to be directly addressed and not sidestepped or dismissed as unimportant. Spelling, punctuation and grammar remain at a modest standard. Abbreviations such as 'MLK', 'Alex II' and 'WII', were commonly used in Unit 2591, and should be avoided. Grammatical inaccuracies such as 'would of', the confusion of 'there/their' and 'where/were', and the belief that popes and kings had 'reins', also abounded.

Copied from Newsletter 4 (Winter 2005-2006), p.3

What makes a synoptic essay effective? Notes from the Principal Examiner

"Certain key requirements are needed if candidates are to score high marks in Units 2590-2591. These units assesses three main skills: the ability of students (1) to identify continuity and change in history and to comment on key turning points; (2) to show links within and between developments in a chosen topic; (3) to demonstrate a good understanding of the whole period in question.

(1) Identifying patterns of continuity and change. Understanding the situation at the beginning and end of each period is a key requirement and OCR has published a series of summaries that presents an overview of each topic. The summary in grid form highlights moments of change and periods of continuity and can be usefully adapted by teachers as the basis of their course. Questions frequently require

candidates to assess the relative importance of a given factor or of a turning point and sometimes they can cause problems. Some students write too little on the factor in question before discussing other, often unrelated, issues; others write too much on a single factor and fail to set it in its wider context. Some students focus inadequately on the short and long term significance of a turning point and assert without further explanation that it was 'clearly very important'. Answers should always be planned, specific examples learned and ideas fully explained.

(2) Showing links between developments. Most Centres in their teaching are likely to cover a topic chronologically, either superficially before examining key developments in more detail, or in reasonable depth from the outset. Having a clear understanding of a topic's chronology is indeed important if the candidate is to make sense of links within and between developments. However, structuring the essay chronologically can bring problems if the candidate is unable to analyse a topic thematically. After all, questions are set on themes, not on period studies. An excellent way to drive home these links is to analyse the period thematically, perhaps according to politics, economics, social and foreign affairs, and for each theme examine any short and long term developments during the period. Then practise cross-referencing these links to earlier and later periods both in discussion and in essay writing. The more flexible students become in using their knowledge and understanding thematically, the less likely they will write a pre-learned chronological answer.

(3) Covering the whole period. Not only must the entire specification content be covered in teaching the course but essays must also be structured to ensure most of the period in question has been assessed. This is normally about 100 years. It helps if the timeline Insert, which is given to all candidates during the exam, is incorporated into the teaching of the course so that candidates remember the importance of comparing the beginning, middle and end of a period, as well as key events within it. Far too many candidates pay no attention whatsoever to the Insert, even when their own factual knowledge is patently weak. Even good candidates under-perform if they only cover part of the period – for instance, ending a Tudor Rebellion and Disorder essay in 1569 instead of 1603, or an Ascendancy of France essay in 1700 instead of 1715, or a Britain and Ireland essay in 1914 instead of 1921, or a Challenge of German Nationalism essay in 1890 instead of 1919.”

Comments on Individual Questions: Unit 2590

Comments have been confined to questions answered by four or more candidates.

The Government of England 1066-1216

1. This was answered by a handful of candidates. With two notable exceptions, most essays offered little on the role of the Church. Factual knowledge was frequently superficial and, though material on the crown and central government was sound, arguments were often skeletal and under-developed.

2. This question generated some reasonable answers on the changing role of the sheriff and his relationship with local government officials. Analysis of other 'significant developments', such as the work of itinerant justices or centralisation of local government, was more limited.

3. Candidates wrote intelligently on the impact of continental possessions over the period but were weaker on 'their greatest impact ... in the reign of Henry I'. The best responses were able to show how continental possessions influenced English government at times of political tension, notably during the anarchy under Stephen and civil war in John's reign.

Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228

4. This was answered by 17 candidates and done very well. Most essays showed a good knowledge of Anselm's importance and compared him with a range of archbishops across the period. While evaluations of the relationships between kings and archbishops were often good, the technique needed to focus on alternative turning-points was sometimes more limited.

5. Responses from the 10 candidates who attempted this question were generally good. The best essays focused on the relationship between archbishops and bishops, as well as issues such as the primacy question and papal power. Developmental patterns were evaluated in thematic essays.

6. This question produced some excellent answers assessing the impact of the papal reform movement. Most concluded that becoming free from royal control was the main development, but considered other key features as well. Some concentrated on comparing Lanfranc, Anselm and Langton but with little discussion of events in the middle of the period. Others wrote about monastic movements but did not always link them to papal reform. Only one candidate considered the growth in appeals to Rome.

Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603

7. This was a popular question answered by more than 100 candidates. Few, however, actually understood enclosures or were able to relate them to causes of disorder over the period. The majority of candidates stated that only Kett's rebellion had enclosures as a cause – ignoring that it figured in many disturbances across the country in 1549, was central to the 1596 Oxfordshire riot and was an article of complaint issued by the pilgrims in 1536. Several believed that the Western rebellion was about enclosures, perhaps unaware that much of Devon had already been peacefully enclosed, and some suggested that Kett began his rebellion in Kent. Most candidates dismissed enclosures as a minor issue before moving on to list other causes of rebellion with little linkage to enclosures or related economic problems. Weaker responses gave a pre-determined catalogue of causes with few references to enclosures. The best explained why enclosures were a cause or a contributing factor at varying times in the period and then compared them with other factors.

8. This was by far the most popular question in the paper, answered by more than 50% of the entry. A common discriminator was whether or not the question set was answered. Some changed the wording and wrote generally about whether rebellions were significant. Some took the concept of 'seriously threatened' to mean merely problematical. Others explained why rebellions failed and therefore could not have been a serious threat and a number of weaker responses examined rebels' aims without assessing the extent to which any of them were achieved. Proximity to London was often cited as a key factor but several arguments then claimed the Cornish rebels, who camped at Blackheath, were not a serious threat. Conversely the Essex rebellion was not considered serious even though it started in the city and a few claimed that the Pilgrimage of Grace and Western Rebellion were serious threats because they got near to London. Several answers asserted that Wyatt and the Northern Earls were engaged in 'regime change' without suggesting that there might have been another agenda; and some focused on the murder of William Body (1548) as an indication of the seriousness of the Prayer Book rebellion of 1549 but then ignored the siege of Exeter. The best examined a range of rebellions, identified common threads making them potentially dangerous and made analytical conclusions about how these factors combined or cancelled each other out.

9. This question was the least popular of the set but often the best answered. Almost all of the better candidates offered clear synoptic comparisons and analyses. Weaker answers agreed that there were fewer rebellions after 1558 but could not explain why or claimed circuitously that there were fewer rebellions because Elizabeth's reign was more stable. Many candidates ignored the significance of 'large-scale' or took it to mean 'covering a wide geographical area'. The focus of most fell on the earlier period and many who examined the significance of the Elizabethan Settlement seemed to think it was a panacea for all religious problems. Few candidates discussed the importance of Tudor economic and social legislation, such as the Poor Laws, in combating rural and urban problems in the mid-century and beyond.

England's Changing Relations with Foreign Powers 1485-1603

10. The most popular question of the set, and generally well answered. Very few took a thematic approach and, though some chronological answers were highly analytical, many tended towards narrative or skewed the focus of their arguments towards Anglo-French relations. Most were far stronger on comparing Henry VIII and Elizabeth than on considering the other three monarchs. Few attempted to explain the longer-term economic links between England and the (Spanish) Netherlands. Weaker responses often displayed a poor grasp of chronology claiming, for instance, that Henry VIII's divorce preceded the 1518 Treaty of London.

11. A popular question that produced a good standard of answer. Most focused on Elizabeth and provided synoptic comparisons with earlier periods, though often not on Henry VII. Weaker essays could not see any links between events in Elizabeth's reign and earlier developments and some revealed huge gaps in knowledge, especially on the 1540s. A common approach was to chart the changing relationship between England and Spain and see how it affected Anglo-French relations.

12. Few candidates attempted this question. There was a lack of specific knowledge and understanding of how economic factors shaped foreign policy, such as the significance of the Netherlands for both Henry VII and Elizabeth. Most referred to trade only and one candidate wrote only on finance in determining monarchs' abilities to pursue their foreign policy aims. Only a few compared economic with other factors.

The Development of Limited Monarchy in England 1558-1689

13-15. Only 2 candidates answered each question.

Dissent and Conformity in England 1558-1689

No candidates opted for this topic.

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610

No candidates opted for this topic.

The Catholic Reformation in the Sixteenth Century

22. A popular question that was answered by some 40 candidates. There were several good answers where the concept of 'turning-point' was explained and illustrated by ranging forward and backward in time. Paul III and the work of Trent were frequent choices but candidates found it easier to contrast Paul with the political nature of the preceding popes than to assess the developments that followed the Trent Decrees. Many candidates, however, did not understand how a particular pontiff or event could affect continuity and change in the period. Some selected inappropriate turning-points, such as the Sack of Rome in 1527 and the commission that investigated abuses in 1536, and so found themselves writing about the same consequences. Few discussed why some turning-points were more significant than others and the weakest merely gave an assessment of the topic's main events.

23. Better candidates began by setting out plausible aims and then assessing them thematically, identifying and explaining the limitations of the reforms over the whole period. The main difficulty facing many was how to demonstrate achievements. Some offered a general description of the Church; others wrote about 'How' (not 'How far') the post-Tridentine Church changed or why it failed to achieve its aims. Too many simply asserted with insufficient explanation, discussion or factual support. A common error was to claim that France became a Protestant nation in the 1590s.

24. This was the least popular of the set, and poorly answered. While coverage of the pontiffs was quite sound, few candidates could comment on a range of secular rulers apart from Ferdinand, Isabella, and Philip II. A number actually saw Philip as an uncritical supporter of the Papacy and many included the Jesuits and new orders as examples of 'other rulers'. Most responses stated what the rulers and popes did by way of contributing to the revival of the Church without making any comparisons.

The Decline of Spain 1598-1700

There was only one candidate.

The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715

28. Two candidates attempted this question.

29. Most did not have enough knowledge of Richelieu to make a very good case. His finance policies, dealing with the aristocracy and conduct of war were notably missing from many essays. On the other hand, many candidates did talk at length about Colbert and attributed to him several achievements, such as the construction of Versailles and directing Louis XIV's wars, that were outside his jurisdiction. Few answers went beyond 1683 or presented a balanced coverage of French ascendancy across the whole period. Mazarin and Louvois, for example, were rarely mentioned.

30. Most were aware of the theoretical and practical strengths and limitations of the French monarchy, but less effective at illustrating them. Many omitted the Frondes as a temporary setback to the growth of absolutism, and in general the law, Church, administration and the later years of Louis XIV's reign, were not well covered.

From Absolutism to Enlightened Despotism 1661-1796

31. Only two answers.

32. This was quite a popular question. The standard response was to run through those factors which threatened the despotism of the French kings and then assert that one was more important than the others. *Unigenitus* was frequently mentioned but the relevance of Jansenism to the question was not explained.

33. Knowledge of Peter was more plentiful than that of Catherine, but most answers were assertions about general features rather than a direct comparison. Little attempt was made to examine what was meant by the 'exercise of power'.

Comments on individual questions: Unit 2591

Comments are confined to questions answered by four or more candidates. The estimated grades were 3.6% down for A, 8.1% down for A & B and 4% for A-C.

Britain and Ireland 1798-1921

1. This question produced some excellent answers that examined a range of 'pressures' upon policy changes, usually in respect of religion, land and home rule.

Most equated pressure with the threat of violence but only a minority was able to identify more subtle pressures such as idealism, conscience or compassion. Some tried to turn the question into one about coercion and concession (set in June 2003) or lacked the knowledge to link changes to either pressure or other factors.

2. This produced a mixture of very good and weak responses. Several candidates failed to understand the difference between constitutional and revolutionary nationalism. Others twisted the question into a comparison of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism or explained why constitutional nationalism failed. While most candidates acknowledged the failures, only the better essays evaluated and explained the successes of constitutional nationalism.

3. Neither popular nor well answered. Few had sufficient knowledge of industry, trade and commercial developments in Ireland, and what was known was confined to the 19th century. Surprisingly knowledge of the Famine was also at a premium and limited to its impact on basic agrarian trends and landlord-tenant relationships.

War and Society in Britain 1793-1918

4. This was quite well done although there was very little comparison of the army and navy. The importance of finance, fear of militarism and the influence of the Manchester School could also have been more effectively stressed.

5. One answer only.

6. This was well answered although treatment was often uneven. For instance, the importance of India and the strategic concern over Belgium were not emphasised and there was no awareness of how attitudes to the Empire changed in the period. In general candidates were strong on continuity but weak on explaining change.

Poor Law to Welfare State 1834-1948

7. A minority answered this question well. They assessed the impact that a variety of social investigators had on government policies and set them against other factors such as the influence of war. The majority of answers, however, were weak. Some simply gave a critique of Chadwick and Beveridge and few dealt adequately with the post-1942 period. Several candidates saw the 'treatment of the poor' as an opportunity to write about public health, housing and education. Few displayed a clear sense of chronology and so could not demonstrate change over time.

8. Poorly answered. Most wrote narratives of main educational landmarks, often muddling the 1870 and 1902 Acts, without much reference to the question. Indeed, the 'use of child labour' was little understood and very few wrote about other factors that resulted in educational reform. It was disappointing that so few candidates saw any links between factory legislation and a rise in school provision by governments.

9. While a number struggled or made no attempt to define *laissez-faire*, most understood when and why it changed to collectivism. Many showed good coverage of the whole period, but were more confident discussing changes than continuity.

The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1992

Very few answers.

The Development of the Mass Media 1896-1996

13. This question was answered reasonably well. Weaker candidates concentrated on merely listing the changes in the mass media and failed to address the key points of the question. The better candidates tried to make the distinction between

entertaining and informing and while some were able to do that reasonably effectively, others struggled to make the distinction clear.

14. This question tended to be answered less well with candidates failing to grasp what was meant by popular culture. This hampered the quality of answers and led to a more general discussion of the impact of the press.

15. Some candidates were able to answer this question reasonably well by focusing on distinct moments of National Crisis and giving some pertinent examples. The better candidates were able to show the importance of the media at these times and how they changed in their perceptions and attitudes. Weaker candidates listed the crises with scant reference to the changing role of the mass media.

The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1919

16. Quite a popular question. Many candidates focused too much on the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars and too little on World War One. Though the Crimean War was discussed in a few essays, more knowledge was shown on Bismarck's organisation of the Prussian army in the 1860s. Some candidates failed to understand the idea of the involvement of government, while others struggled to make the distinction clear between organisation and conduct. Unfortunately few candidates attempted to make comparative and synoptic judgements.

17. Only answered by a few candidates, and not done very well. Knowledge of allies and alliances in wartime was limited, and most candidates preferred to talk about other factors such as the role of generals and the effects of industrialisation. Some answers were very narrative discussing the various alliances at great length.

18. There were several good answers from candidates who countered the influence of industrialisation by arguing in favour of other factors (such as good leadership) but many candidates focused on the impact of technology rather than industrialisation and could not link these developments closely to the winning and losing of wars. The better candidates weighed up the importance of various alliances while recognising that other factors were clearly important in leading to success in war.

The Challenge of German Nationalism 1815-1919

19. 'Assess the reasons' became for many a narrative of the growth of nationalism. Some lost sight of the need to focus on 'growth' and imposed a pre-determined structure that charted 'nationalism from above' and 'nationalism from below'. Only a few offered evaluation of reasons for its development over the whole period.

20. Few candidates compared and contrasted the years following William II's accession with earlier developments in nationalism. Chronological narratives were the preferred means of delivery and there was considerable confusion between nationalism and unification when dealing with the 1850s and 1860s.

21. The key to this question was to identify the aims of German nationalism and assess how and how far they changed. Some candidates had difficulty explaining the differences between liberal, Prussian and *weltpolitik* nationalism and how they evolved. Few demonstrated synoptic skills by cross-referencing various stages of development and the post-1914 era was particularly underplayed.

Russian Dictatorship 1855-1956

22. A popular question but modestly answered. The importance of Alexander II's assassination was generally well understood, although a minority dismissed it in their opening paragraph and a significant number only covered the reigns of Alexander II

and Alexander III. Some candidates had difficulty comparing the assassination with 'other' turning-points in the development of Russian government and chose instead to write about social, economic and political policies across the period.

23. This question produced some very good answers that matched economic developments and other factors to a range of political, legal, economic and social reforms. Many candidates however restricted themselves to assessing motives for economic change and overlooked political reforms, and quite a few saw no distinction between 'reform' and 'change'. Weaker candidates concentrated too much on describing the reforms. War and fear of war were quite well addressed, but fear of unrest and Marxist-Leninist ideology after 1917 were not dealt with effectively. Knowledge of Five Year Plans and Collectivisation seemed vague in several essays.

24. This question produced some very disappointing answers. Only a few defined 'autocracy'. Most ignored 'simply exchanged' and instead described pre- and post-1917 policies. While most looked at similar aspects of autocracy and totalitarianism, only the best analysed their differences within and between regimes. Not many answers considered the Provisional Government or the extent of centralised economic control exercised by Nicholas II, Lenin and Stalin. A number also claimed the concept of autocracy and dictatorship in Russia had no common features.

The Struggle for the Constitution 1763-1877

25. Most candidates were well aware of states' rights issues and assessed them effectively but very few focused on the 'most important constitutional issue', and so failed to introduce ideas on the Presidency and Supreme Court.

26. Candidates described and often comment on the work of Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington and Jackson, but few offered sustained comparisons over the period.

27. The significance of the Missouri Compromise was not clearly understood by some while many failed to go before 1820. The nature of North/South issues was normally well known, but few were able to focus on alternative turning-points.

Civil Rights in the USA 1865-1980

Copied from Newsletter 4 (Winter 2005-2006), p.2

NOTE ABOUT THE CIVIL RIGHTS SPECIFICATION (2005 edn.)

No content has been added. No teaching requirements have been changed: see the statement in the *Specification* p.1. Content paragraph 1 provides background to introduce students to the concept of civil rights so no question is ever set on it.

Teachers asked us to suggest specific examples to consider when thinking about "social groups" and "political agencies" as they introduce students to the concept of civil rights, thereby linking up with the similar background references on the Insert (e.g. *Roe v Wade*). That we have done, and it is all that we have done.

28. Most assessed civil rights with a degree of confidence but 'social and economic rights' proved more elusive. Many candidates assumed that they were identical or ignored them altogether. The stronger candidates were able to link ideas and were able to make the distinctions between the two. The middle years of the period were often thinly covered, candidates jumping from Reconstruction to the 1930s.

29. The least popular of the set and generally not well answered. Many had no clear idea of the concept of 'melting pot' (even though it is identified in the syllabus) and knowledge of Native Americans was often very basic; for instance, few could distinguish between tribes and leaders. Most just listed key events, failing to address the most pertinent part of the question. Post-1945 developments were rarely discussed. Most painted a picture of unrelieved suffering throughout the period.

30. The focus of most answers fell on African American civil rights and few candidates broadened the scope of their answer to include labour rights, Hispanics, Native and Asian Americans. Although many candidates wrote at length on Martin Luther King, the significance of Kennedy and Johnson and what their civil rights legislation entailed was often less assured.

Copied from the June 2005 Report, p.368

INSERT Units 2590-2591

The copy that you use in your teaching may need replacing. Please check it with the text of the INSERT used in the Summer 2005 exams. Amendments and additions suggested by teachers have now been incorporated into various timelines.

INSERTs promote a distinctive approach in teaching and learning, encouraging a 'long view' of continuity and change, and a focus on patterns of development. They offer ideas on possible routes across sub-themes. They suggest points of reference around which to think, looking forwards and backwards over the 100 years.

INSERTs aim also to influence revision in those same directions, encouraging a focus in final preparations on writing essays that investigate a developmental pattern over time or explain a change/development by testing the relative importance of various factors or test the validity of a generalisation about the a given period.

Units 2592-2593 (Independent Investigations)

General Comments for summer 2006

Copied from the June 2005 Report p.379

The role of the teacher

With immediate effect, the ban on teachers reading draft work is removed. Teachers may thus now read material to assist them in the on-going oral advice they give to their students in coursework tutorials – see the new specification pp.134 & 138.

This has been done to bring us into line with other subjects and Boards using examiner-marked A2 Level coursework, having discovered that the rule laid down for OCR History had not been imposed on the examiner-marked coursework for any other subject in any Board.

NB Teachers may still not mark anything, whether research notes or drafts of the Investigation. Written feedback is not permitted.

Copied from Newsletter 4 (Winter 2005-2006), p.4

Submission of Independent Investigations

When submitting Independent Investigations to your examiner for 15 May 2006, please ensure that every candidate has attached to his/her work:

- a) their Coursework Proposal Form, and
- b) the Unit's cover sheet [CCS236 Revised June 2005/CCS2592], properly filled in. Please note: no other coursework forms are required (e.g. CCS155 or CCS160).

Also, please check that each candidate has

- c) stapled everything together, and
- d) not put their Investigation in a folder, plastic wallet or file.

Finally, would teachers please ensure that

- e) the declaration on the Cover Sheet has been signed for every candidate, and
- f) a fully completed Attendance Register is enclosed with the scripts when despatched to your examiner in May.

Please remember that all scripts are couriered from centres by Parcelforce. In summer 2004, some 14 centres posted theirs instead, three of which were lost in the post.

Copied from the June 2005 Report p.389

Board set questions for 2007+: World History – a reminder

As notified in *Newsletter 2* (Winter 2004-2005) p.5, the World History question from 2007 will sometimes have a more particular regional focus, e.g. on the history of Africa or of the Indian sub-continent.

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@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 2006

