

History

Advanced GCE **A2 7835**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS 3835**

Mark Schemes for the Units

January 2007

3835/7835/MS/R/07J

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 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
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 (3835)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Marking Instructions	1
2580	Document Studies 871 – 1099	25
2581	Document Studies 1450 – 1693	41
2582	Document Studies 1774 – 1945	59
2583	English History 1042 – 1660	87
2584	English History 1780 – 1964	135
2585	European History 1046 – 1718	167
2586	European and World History 1789 - 1989	223
2587	Historical Investigations 768 – 1216	271
2588	Historical Investigations 1556 – 1725	291
2589	Historical Investigations 1799 – 1955	319
2590	Themes in History 1066 – 1796	361
2591	Themes in History 1763 – 1996	403
*	Grade Thresholds	446

Marking Instructions

January 2007

Marking Instructions

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.

Marking Instructions

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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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).

Marking Instructions

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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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;

Marking Instructions

Do **not** make:

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

Marking Instructions

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

Marking Instructions

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]

Marking Instructions

- 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.

Marking Instructions

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]*

Marking Instructions

- 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 (ie 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.

Marking Instructions

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 double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.
- The quality of the English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is **NEVER** to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- If a candidate discusses the wrong topic (eg evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II 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 (eg political, religious, social).

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (eg 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 (ie '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.

Marking Instructions

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.

Marking Instructions

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.

DOCUMENT 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

Marking Instructions

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.

Marking Instructions

DOCUMENT 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.

Marking Instructions

- 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.

Marking Instructions

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.

Marking Instructions

- 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.

Marking Instructions

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 (eg 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.

Marking Instructions

- 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.

Marking Instructions

UNITS 2592 & 2593: GENERIC MARK BANDS INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION

NB

- Examiners are reminded that they are looking for the 'best-fit', not a 'perfect fit' [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Examiners should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see History's Marking Instructions #5].
- Candidates must either use and evaluate primary and/or secondary source material relevant to their question, and/or must explain and evaluate interpretations of the topic(s) studied. The importance of this is reflected in the weight given to AO2. Investigations which offer no interpretation or evaluation of sources and/or historical interpretations (ie. they fail completely to address AO2) may not be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The Investigation does not require high-level research or specialist resources (such cannot be expected at Advanced GCE).
- The quality of the English (grammar, punctuation and spelling) is never to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

NOTES (Unit 2592)

1. **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on an historical period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
2. **WORD LIMIT:** The target length is 2,500 words. **The maximum permitted is 3,000 words (excluding only the footnotes & bibliography). If that limit is exceeded, examiners must stop reading at 3,000 words and base their entire assessment on the first 3,000 words offered.** Watch for footnotes that evaluate sources &/or carry on the argument of the Investigation and, intentionally or not, thus circumvent the limit. **If any such footnote text takes the Investigation's total length beyond 3000 words then it must be included in the word-count after all and the excess material must be excluded from the assessment.** In such cases, please write an explanatory note on the front of the script [Do not check the actual length unless you are suspicious].
3. **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY:** Candidates **must use footnotes and provide a bibliography.** No set form or location for either is prescribed; a list at the end is fine. The absence of either or both, or the inadequacy of either or both, must never be the sole criterion to pull an answer into a lower Band, but will be taken into account within the examiner's overall judgement.
4. **HANDWRITTEN INVESTIGATIONS** are valid.

NOTES (UNIT 2593 Open Book Exam)

- 1 Candidates have less time to write-up their Investigation than those who enter Unit 2592, so the following points of difference will be applied:
 - (a) Unit 2593 Investigations will be **shorter** and contain **less supporting detail/fewer examples. The range of evidence** marshalled to support arguments **will be narrower.** That said,
 - (b) **The qualities of evaluation and analysis required will be just the same.**
- 2 **NOTHING pre-768AD:** Investigations must be based on a period from 768 AD. Any ranging before 768AD must be sent to the Principal Examiner.
- 3 **FOOTNOTES & BIBLIOGRAPHY: Footnotes are optional. A bibliography is required.** This may be pre-prepared (typed or hand-written), taken into the exam and attached to the script with a tag.

Marking Instructions

Bands I-VII/90: Essay

I (72-90) The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve in A Level.

Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.

The Investigation uses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically an appropriate (but not necessarily full) range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic which is integrated into the overall approach. The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question** (eg causation, change over time, evaluation). The Investigation reflects a very high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach is consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative.** 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.

At the lower end of the Band, **there may be some weaker sections, but the overall quality still shows that the candidate is in control of the argument.**

The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

II (63–71) **The Investigation uses critically a reasonable range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or discusses critically a range of historical interpretations bearing on the topic.** The response is **focused clearly on the demands of the question but there is more unevenness than in Band I** answers. The Investigation generally reflects a high level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. **The approach is mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer is fully relevant.** Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

III (54–62) **The Investigation uses a range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, but with some significant gaps and possibly with a limited critical sense.** The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt to provide an appropriate argument** and factual knowledge. The Investigation reflects a competent level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach contains analysis or explanation, but there may be some purely descriptive or narrative passages that are not linked directly to analysis or explanation. The answer achieves a genuine argument, but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge.** Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily, but some parts may lack full coherence. **The answer is mostly relevant.** The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate. *Alternative approaches to the chosen question are always possible and examiners must be open to these.*

Marking Instructions

- IV (45–53)** The Investigation uses largely uncritically a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations, and this may be 'bolted-on' to the other material. The response indicates an attempt to argue relevantly. The Investigation reflects an adequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The approach depends more on descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions.** 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 (36–44)** The Investigation refers to a limited range of primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. These may be poorly understood and used uncritically, and may be 'bolted-on' to the other material. The responses offers some elements of an appropriate answer, but there is little attempt to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The Investigation reflects a very basic level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **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 argument.** The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer 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 (19–35)** The Investigation refers only occasionally, and without any critical evaluation, to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations. The response is **not properly focused on the requirements of the question.** The Investigation reflects an inadequate level of ability in organising and presenting an extended argument. **The argument will be of very limited relevance and there may well be confusion about the implications of the question.** There may be many unsupported assertions or a commentary which lacks sufficient factual support. **The answer may lack coherence as an extended essay, being largely fragmentary** and perhaps incoherent. The Investigation may rely heavily on a 'scissors and paste' approach. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-18)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt to meet any of the demands** of the Unit. There is **no reference to primary and/or secondary sources and/or interpretations.** There is **no attempt to discuss any of the key issues in 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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY

January 2007

Unit 2580/01 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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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.

GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2580-2582

AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

- In Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- 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.
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin answers **without an introduction**.
- The quality of English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to use a lower Band.
- Glosses in [] exist to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme.” (*Code of Practice 2005*, #4.17).

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

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

- I (18-20) The response provides a genuine comparison and/or contrast about most of the qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. Areas of agreement and/or disagreement are discussed. The argument shows judgement. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- [‘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 (15-17) 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 (12-14) 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 (9-11)** The response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comments are largely sequential and with few points of internal analysis or discussion of similarities and/or differences. The answer is largely relevant. The organisation of the answer is limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

[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 (6-8)** 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 (3-5)** 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 (0-2)** The response is extremely limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There is no attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The answer is irrelevant. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Question (b)

BAND/40: Context

- Answers using Sources but no own knowledge may not be put in Bands I or II.
- Answers using own knowledge but no Sources may not be put in Bands I to III.

I (36-40) The answer contains a good balance between analysis of all four Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge which is used appropriately and effectively in relation to the question. (This independent knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.) There is a clear judgement on the question. There may be some indication about the limitations of the Sources or what may be required to add to their completeness and explanatory power. The strongest answers **may** offer views on the general consistency and completeness of the Sources as a set, as well as individually, but this is **not** a pre-requisite for Band I.

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

II (30-35) 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 (24-29) 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 (17-23) The response shows a clear imbalance between source analysis and use of independent ('own') knowledge. These aspects are not linked effectively into an argument. The Sources are discussed sequentially; a basic argument is provided, but overall judgement on the question is very limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

*['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 (11-16) 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 (ie rather than for analysis and evaluation of the argument). Judgement will be skeletal if present at all]*

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

The Reign of Alfred the Great 871-899.**1(a) Study Sources A and C****Compare these Sources as evidence for Alfred's concerns for the welfare of his people.****[20]**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 provenances offer points of comparison: Source A comes from the king himself and reflects his highly involved role while Source C comes from his well-known biographer, offering a favourable but not necessarily partial or distorted view. The language of A is rather insistent and driven; that of C is more measured yet reflecting a ruler heavily involved in worldly affairs. They are aimed at somewhat different audiences: Source A at the clergy; Source C at a more general, but literate audience. Both Sources convey a sense of concern. In Source A this seems very personalised urgent and insistent while, in Source C, Asser records a king closely involved in justice. In Source A, Alfred is the translator and his audience is evidently the literate and powerful, both churchmen and laymen while in Source C the recipients of his concern for good justice are the ordinary people. In Source A the availability of the outcome of his work as a translator is vital to the king and, by implication, to the kingdom while in Source C the outcome of his actions as a 'painstaking judge' are to bring 'truth' and show 'care of the poor'. There is a link between Sources C and A: the 'common good' is important and the nobles are too worldly; they need the benefits of the type of translation work undertaken in Source A.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Alfred was motivated primarily by providing for the religious needs of his people.

[40]

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 address well the proposition here, 'primarily' offering the chance to argue that other motivational factors were involved. All the Sources refer to religious and educational issues while Source D indicates other concerns, military and political. Source D provides several alternatives and provides an overview, with its views on the ideas behind Kingship, the role of Christianity, religion and education but also its reference to Alfred's pragmatism and the awareness of the wider needs of society. That can be linked to the concern for the poor shown in Source C. The 'systematic programme of instruction' mentioned in Source D can be linked to Sources A and B with those Sources as examples of that programme. Here, own knowledge can be used to support: Alfred translated four major works and set up what has been described as a 'palace school' to educate and inform the political and religious elite. Sources A and B together point to the importance of the king's work as a translator and to his sense of the context to that work (unrest, Viking attacks, distractions from invaders and indeed his own health problems). Both Sources reflect a sense of urgency as well as a sense of priority. Source C has some indirect links to Sources A and B; Source C reaches out to all ranks of society in its demonstration of Alfred's very active kingship but puts across something of a condemnation of the nobility ('nearly all the nobles ... more to worldly than to spiritual affairs'). The religious content involved directly seen in Sources A, B and D, more indirectly it is a motive in Source C. But non-religious factors are present, too: military and political factors are touched upon in Source D; Source D suggests a wider concept of kingship beyond the purely religious; legal concerns feature in Source C. Own knowledge can be used to support and illustrate. Reference might be made to the broad context to Alfred's kingship, to the idea of an 'Alfredian Renaissance', to the gathering together of scholars from Mercia, Wales and the Continent, to the developments in government through the 880s and into the 890s as Alfred's position became more secure, to the widespread evidence of a desire to instruct and improve the learning and service of ecclesiastics and lay officials (thegns, reeves) alike. Instruction was important and with it a proper sense of reverence, obedience, God's ruler on earth, properly constituted authority and the service of God and king. Alfred's capacity as an all-round king, operating on several levels and several fronts (captured in part in Source D) would be a useful evaluative area.

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 Normans in England 1066-87**2(a) Study Sources A and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the purpose of the Domesday Book as a record of changes after 1066. [20]

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 provenances can be compared thus: Source A is English and may offer some distortion, even possible bias, in its appraisal, the language being helpful to evaluation; Source C is much more neutral and more factual in content. Source A sets out a wide spectrum of information that is to be gathered, detailed and close examination is required, while Source C reflects something of the scope of enquiries. It has a heavy emphasis upon money and this may be exaggerated, of course. In Source C, there is reference to lands and tenure, the people on lands, the values of the lands, the manorial system as well as claims to lands and disputes; evidence is gathered about these disputes. The disputes arise from the pace and scale of post-1066 changes as well as the King's desire to assert the maximum control over lands and rights to those lands. Source A mentions the gathering of information, including land values as well as tenurial changes. The two Sources indicate a diversity of approaches to gathering information about the changes since 1066 and they reflect a diversity of information returned to the Domesday commissioners. They reflect a range of purposes such as elements of political control in Source A and the assertion of legal-tenurial claims and controls in Source C. Contextual knowledge may be used (here, for example, about the orders given for the Domesday Survey or the types of information collected from so many areas) but none is required even for Band I.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Domesday Book was primarily intended to serve William I's military needs. [40]

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 address 'primarily...military needs' and argue for and against the proposition, embracing some other factors. Source D provides quite a detailed overview: it cites a military purpose and context to the Domesday Survey: it mentions a record of tenurial and territorial changes, of fiscal information ('rateable values') and it states that the Survey was planned, to reflect the wide interests of the government. Sources A, B and C can be linked to Source D by way of illustrations of these points though B and D have more of a military dimension while A and C reflect other issues. Source A points to a variety of needs being met by a Survey. Source B, from a reliable Anglo-Norman source, links to military needs and mentions revenue (as does Source A). Source C gives examples of the types of information gathered up, pointing to pleas over false claims to lands. Sources A and D and parts of B and C all mention wealth as a key factor. But Sources B and D point to a military purpose and this can be linked to the context of the threat of a serious invasion and to the Great Oath of 1086; Source C mentions 'men-at-arms'; Source D mentions 'quartering of mercenaries'. In addition, Source C reflects tenurial changes and parts of Sources A and D mention new landholders and the needs of information about such changes. Own knowledge can be used and, though this is not a prerequisite, there may be some broad sense of the debate over the purposes and roles of Domesday Book. There is argument as to whether it served the purpose of a tenurial and territorial record, a type of land register, or whether it was designed to be a geld book, listing values for taxable purposes. The links to the prevailing (Danish) invasion threat and to the Great Oath of Salisbury (1086) are important. Clearly, amongst other roles, Domesday Book served the purpose of recording proprietorial changes linked to the assertion of royal authority and feudal lordship. It remains an immensely valuable indicator of tenurial and territorial changes, both before and above all after the c.1071-2 watershed, with much evidence of the redistribution of estates, changes in landed wealth ('waste' features prominently in some areas of the kingdom) and the personnel and resources making up landed estates. That said, military needs, within a new feudal-tenurial context, were of significance.

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 First Crusade and its Origins 1073-99**3(a) Study Sources A and B****Compare these Sources as evidence for the threat posed by the Turkish forces in 1098.****[20]**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 provenances offer these areas of comparison: Source A comes from a crusader, Christian perspective and sets out the level of confrontation with the Turkish forces and their leader while Source B is a Muslim author who actually offers a balanced, impartial view of the threat posed by the Turks under Kerbuqa. That view needs emphasis given the authorship. The contents of the two Sources convey something of the nature and magnitude of the Turkish threat. In Source A the Turkish forces are able to lay siege, they have a fierce leader and pose a diverse threat, religious, military and territorial; Source B reinforces the sense of power and reputation of Kerbuqa and his forces. But Source B presents a different picture, no matter the power of the Turkish threat, when it mentions that Kerbuqa could not rally all Muslim forces, that he alienated some and, ultimately, his forces were defeated. Thus, though Source A tells us much about the threat, Source B indicates that the threat had inherent weaknesses and was capable of being defeated. The tone and language used in each Source could be commented upon.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all the Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the success of the crusaders in 1098-99 was mainly because their divisions were less serious than those of their Muslim opponents. [40]

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 assess 'mainly' and the argument and counter-argument surrounding the proposition as to the levels of internal division, likely to be set, if briefly, against other factors. They will need to consider both Muslim divisions and Christian, assessing the relative extent of each. Sources A and B can be taken together with their emphasis upon the threats posed to the crusaders at Antioch but also the demonstrations of the weaknesses experienced by the enemy forces. The ever-present threat of further attacks by Muslim forces is also found in Source D (the Egyptian army). Sources C and D are linked by their evidence of internal crusader divisions and splits; quarrels are featured but so, too, the rank-and-file play their part in galvanising the leadership and in Source D religious fervour plays a key role. The contents of Source C are useful for the nature of crusader differences. Evidently, there were major problems in a hostile environment and the crusaders did well to survive in the numbers they did and to succeed in their aims, not least the capture of Jerusalem. Own knowledge can be used to develop the scale of problems. The troubles with the Byzantine Empire might be adduced, for instance. The Sources point to some reasons why the crusaders found success: religious zeal in Sources A and D; military focus in Source B; the sense of unanimity in the rank-and-file in Source C and the preparedness of their leaders to be united in the face of extreme adversity in Sources C and D. Own knowledge can be used to support and illustrate. Examples might embrace, for instance, the events at Antioch and Jerusalem, not least the religious experiences and sense of miracle; the determination and military prowess of key leaders (eg Bohemond, Raymond, Godfrey); the ability to adapt military strategy and tactics, not least the use of cavalry and archers; siege techniques; the divisions of their enemies (Shi'ites and Sunnites, Turks and Egyptians, Aleppo and Damascus) preventing mass resistance to their progress. The balance between crusader divisions and those of their opponents needs assessment. Candidates might also (briefly) allude to other factors such as whether it was religious zeal, luck or strong leadership at crucial junctures that led to overall success.

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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY

January 2007

Unit 2581/01 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 Centre 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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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 marks must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 avoid 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.

GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2580-2582

AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

- In Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- 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.
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin answers **without an introduction**.
- The quality of English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to use a lower Band.
- Glosses in [] exist to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the mark scheme.” (*Code of Practice* 2005, #4.17).

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

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

- I (18-20) The response provides a genuine comparison and/or contrast about most of the qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. Areas of agreement and/or disagreement are discussed. The argument shows judgement. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

[‘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 (15-17) 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 (12-14) 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 (9-11)** The response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comments are largely sequential and with few points of internal analysis or discussion of similarities and/or differences. The answer is largely relevant. The organisation of the answer is limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

[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 (6-8)** 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 (3-5)** 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 (0-2)** 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.

The Wars of the Roses 1450-85**1(a) Study Sources A and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for Warwick's relations with Edward IV from 1461 to 1470.

[20]

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 are useful because they show how relations between Edward and Warwick changed from close alliance to outright hostility. Source A records some of the grants made not only to Warwick but also to his relatives between 1461 and 1465, showing the close relationship at that time. Source C by contrast shows Warwick taking the lead, along with Clarence, in overthrowing Edward and restoring Henry VI. The difference between the two Sources arises from their dates: the change in relationship is usually ascribed to the Woodville marriage in 1464, which is not mentioned in these Sources but is well known to candidates. 'As evidence', it can be pointed out that both Sources are from official records, but of very different types. Source A is a factual record of grants which can be interpreted as showing the exercise of royal patronage in favour of the Nevilles. Source C, a record kept by the Mayor of Coventry, appears to be factual and provides no evidence of bias. Edward and Henry are both called King with no suggestion that in either case this was false. Presumably the Mayor is well informed about these events since the Source records that Warwick actually came to Coventry.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that, in his first reign (1461-70), Edward IV failed to solve the political problems facing the Yorkist monarchy in 1461. **[40]**

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, including 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 D provides a good starting point for outlining the problems Edward faced: Lancastrian resistance (with Henry VI still at liberty as a potential figurehead), restoring order, re-establishing the authority and the finances of the monarchy. Source C supports the proposition as it describes Edward's flight and the readeption of Henry VI. Source D also refers to the readeption but plays down its significance as temporary. The main argument of Source D (the overview of a modern historian), however, is that Edward was largely successful. Source B also points to success in solving many of the problems Edward faced, explaining how Edward overcame Lancastrian resistance by capturing castles, beheading rebel magnates and finally capturing Henry VI. Source A may be interpreted as supporting the view in D that Edward used confiscated lands astutely. On the other hand, candidates may argue that A shows that Edward was at first over-generous towards Warwick, thereby creating future problems for himself. What none of the Sources mentions explicitly is the Woodville marriage, though D alludes to it indirectly by denying that Edward allowed the Woodvilles to dominate him. This is the most obvious piece of own knowledge which can be brought to bear on the question, though candidates can also use own knowledge to develop some of the points made by Source D, eg foreign interference. Candidates will have to make their own judgment as to whether the successes referred to in B and D are outweighed by the fact of Edward's overthrow in 1470, or whether this is best regarded as a temporary blip (as Carpenter suggests).

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 German Reformation 1517-30

2(a) Study Sources A and C. Compare Sources A and C as evidence for reactions to unrest in the period 1524-25. [20]

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.

There are clear differences between the content of the Sources. In Source A Luther is seen by a leading Catholic as socially disruptive, using popular grievances against the merchants to arouse hostility to the princes. Candidates might also comment on the fact that Luther's book was written in German to gain wide publicity. It can be used as evidence of the reactions both of Luther and of a leading Catholic. Source C provides different dimensions. There is reference to religious issues in the attack on the Catholic mass, Catholic churches and images. There is also a political aspect inasmuch as the rioters were accused of betraying the Empire and the Source also mentions the peasants. The reaction of the authorities is harsh punishment; there was a perceived threat to the Empire and fear of a dangerous alliance between townspeople and peasants. The provenance of the extract (an anonymous writer) is more uncertain than Source A's but the facts that are recorded are probably accurate as such.

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 sections.

Answers in **Band IV** will be largely descriptive and sequential. Any comparison will mostly be implicit. Much may be only 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 and will use only one Source.

(b) Study all the Sources. Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Luther was mostly responsible for the outbreak of disorder in Germany. [40]

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, including 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 strongly. Luther exploited popular animosity against merchants to widen social disorder against the social hierarchy of princes. Source B contradicts the claim. Luther energetically criticises rebellious peasants. The first of the 'terrible sins' is based directly on the issue of social disorder. The two others support this from different angles. Source C is a narrative but is useful as an account of the violence in southern Germany. It supports the claim in the Question because it refers to attacks on Catholics. Source D gives support to some extent but it widens the argument. The Free Cities offer conditional loyalty to the Emperor but this is not directly based on Lutheranism. The end of the extract does refer to religious problems but does not directly blame Luther for the problem. One can expect the most successful answers to group the sources. The sequential discussion of Sources is not the best approach in answers to Question (b) in this Unit unless it coincides with 'grouping'. In this case, the sequence A - D will probably not be the best approach but examiners should be open to alternative explanations. The relevant Content in the specification mentions 'The effects of Lutheranism on German princes, knights, towns and peasants'. In using their own knowledge, candidates can be expected to focus on the Peasants' Revolt. This will be acceptable for **Band I** but high credit should be given to arguments that widen this. For example, the Catholic authorities saw the potential for disorder before 1524. Other groups linked their causes to Luther, eg the knights, but they had their own grievances. Charles V's imperial power was too limited to prevent disorder.

Answers in **Bands I and II** will strike a reasonable balance between all of 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 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.

Mid-Tudor Crises 1540-58**3 (a) Study Sources A and B**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems facing Edward VI's government in introducing religious change. [20]

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 come from rival camps (Catholic rebels and a committed protestant bishop) so their overlap indicates genuine problems facing the Edwardian regime. Both indicate opposition which needs to be overcome: Source A is written by religious conservatives, Catholic certainly, and unhappy with aspects of the Henrician Reformation, such the vernacular Bible (item 5). They condemn the new prayer book (item 3) and many other aspects of the early Edwardian reformation. Source B indicates the threat from more radical protestants, the Anabaptists, whose teachings need refuting. But both Sources also indicate that the clergy are another problem: Source A item 5 implies that traditional clergy are active in the South-West and perhaps elsewhere; while Hooper would not have needed to issue his injunctions, on some of the basic tenets of Edwardian protestantism, were the clergy already expounding them throughout Gloucester diocese. One of these doctrines, prayers for dead, is explicitly defended by the Western Rebels. So there is some overlap, here, though the targets are different. Source A also identifies a problem of language peculiar to the outlying areas of the realm: that Cornish speakers do not understand English (a similar problem was encountered in Wales).

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the religious changes of Edward VI's reign amounted to a complete Protestant Reformation. [40]

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, including 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 need to provide a working definition for 'a complete Protestant Reformation' in the course of their answers: one might be a dramatic and irreversible set of religious changes, both at official and popular level. The official changes are conveniently listed in Source C which in Cheke's view amount to an extraordinary set of reforms; he might, though he doesn't, use the phrase 'complete Protestant Reformation'. Sources A, B and D consider their popular impact: for the Western Rebels in Source A, they constitute a very serious threat to their religious observance, leading them to take up arms, chiefly in defence of the old religion. Source B suggests how key doctrines should be disseminated locally, through the preaching clergy, though how often this happened is not indicated in the source (and we know that Gloucestershire was not well-stocked with either preachers or committed protestant clergy); the late date, 1552, points to how much still needed to be done. No religious or at least doctrinal revolution had yet happened on the ground in this part of England. This is powerfully reinforced by Source D's view that the Edwardian reformation did not develop popular roots. Candidates can develop other lines, such as the transformation of church interiors (hinted at in Source C), the final removal of the chantries, the formulation of the 42 Articles, the reversibility of these reforms under Mary, and so on. So there is much to debate here, for and against the proposition.

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 English Civil War 1637-49**4 (a) Study Sources B and C****Compare these Sources as evidence for divisions between King and Parliament in January 1642.****[20]**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 are reliable, as contemporary statements by the King and by one of his opponents, though this can be taken as representative, since it summarised the parliamentarian reading of the episode. The two Sources in fact complement each other as two different accounts of the same event, which allow us to understand the rival viewpoints of the King and his critics. Most of the divisions are also expressed in much the same language: each accuses the other of undermining the law and 'fundamental' rights; in particular, each sees the other attacking Parliament. There are differences, of course, and these can be spelt out – especially the King's belief that his regal authority is being sapped, and his reputation damaged.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Irish Rebellion was the main cause of Civil War in 1642. [40]

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, including 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 D offers powerful support for the importance of the Irish Rebellion, which can be explained first by the massacre of protestants there but also by the threat to protestantism in England as well as in Ireland. The fact that English Catholics support the King implies that protestantism was not safe in his hands. The rebellion also intersected with existing tensions over evil counsel, which surfaces in Sources A and D: could the King be trusted with an army (Source D) or should it be conditional on a change of royal counsellors (Source A). The second point in Source B alludes to this accusation of 'evil counsel'. The character of the King is clearly another factor: his 'arbitrary' behaviour in the attempted arrest of five MPs (Source C) and his unyielding opposition to his parliamentary critics (Source D) and his association with Catholics (also Source D). Equally, Source B indicates that Charles I believed that his regal authority was on the line, so for him the stakes could not be higher. Candidates can draw on their own knowledge to introduce other factors, such as the controversy over the militia which, as Source D intimates, arose directly out of the Irish Rebellion; also puritan frustration at the absence of a godly religious settlement, and Charles' frustration at the lack of a financial settlement.

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.

Louis XIV's France 1661-1693**5(a) Study Sources B and C. How far does Source C challenge Source B as evidence for royal taxation policy in France? [20]**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 paints an encouraging picture. Taxes were reduced but the income to the crown was actually greater. Colbert explains this by reference to Louis XIV's authority and public respect for him. Colbert evidently believes that the fiscal system has become more efficient, benefiting the King and his subjects. Source C is very different. It describes an inequitable and inefficient fiscal system which is at the mercy of tax farmers. There is a slight but not significant difference in the dates of the extracts (1670 and 1675) which might be noted. Provenance might be examined. Colbert was a leading minister which might have exaggerated the success of the tax system although his reports are usually quite reliable appraisals. The fact that he mentions specific figures adds to the accuracy of his claims. Locke was an outsider but is not necessarily unreliable. The system that he describes is quite an accurate portrayal. Good candidates might consider that both are true. Colbert did increase the King's income although the system was still inefficient.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources. Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that from 1664 to 1692, Louis XIV's policies were disastrous for the French economy. [40]

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, including 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.

Louis XIV in Source A promises policies that will benefit the French economy. The policies themselves intend to promote trade and increase prosperity. The extract does not say how far or how effectively the policies were implemented and candidates might use their own knowledge to assess their success. Colbert, in Source B, paints an optimistic picture. In spite of the inefficiencies of the system, the minister is confident of prosperity that will benefit King and France generally. He refers to 'the King's immense authority and the respect that the people have for his authority'. Sources C and D point to different conclusions. Source C can be used to show an inefficient system that ground down the peasantry. Candidates might use their own knowledge of the system of tax farming and the condition of the peasantry to assess Locke's description. Source D also refers to tax farmers but widens the explanation ('poverty of the people, the decay of trade, the emigration of the Protestants... the waste of manpower in the wars) but it indicates some other explanation of the economic problems for which the King could not be held responsible. Natural disasters were beyond Louis XIV's control. In using their other knowledge, candidates might consider the King's extravagance and his lack of interest in trade but the sources alone (especially Source D) give sufficient opportunity for expansion from other knowledge. They might consider how far Louis actually showed a commitment to economic affairs that is apparent in Source A. Examiners will note the comparatively limited time available to candidates and will therefore be realistic in their expectations of the scope of other knowledge.

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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY Unit 2582 January 2007
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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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.

GENERIC MARK BANDS

Units 2580-2582

AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

- In Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- 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.
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin answers **without an introduction**.
- The quality of English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to use a lower Band.
- Glosses in [] exist to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the markscheme.” (*Code of Practice 2005*, #4.17).

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

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

- I (18-20) The response provides a genuine comparison and/or contrast about most of the qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. Areas of agreement and/or disagreement are discussed. The argument shows judgement. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- [‘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 (15-17) 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 (12-14) 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 (9-11)** The response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comments are largely sequential and with few points of internal analysis or discussion of similarities and/or differences. The answer is largely relevant. The organisation of the answer is limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

[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 (6-8)** 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 (3-5)** 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 (0-2)** 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.

1 The Origins of the French Revolution 1774-92

(a) Study Sources A and B. Compare these Sources as evidence for position of the middle classes in France by 1789.

[20]

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 agree that the nobility dominate all the important elements of public life; B refers to church and army, as does A – A mentions government office, B mentions judiciary. B is more conspiratorial with the nobles supporting each other. Both mention the frustrations of the middle class (A that despite education middle class citizens do not get just rewards; B that though the middle class is everything it is nothing in the political order). A stresses education, and while B does not, the demands it makes do accord with a more educated class. With hindsight, A says this will be fatal for the nobles; B does not.

In terms of authorship, A is written in hindsight by an aristocrat, not a radical as his support for Louis in 1791 shows, but who has seen the consequences of the inequality. B is from one of the leaders of the Third Estate in 1789 and this is a pamphlet urging action, not memoirs reflecting on the consequences of inaction. This author is not looking back, but playing a leading role in the development of the Revolution. A is reflecting on inequalities which brought about the fall of the established order; B is trying to engineer political change.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the main cause of the Revolution in 1789 was social conflict. [40]

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, including 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 agree that social conflict was important, but not what that social conflict was, but this is unlikely to be the main line that candidates take, – A and B stress middle class discontents; C stresses peasant hardships; D raises the possibility of a failing monarchy and discontented masses and does not put all the blame on class struggle – the failings of the King are mentioned. The debate is whether middle class and peasant grievances could have been contained- hence D's reference to political failure - and met without there necessarily being a revolution or whether social and economic tensions were too great and the situation by 1789 had become revolutionary. Most candidates are likely to balance social factors against others, eg economic, financial, political, etc.

A refers to an educated middle class (added knowledge might link this to more political awareness, reading enlightened authors). Despite this education and personal merit they were excluded from many areas of the state (there might be knowledge of aristocratic dominance of church or armed forces or privileged blocking of reforms). This source, of course does have hindsight – there is a view that the reforming ministers were aware of problems and France was changing and there was not complete political failure.

B is from a famous pamphlet and was influential in encouraging the Third Estate to assert itself – some might link this to the Tennis Court Oath and the demands for fairer representation in the Estates General and to the political failure to meet demands in 1789. It is a polemic rather than a considered judgement by one deeply involved in political ambition. However it does link with the view of a frustrated bourgeoisie in A.

C refers to more class discontent – envy of rich peasants, hatred of noble landowners and local officials; there is also direct economic discontent. Some may link this to the particularly bad economic conditions 1787-9 which observers like Young saw; some may question whether this was typical of the ancient regime as a whole. Some may point to the circumstances in which the cahiers were drawn up. Some might see political failure to deal adequately with peasant grievances.

D introduces a wider context for these grievances and the references to the king blocking progress may lead to knowledge of the failure to support reformers' programmes and failure to take advantage of the Estates General to introduce wider reforms. The intellectual ferment could be discussed – but could be linked to middle class frustrations and ambitions. The problems of the masses could also be discussed and set against middle class discontent. Some may argue that the nobles themselves, far from simply blocking change were dangerously proposing it. There is considerable scope for own knowledge of allied or alternative causes here.

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 Condition of England 1832-53

(a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these sources as evidence for workhouse conditions under the New Poor Law of 1834. [20]

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 very useful as evidence, one a very graphic account of brutal moments, the other a follow up to an inspection that was unhappy with some of the 'kinder' aspects in a London workhouse. A is an obvious piece of propaganda with exaggerated language, tone and graphics (punishment, lashes, impossible hours of work and, a key fear of the poor, the selling of bodies). It demonstrates what opponents of '1834' thought occurred. B is pro 1834, Chadwick himself, and is concerned to set standards. Its proposals and criticisms reveal a different set of conditions. The differing dates here are not of any particular relevance other than A, 1837 being the moment of northern imposition.

There is some agreement on dirt and the lack of ventilation (no windows in A) but otherwise the differences are more striking. There is a brutal order in A whilst B appears more relaxed. A, deliberately, portrays a 'Bastille' where inmates are overworked, underfed and with the same standards applied to all - young, old, male and female. Terrible punishments regulate activity (lashes, hanging on rafters). B allows comforts (extra food, fires in the female wards, own clothes and no strict dietary). Chadwick however, in B, is suggesting a third type of workhouse – his intended 1834 model which is stricter than St. Luke's but not the exaggerated and chaotic workhouse of the poster. He wants a proper diet, uniform and sexual segregation. B may be the better evidence – it shows aspects of the New Law but not the strict Chadwick model or the immiserated Bastille portrayed in what was probably an Anti-Poor Law League poster. However, in terms of audience and contemporary fears the image of the poster, more widespread, may have been more extensively fixed in the popular imagination (Andover, Oliver Twist etc).

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.

(b) Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the critics of the New Poor Law were successful in their opposition to the New Poor Law of 1834. [40]

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, including 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.

All the evidence is from the 1837-44 period. The New Law was swinging into action in the North from 1837, although in the South it had largely been imposed. The poster (A), the 1842 Order C(i) and Day (D) all suggest that the Anti-Poor Law movement was, in part, successful, especially in the North, Wales and the West Midlands. The poster (A) is a very telling piece of anti-Poor Law propaganda. It played on key fears, it suggests the system was swamped (it was in the North), its images are emotive with effective dialogue. One can assume it was much reproduced. Own knowledge could extend this with reference to Dietaries, Punishment lists, the Andover Scandal and *Oliver Twist*, another fictional account. It is likely to encourage opposition. The 1842 Order C(i) clearly demonstrates that the Poor Law Commission itself was aware that the New Law was not working properly and is making concessions allowing outdoor relief, ½ in kind. It is reliable evidence for compromise as the official reaction (and interestingly clings to the fig leaf that the workhouse and indoor relief remained ‘the most effectual remedy’). Candidates could extend this in relation to the earlier 1838 Order which began concessions, some considerable (in Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire). Day in D provides evidence of why the opposition often succeeded. A sympathiser with the New Law and an Assistant Commissioner, experience has led him to give up and he refers to the local Guardians who opposed him, the impracticality of sudden imposition, the loopholes that could and were, exploited (Doctors willing to sign medical certificates to circumvent indoor relief). This is particularly useful evidence as he is clearly on the receiving end, he has sympathy both with the New Law and with those who opposed it and is fed up with the inactivity of the London Commissioners. The picture is one of concessions on outdoor relief as the 1844 Order C(i) refers to labour tests and work.

However the 1844 Order C(ii) and Chadwick’s letter (B) suggests ultimate failure by critics of the New Law. Despite concessions in 1838 and 1842, perhaps understandable during the height of the great Victorian depression, the Commission by 1844 in C(ii) is clearly prohibiting outdoor relief. The government was not prepared to repeal ‘1834’ but only delay its full rigours. An administrative order, this is good evidence as to intent, if not success. Chadwick in B is better here as he is keen to keep the pressure up for the type of workhouse (less eligibility) that was the basis of a deterrent system. However, as evidence, it does not tell us whether the St. Luke’s Guardians acted upon the inspection and Chadwick’s chiding.

Either stance could be extended by own knowledge of the Anti-Poor Law League, the administrative problems of the Commission, the Andover Scandal etc. Such knowledge, in combination with the sources, could produce a more nuanced response based on geography – that in the North and Wales, sympathetic manufacturers and officials, the Short Time Committees, attacks on workhouses, pressure on Guardians, meetings, demos, mass petitions and an organised and militant working class could prevent effective implementation for quite a long time. Using Christian values and exposing an uncaring ideology that trampled the Christian rights of the poor (source A) they could mobilise whole communities. However, the great depression and the onset of Chartism did siphon off opposition post 1838.

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 Italian Unification 1848-70

(a) Study Sources A and B

Compare these Sources as evidence for Garibaldi's role in the military campaigns in Sicily in 1860. [20]

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.

Some candidates may place greater emphasis on the similarities or the differences or both depending on their interpretation of the content of the sources. Clearly, Source A focuses on one action only whereas Source B is a comment on the campaign in general terms. Nonetheless, Calatafimi was representative of the campaign in many ways and was the key to final victory. It could be argued that both sources emphasise the central role of Garibaldi. In Source A he 'pressed ahead' whilst others fell beside him and in Source B he is shown to the fore and fills the centre of the cartoon. In both sources Garibaldi is portrayed as a warrior wielding his sword over his right shoulder. He is also depicted as super human, almost a deity. The differences are considerable, however. Source A makes it clear Garibaldi was dependent on others in his army who made a valuable contribution to victory: it was one of the gunners who inspired the final rally when Garibaldi may have lost heart. This is in stark contrast to Source B which suggests military victory was won by Garibaldi alone. Furthermore, it is implicit in the detail and tenor of Source A that the Neapolitans clearly offered strong resistance whereas in Source B the flight of Francis II suggests that the Neapolitans failed to stand and fight.

Comments on the provenance would be helpful. Source A might be dismissed as less than reliable by some candidates who argue that as the author was one of the Thousand he was favourably disposed to Garibaldi which would account for the hyperbole of the description. However, a more discerning evaluation might suggest that the author was merely stating the facts that Garibaldi was welcomed and that the battle was a close run thing. The timing of Source B is clearly important in explaining the impression it conveys. By mid-June Garibaldi had captured Palermo and was in effective control of the island. In addition, it could be argued that the British were favourably inclined to Garibaldi for achieving the defeat of a regime that most in England regarded as odious.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Garibaldi's expedition of 1860 was intended to achieve the freedom of Sicily rather than the unification of Italy.

[40]

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, including 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.

Some sources can be used to show that the expedition was a means to achieve the liberation of Sicily and some to achieve the unification of Italy. Sources B and D suggest that the freedom of Sicily was the objective. The very title of the cartoon is explicit as are the words on Garibaldi's shield. In addition, the figure of Sicily in Source B is chained and blindfolded indicating that Garibaldi's purpose was to release the island from bondage and to expel the repressive ruler (portrayed as a demonic figure). Candidates could reinforce these points by explaining that Garibaldi was responding to the revolution that had broken out in Sicily (he was not initiating it) and comments on the repressive tyranny of Francis II would be appropriate. There is no hint in the cartoon that the issues at stake ran beyond the objective of liberation. Source D serves to reinforce the notions covered in Source B but develops them further. 'D' implies that Garibaldi is there to support these rather than the pursuit of 'Italia'. The interests of particular social groups are explained rather than Sicily treated as one uniform whole. As such it is clear that selfish, rather than national, interests were the priority. Candidates should be able to elaborate on the concerns of each group mentioned: the peasants wanted relief from the feudal system; the idea of independence suggests separation from the mainland which had been the objective of Sicilians in 1848/9, and the middle classes were anxious to remove Neapolitan office holders. Furthermore, the reference to the vagueness of the objectives of many revolutionaries and their ignorance of *Italia* might be supported by knowledge of the strength of regionalism, local tradition, difference of language and so on. Indeed, the suggestion implicit in the final line is that nationalism was merely a convenience to cover more local aspirations.

However, Sources A and C can be paired to argue that Garibaldi's expedition was intended to achieve the unification of Italy. There are two key references in Source A that candidates should exploit. The fact that Garibaldi 'assumed the dictatorship of Sicily' implies that Francis II was merely replaced, not that Sicily was freed, and the idea that this was done 'in the name of Italy' confirms that the objective was more the unification of Italy than the liberation of Sicily. The final line of Source A also hints at the nationalist agenda of the Garibaldini who were fighting for 'our country'. Candidates should have sufficient knowledge to expand on these points. Mention might be made of the composition of the Thousand (northerners), the most recent events which had resulted in the unity of Piedmont, Lombardy, Emilia and Tuscany and the fact that Source A declares that Garibaldi was acting on behalf of Victor Emmanuel. Source C explains that the conquest of Sicily was merely the first step of a plan to annex Naples and Rome and to free Venice with the intention of linking them to the other possessions of Victor Emmanuel. A key line in Source C is that Garibaldi 'feels it is his duty to unite Italy'. Candidates can add their knowledge to this explaining how Garibaldi crossed the Straits of Messina and processed north, taking Naples, defeating the Neapolitans at the River Volturno and subsequently handing over his conquests to Victor Emmanuel at Teano, 26 October 1860. The reference to Rome might also be picked on. Cavour's reaction to Garibaldi's advance - when he despatched an army from the north to prevent Garibaldi marching into the Patrimony of Rome - and Garibaldi's attempts in 1862 and 1867 to take Rome might be explained. The reference to Venice and Nice could be used to demonstrate Garibaldi's commitment to the unification of the whole peninsula and candidates might explain his involvement in the war of 1866 and the reasons for his

interest in Nice. Garibaldi's loyalty to the King can be cited as proof of his desire to unite Italy.

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 Origins of the American Civil War 1848-61**(a) Study Sources A and D****Compare these Sources as evidence for opinions on the raid on Harper's Ferry in 1859.****[20]**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 claims that the raid was part of a bigger conspiracy to end slavery by military force from the North. This implies secret backing, or at least, connivance, from official sources in the north, as is indicated by the suggestion that the solution is for the South to have its own government controlling its own armed forces. Source D denies that the raid had anything to do with the Republican Party, thus denying official backing for the enterprise. Lincoln appears to regard the raid as a foolish attempt by a few extremists to provoke a slave revolt. The provenance of the two Sources explains their different accounts. Source A offers no evidence to support its charge and there is no reason to think the journalist will have direct knowledge of the alleged conspiracy. Lincoln (Source D), however, is in a position to speak authoritatively about the Republican Party. Both Sources clearly have political motives for taking their stance. Thus neither can be regarded as conclusive evidence that Brown was acting purely on his own initiative.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that, despite its failure, the main effect of John Brown's Raid was to reinforce anti-slavery feeling in the North. [40]

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 C provide evidence to support the view to varying degrees. Source B predicts that the execution of Brown and his associates will strengthen anti-slavery feeling by making them martyrs. Of course, as this is a newspaper editorial, it aims to form opinion as much as to reflect it. In Source C Brown himself is in effect appealing to opponents of slavery to use force. As this was his last message, its emotive power is enhanced, but it is what one might expect an extremist to say rather than a clear indication of opinion at large. These two Sources therefore indicate that Brown's Raid was used by opponents of slavery to gain support. Source D, however, shows Lincoln dissociating the Republicans from Brown, though he also claims that the feeling of 'this nation' – actually only the northern section – is against slavery. Own knowledge confirms that Source B was right: Brown was widely regarded in the North as a martyr ('near-canonisation', according to James McPherson), particularly after his speech from the dock at his trial. Source A, however, points to another outcome of the raid: it reinforced southern paranoia and was thus an important step towards secession. This Source claims the raid was part of a conspiracy to abolish slavery. Own knowledge could add that, even if there was no conspiracy, throughout the South the raid raised fears of a slave rising – as Brown intended (see Source D). It is for candidates to decide whether the raid's effects in the North were more or less important than in the South. In any case, it was a significant step on the road to civil war.

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 The Irish Question in the Age of Parnell 1877-93

(a) Study Sources A and C

Compare these Sources as evidence for the success of government policies in Ireland in the early 1880s. [20]

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 their content

For A the Land Act was a great law; C sees it as a reform, but one which has not stopped the increase of discontent. A outlines the Land Act's strengths – it freed Irish tenants and had long lasting social effects. C does not refer to these. A does admit that neither the Land Act nor Coercion brought miracles because of opposition by Parnell.

C goes further in criticism – the alternation of Coercion and Conciliation – not his opposition to reform – has led to disloyalty and discontent. For A the issue is trust; for C it is unreasonable opposition to worthy legislation. For A government policy has been successful by wise laws; for C it has been unsuccessful for failing to introduce Home Rule (see last sentence)

In terms of authorship A is from a friend and political associate who shared Gladstone's views that quite radical land legislation was a major concession, breaking many Liberal beliefs in laissez-faire. Parnell in C is not interested in this as his aim is to focus attention on the key issue of Home Rule, not to make fair political judgements about the wisdom of particular pieces of legislation. The intention and context of the Sources are different; A looks back on the efforts of Gladstone to pacify Ireland with the knowledge that such heroic efforts finally broke his party; C is in the middle of a desperate struggle for political change and is intensely partisan.

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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that Gladstone's attempts to pacify Ireland from 1880 to 1886 had widespread Irish support. [40]

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, including 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 offer different views- D is the most favourable to Gladstone; A offers a rather more balanced view, despite being from a colleague of Gladstone. The cartoon, B, is somewhat ambiguous – there is the usual anti-League sentiment, but Gladstone is not portrayed entirely flatteringly – the policy being seen as a lure rather than necessarily a piece of grave statesmanship. C, in the middle of an election, is the most critical. A possible grouping is B and D, stressing widespread support, versus A and C who maintain the opposite.

D gives the impression of Gladstone's measures being highly popular, but there is more than a touch of overestimation here. The Land Act may have paved the way for proprietorship, but there were still problems with evictions in the later 1880s. Similarly, the Home Rule conversion certainly did not delight Irishmen in Ulster and this is a major omission which candidates may well pick up on. Also, some found the limited terms of Gladstonian Home Rule unacceptable.

B offers the spectre of violent agitation with the message that the actions of Gladstone were winning over 'Ireland' generally, but that the violent and degraded extremists were still urging the Irish people to terrorism. The Source can be criticized in terms of what the Land Act really was offering – not independent proprietorship or relief from evictions which came later. Also the opposition is too crudely characterized: the Land League joined much respectable middle class discontent with more traditional rural unrest. This is a simplistic view and also does not include Ulster. Punch's prejudices are evident in the depiction of unrest and also of the view that somehow reform would end rural unrest and that political aspirations would fall away. There is an element, too, of Gladstone appeasing and luring Irish opinion and he is shown in a somewhat ridiculous way rather than as a grave, statesmanlike figure.

A suggests the skill and power of Gladstone and the wisdom of the Land Act – it is suggested that its opponents were only old fashioned English conservatives – even Irish nationalists gave 'cold approval'; there is little here to suggest that Gladstone's reforms were weakened by his reliance on coercion, by outbreaks of violence like the Phoenix Park murders and by the wider demands for Home Rule. Certainly the source does not stress the unpopularity of Coercion. However, the source is balanced – the measures did not work miracles.

C Parnell, on the other hand, plays down the significance of the Three Fs and land reform, which was a measure that Gladstone had to force on conservatives in his own party and did go some way to meet rural grievances. The level of unrest he claims may be overstated as by 1885 the very depressed conditions of the early 80s had yielded.

He himself had generally supported Land Reform.

Own knowledge, therefore, **may** focus on a discussion of the strengths and limitations of the three Fs of 1881; the unpopularity of Coercion; the reaction of Ulster and protestant Irishmen to Home Rule; the limited scope of the Home Rule proposals. There are a number of themes that candidates may pick up here and it is important to credit how knowledge is used rather than to expect specific information.

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.

6 England in the new century 1900-1918

(a) Study Source A and Source D

Compare these sources as evidence for views on the nature of poverty in England during the period from 1903 to 1910. [20]

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 agree that poverty in Edwardian England is a serious problem. Both Sources are based upon long-term research and investigation. But, otherwise, there are clear differences of attitude in the content of each Source.

Source A (Booth) is the result of seventeen years of investigation. It links unemployment (the main cause of poverty) to social class; and regards the bottom 8% of the population as being incapable of helping themselves. Booth's suggested solutions to the problem of poverty in Classes A and B are mainly harsh and penal, rather than supportive of health as in Source D (the Webbs). Booth's moral preoccupations reflect the common fear of contemporaries that the respectable poor would be contaminated by Classes A and B, the criminal and semi-criminal groups of the poor. He suggests that forcing the bottom layers of society to work will prevent the danger of a descent into an interfering and expensive socialism implied by Source D.

However, in Source D, the Webbs, prefer to blame social circumstances rather than the character defects of individuals, or Classes A and B as Booth stresses. Their view of the nature of poverty stems from a fundamentally different analysis. Hence their belief that the proposed solution of the Majority Report (basically the continuation of the existing Poor Law) will do nothing to prevent or cure poverty. Far better for the state to tackle the main causes of poverty at source by looking at education, health and unemployment.

Provenance may be useful in explaining these differences. Booth's proposals, although well-meaning, have their roots in late 19th century individualism. The Webbs, however, are writing later, in the midst of an unprecedented period of state welfare reform, and following a major investigation into the Poor Law in which they were involved. Unlike Booth (and unlike the Commissioners who signed the Majority Report), they believe in a socialism where the state accepts full responsibility for the most vulnerable.

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.

(b) Study all these Sources.

Using **all** these Sources **and** your own knowledge, assess the view that the need to promote national efficiency was the **main** reason for the measures and proposals to tackle poverty between 1900 and 1914.

[40]

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

Successful answers will need to make use all four Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge, and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

Candidates should be aware that there was a variety of arguments supporting the need to tackle poverty during this period. The main issue here is whether strengthening national efficiency was seen as being more important than improving the lives of the poor. Source A and Source B support the question; while Source C and Source D stress the interests of the individual poor. However, it is acceptable that answers might (in addition) examine other aims: such as gaining political support (see Source B); or avoiding socialism (see Source A).

Source A (Charles Booth) refers to measures necessary to save the country from “serious danger”. This phrase can be linked to the “national efficiency” argument: especially through the reference to useful work in Labour Colonies. It could also be argued that the phrase “serious danger” means that England will be weakened if feckless poverty spreads into Classes C and D. Again, “serious danger” might refer to socialism. Source B (Churchill) illustrates the growing fears of national decline by reference to German social reforms: the background being Britain’s rivalry with Germany. But it also emphasises the political advantages of welfare reform. The suggestion is that Churchill knew how to appeal to Asquith’s political instincts. There are clear references in this Source to the main Liberal programme of welfare reform; and contextual knowledge might be used to develop these points in relation to the various reasons for such reforms. Source C (Lloyd George) is clearly concerned with the plight of the poor; and so belongs to the counter argument. However, candidates might well point out (from their own knowledge) that Lloyd George often used emotive speeches of this sort to win political support for the policies of the Liberal Government. He would be fully aware of the other and wider reasons for welfare reform. In Source D, the Webbs are also clearly concerned with the individual poor. As socialists, and as authors of a radical Minority Report, they imply early intervention to save the less-fortunate from the evils of poverty.

Own knowledge might include some of the following, all of which illustrate a growing concern with poverty. The early research of S. Rowntree (York, 1901), which was sympathetic to the poor. The impact of the Boer War, clearly raising issues of national efficiency, which led to the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, which reported in 1904. The Unemployed Workmen’s Act (1905). The Royal Commission on the Poor Law (1905-1909). Liberal welfare reforms (1906-1911). However, the Sources remain the main basis for the answer.

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.

7 Nazi Germany 1933-45**(a) Study Sources A and C**

Compare these Sources as evidence for the popularity of Nazi Youth movements during the 1930s. [20]

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 by those involved at the time, but come from different perspectives. Source A, a Socialist Sopade Report, is already from a party in exile. Source C is from a Nazi supporter, Hitler Youth member and later leader. Despite this both are in agreement over the popularity of the Hitler Youth and provide effective evidence for this. Source A is especially valuable as, from an opposition perspective with its own youth organisation, it admits to Nazi success. Klönne in C, at first hand, obviously agrees on the popularity of the slogans, trips and games. Both stress the importance of Volksgemeinschaft. The differences between A and C lie in their dating and stance. Source A is an early source (1934) when much of this had novelty, recently boosted by State backing. Its perspective is a class one, pointing to its own unpopular move in stressing Youth as a revolutionary lower class. It mentions the potential popularity of 'sacking Jews and Marxists to provide jobs for youth, not referred to in C and also the pressure which could be brought on parents, a pressure which could work for or against the Hitler Youth. In contrast Source C is from hindsight, long after the collapse of the Reich. It takes a longer perspective. As a young member Klönne concurs with A's points and was a clear beneficiary (he becomes a leader). Then he became more critical than A, implying a less popular organisation in the longer term given its stress on obedience and compulsion. This might just be an adolescent response or that of an observant and educated young man ('strong willed' men cannot be produced that way) or simply that later knowledge colours the evidence. He could well have sought to inject an element of critique over control and influence. Given this, candidates might conclude that A provides the better 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.

(b) Study all the Sources

Using all these Sources and your own knowledge, assess the view that the Nazi Youth movements played the major role in creating the National Community (*volks-gemeinschaft*). [40]

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, and their 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 focus of the question is on how far the Hitler Youth played the major role in creating Volksgemeinschaft. The Sources, especially A, B and C, largely focus on the role of the Hitler Youth and of Youth Organisation in general (the Socialist Sopade Report in A clearly goes in for some soul searching as to their failure to woo youth). However they are far from conclusive as to whether the H.J. played the major role. Candidates who wish to stress that they did can in particular use A, B and C. Source A especially provides reliable evidence for this triumph of 'Volk' via the H.J. over the Socialist class consciousness pedalled by the SPD and KPD. It stresses the bridge between young farmers and factory workers as opposed to the triumph of the latter over the former. It implies that parents and families can be penetrated in this way, a point corroborated by Klönne in C who refers to the invasion of privacy. The Poem (B), at face value, shows how vows, slogans, and gushing, quasi religious, rhetoric are used to create a National Community built around warrior values. It is a clear statement of intent to create National Comradeship. Source C explicitly states the key was 'comradeship' with effective interference. Own knowledge of the structure of the Youth Organisation, the prominence given to Youth as the future, their semi military training as time progressed and their ultimate use in war would all suggest the primacy of their role given Hitler's national vision. **However** candidates could also stress the role of other factors and the limitations of what the H.J. achieved. It may be set against other institutions and events - the SA, at a later date the SS, RAD, the Propaganda Ministry, Schools (referred to by Housden in D) the Family and ultimately the War, although a focus on the H.J. is an acceptable route. Source D provides a more balanced view, putting the H.J. into perspective (eg it's ability to play the generational conflict). School could be much more important given the time devoted to it and the ability to change the curriculum to stress a National Community bent on racial survival and national consciousness. The SA and SS could provide adult involvement and provide the compulsion when persuasion failed. 'A' is a very early Source and not based on a wide chronological perspective. It is overeager to eat humble pie and cannot yet see the disadvantages pointed out by Klönne in C (over-time the novelty wears off, the compulsion is obvious and the organisation could become counter productive). Source B is just a slogan, an initiation rite, the sort of thing referred to by Klönne in C. Its meaning may not be entirely clear to younger children. We cannot know whether it was taken seriously (own knowledge might suggest that, like ideology in general, much like this was misunderstood or ignored). Klönne's evidence would suggest a cynicism once adolescence or young adulthood was reached. Source B would appear to have more to do with an older leadership and a war that few predicted in the early and mid 1930s. As a result better candidates might conclude that the H.J., despite compulsion in 1936, was but one amongst many organisations, policies and events that attempted to create an effective 'Volk'.

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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY

Unit 2583

SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS June 2006

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: 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.

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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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 marks must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 avoid 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 2583-2586: GENERIC MARK BANDS

AS PERIOD STUDIES

NB

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 double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.
- The quality of the English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- If a candidate discusses the wrong topic (eg evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II when the question is on William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award up to the top of Band VI.

ESSAY**Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation**

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

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (eg 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 perspective(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 (ie. '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.

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

1(a) How far do you agree that the Godwin family presented the most serious problem to Edward the Confessor?

Focus: Assessment of the problems of a medieval king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Earl Godwin of Wessex headed a powerful family. His area of influence in the south of England was extensive. His daughter, Edith, was married to Edward. The earls were important in any monarchy but especially that of Edward the Confessor. Earl Godwin was able to raise an army to threaten the King in 1051-52. Although he died in 1053, Harold, his successor, was equally influential and problematic to Edward. He played a vital part in the succession issue. However, in assessing ‘How far..?’ candidates might well consider the weak position in which Edward found himself. After spending so much time abroad, especially in Normandy, he was ill-acquainted with English affairs. His personality lacked the vigour that could impose order unquestioningly. The lack of a direct heir was a problem. There was unrest over foreign influences, especially the eminence of the Normans. Edward was dependent on other earls such as Mercia and Northumbria, controlling regions over which the King had limited control.

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 strengths of the English Church outweighed its weaknesses during the reign of Edward the Confessor.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the Church 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. Although the strength of the tenth-century monastic reform movement had faded, most of the monasteries and their monks, as well as most of the secular clergy, carried out their duties diligently. The Church maintained a high level of cultural activity. Whilst church buildings were small (in comparison with Norman churches), it is difficult to see why this was a weakness as such before the Conquest. Some candidates might argue that the poor reputation of the Church on the eve of the Conquest was undeserved because it was largely created by hostile chroniclers who believed that the Norman Conquest restored order, purity and discipline to the Church. This is a valid point but candidates should be wary of spending too much time describing the reforms that were introduced by Lanfranc; the focus should be on the period before 1066. Certainly, the circumstances of Stigand's appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury and his pluralism (he remained Bishop of Winchester) pointed to problems. England's relations with the papacy were poor during the reign of Edward the Confessor, one reason for papal support for William of Normandy's invasion.

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 Norman Conquest of England 1064-1072**2(a) Assess the reasons for William of Normandy's victory in 1066.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the outcome of an important battle.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might consider short-term reasons, focusing on the events of the Battle of Hastings. Others might give most attention to long-term factors. One would expect answers in **Band I** to consider and assess both but the balance will depend on the argument that candidates offer. Examiners are reminded not to undervalue answers that are organised chronologically. The unfolding events benefited William and disadvantaged Harold. Among short-term factors was the combination in William's army of different types of soldiers, including cavalry. The indiscipline of the Anglo-Saxons was important, as was Harold's death. Until these developments, the Anglo-Saxon fyrd held firm. Candidates can evaluate William's leadership (the feigned retreat?) and Harold's shortcomings on the battlefield. Longer term factors might include William's organisational ability in gathering a powerful invasion force. He was also wisely cautious after landing in England. Candidates can come to different conclusions about the effects of the support that he received from the Papacy. Harold was distracted by his decision to confront Harold Hardrada in the north and he then decided to march quickly against William. He did not reinforce his army after the major encounter at Stamford Bridge.

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 serious were the problems that faced William I in establishing his rule over England after his victory at Hastings? Explain your answer with reference to the period to 1072.

Focus: Assessment of the problems of a ruler in establishing control.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should note the end date in the question. (This reflects the Content of the fourth Key Issue.) However, some candidates might discuss the evidence in Domesday Book; this was compiled late in the reign but it included descriptions of the effects of Norman government in earlier years and should not therefore be dismissed as irrelevant. The death of Harold at Hastings removed William's most dangerous challenger. His surviving enemies, such as Edwin, Morcar and Waltheof, proved less daunting. Others, such as Hereward, were troublesome but less dangerous. Resistance at Exeter and in the Midlands was put down quite easily. Some might point out that William had not completely secured the north by 1072. It was still prone to attack by Danes and from Scotland.

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.

Norman England 1066 - 1100**3(a) Assess the reasons why castles were important during the period from 1066 to 1100.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the importance of castles in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. As in other questions that ask candidates to assess something, the answers at the top of **Band I** will offer some priorities in the factors that they consider. Castles had important military functions in defending Norman power and suppressing potential rebellion. One of William's first actions after landing in England was to build a fortification. The (White) Tower was important in London. But they were more extension than simple military structures to control rebels, invaders or potential troublemakers; they were also homes and administrative centres. In many cases, this gave rise to urban centres as supplies and tradesmen were needed. High credit should be given to sections of answers that include some specific examples.

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 William I could not prevent rivalry over the succession to his throne.

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

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— 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 in the Study Topic, ‘What problems were raised by the linking of England with Normandy? The problems of ruling both England and Normandy, the effects of William I’s absences from England, William I’s division of his territories, rivalry among the sons of William I’. Examiners will note that candidates are expected to have only enough understanding and knowledge of Normandy to make sense of the English history. William I had three sons: Robert, William (Rufus) and Henry. In spite of the strength of William I, the rules of succession were not clear. Normandy and England were governed as separate states. Robert was in rebellion against his father before William I’s death and William could see that he was incapable of ruling both states. William’s choice was to pass England to William Rufus, with Normandy going to Robert. However, the succession needed the consent, open or tacit of nobles. Kings were not yet paramount in this respect. William I’s preference did not ensure a peaceful succession because Robert challenged William II’s right to the English throne. Some nobles, including his powerful uncle Odo of Bayeux, supported him. However, William II was active and determined and prevailed in the struggle.

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.

Society, Economy and Culture 1042 - 1100

4(a) 'The most important changes in the arts during the period from 1066 to 1100 were in church architecture.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a cultural change.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The balance of answers will reflect the weight of the argument but candidates who reject the claim should still show enough understanding and knowledge of Church architecture to frame a solid paragraph if they are to reach **Band I** or **Band II**. Another problem might be that answers agree so completely with the claim in the question that they do not examine other forms of art. 'How far..?' invites candidates to take a comparative approach. An exclusive concentration on church architecture, if very well argued, might deserve **Band II** but it is difficult to see it reaching **Band I**. The Specification mentions 'architecture and the arts including illumination, metalwork and embroidery, changes after the Conquest (especially church architecture)'. This gives examiners guidance as to what might be expected although it is not reasonable to expect even the best answers to consider all of these arts. Some candidates might use the question to compare change and continuity, for example change in church architecture but continuity in other forms. This will be a valid approach and can reach the top of **Band I**. Changes in Church architecture followed the Norman invasion and reflected the Normans' wish to reform the church in line with continental practices. They became important patrons. The size and elaboration of the church was more impressive. Glass became more common in windows. Altars were decorated. Some might use the Bayeux Tapestry as an example of continuing Anglo-Saxon skills in embroidery but others might question this. Some have seen the Conquest as a disaster for Anglo-Saxon sculpture. A valid alternative approach will be to argue that, by 1100, there were no fundamental changes in the arts but this will still need substantiation.

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 do you agree that the Norman Conquest brought about important changes for towns in England by 1100?

Focus: Assessment of changes in towns in a specified period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Except for London, then Norwich and Winchester, most towns were small, usually with a population less than 2,000. Some were hardly distinguishable from large villages. But some developed as markets after the conquest. Some became centres of Norman administration. The proximity of a castle could make a difference. Others benefited as centres of church dioceses with their cathedrals. As trade developed with the continent, towns in East Anglia and south-east benefited. On the other hand, there is evidence that some towns declined when they lacked these advantages. There were also regional differences. Many northern towns suffered from the depredations of William 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.

England 1450 - 1509**The Threat to Order and Authority 1450 – 1470****5(a) How strong was kingship in the mid-fifteenth century? Explain your answer.**

Focus: Assessment of the power of kingship in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It might be claimed that a problem faced by kings during the relevant period was the contradiction between the theory of kingship, which gave rulers considerable powers, and the practical situation, which saw limitations. Kings were expected to govern in line with divine law and English tradition but this allowed for considerable leeway in interpretation. Against this the ever-present context of threatened accession (the Lancastrians had gained power by the usurpation of a noble) meant that powers could be threatened by disorder and disobedience. The nobles saw themselves as the natural leaders of society and as the necessary advisers of kings. This situation was heightened during the reign of Henry VI mostly because of his natural inadequacies. The relevant period might be seen as the great age of noble power rather than as the age of dominant kingship. However, from 1461 Edward IV restored the powers of kingship to some extent. The Specification mentions the council and parliament and candidates might assess kingship in the light of their roles during this period. A feature of some answers is that they might focus on individual kings rather than kingship. This will be relevant but it is difficult to see how such answers can merit a high mark. Perhaps **Band III** might be an appropriate ceiling but, as always, examiners should pay most attention to the quality of the answer and be open to alternative explanations. Some answers, whilst being organised reign by reign, might actually make some telling points about kingship and therefore might be worth a higher band.

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 Henry VI personally responsible for the problems he faced from 1450?

Focus: Assessment of the responsibility for political problems in a specific reign.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Study Topic (and the question) begins in 1450 and candidates are expected to have only sufficient general knowledge and understanding of the reign of Henry VI from 1422 to make sense of developments from 1450. It might be argued that Henry's 'madness' from 1453 made him an incapable king. This gave room for the ambitions of powerful nobles such as Richard of York, who claimed the regency. York had grievances against Henry, including his resentment of Somerset. He was joined by Warwick. Some might consider that Henry VI, either willingly or unwillingly, gave too much influence to his Queen, Margaret of Anjou. Her loyalty to her husband helped to restore Henry to the throne (Readeption) but it also prolonged the civil unrest. Some answers might argue that Henry was weakened by grave financial problems that were not his personal responsibility. Parliament was more reluctant to grant supplies. The expectations of many that England would pursue the old war with France was unrealistic but Henry's peaceful demeanour and interests in non-military activities worsened his reputation.

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 End of the Yorkists 1471 – 1485**6(a) Assess the reasons why Richard III became king in 1483.**

Focus: assessment of the reasons for the accession of a controversial king.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners should take care in assessing answers that are organised chronologically. Narrative that is used to support an argument can deserve high merit; the discriminating factor will be the effective use of narrative to discuss the key issue in the question. Edward IV's heir was twelve years of age. A long minority would have been a problem in any case in an age that needed strong kingship but especially in a period that had seen England riven by civil war. Many of the elements that had caused the conflict were still present. There were also quarrels between Edward IV's Queen, Elizabeth Woodville and her family and adherents, and Richard of York. Edward's marriage had always been controversial. There were no suspicions that Richard might become an unsuitable king when he acceded to power. He was thought able and had been a faithful and effective supporter of his brother. The circumstances of his accession will be very relevant: how much support did Richard enjoy? It has been argued that he acted to oust the unpopular Woodvilles and alternatively that it was a naked act of usurpation. Richard had the support of important nobles such as Hastings and Buckingham. One can expect candidates to deal with the 'murder' of the princes (Edward V and Richard) in the Tower. There is no need for much detail but the circumstances and the controversy will be very relevant.

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 Richard III lost the throne to Henry Tudor was that the Stanleys betrayed him at the Battle of Bosworth (1485).

Focus: Assessment of a claim about 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. Answers can devote most time to whichever aspect is selected as a priority but good answers will contain a reasonable range. The balance of answers will reflect the weight of the argument but candidates who reject the claim should still show enough understanding and knowledge of the Stanleys and Bosworth to frame a solid paragraph if they are to reach **Band I** or **Band II**. Richard had the larger army at Bosworth but the commitment of the Stanleys to Henry Tudor was indeed a key element in the King's defeat. However, the outcome of the Battle was also shaped by Northumberland's lack of support. It is possible to argue that Richard, although an experienced and previously successful soldier, was reckless in his tactics. Good answers might be expected to consider wider issues. Richard's position was already weakened by the unpopularity of forced loans. His patronage of northerners' causes harmed his reputation. The death of his son was a blow. Candidates might discuss whether Richard was damaged by rumours of the death of the princes in the Tower. Henry Tudor proved to be an adept opponent, careful not to invade and then engage Richard on the battlefield until he had maximised his support. He promised to marry Elizabeth of York and was backed by 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.

The Reign of Henry VII 1485 – 1509

7(a) How successfully did Henry VII deal with the threats to his government? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of a king's success in a specific area of government.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Most candidates are likely to argue that Henry VII was very successful. The threats to his government and to law and order were very real at the beginning of the reign. A king who had seized the throne by force after thirty years of political instability could expect further challenges to his attempt to enforce order. The threats were very real. The King used the council to ensure control over the courts to make sure that laws were implemented. The potentially disruptive and actually powerful influence of the nobility was controlled through devices such as the ban on livery and maintenance. Henry was determined to stamp out private armies. A smaller group, the Council Learned in the Law, was also used to implement Henry's wishes. The Court of Requests and the role of Star Chamber can be explained. These helped to control men whose influence might have been malign. The regions came under the closer supervision of the councils of the North and of Wales and the Marches. Local administration was in the hands of sheriffs and JPs but the system worked quite successfully. The King faced problems from pretenders and other Yorkist sympathisers. These were solved by 1509. It is possible to discuss foreign policy but candidates who do so need to explain how it is linked to 'threats to his government'. For example, France and Burgundy began by supporting the Yorkists.

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 success of Henry VII's foreign policy was the series of marriage settlements that he negotiated.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a king's foreign policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates who agree with the claim in the question might point to the marriage agreements of his son, Arthur, with Catherine of Aragon and of his daughter, Margaret, with James IV of Scotland. A limitation of this argument might be that the Spanish marriage was prevented by the death of Arthur and the marriage of Prince Henry was not agreed at the time of Henry VII's death. The reconciling effects of the Scottish match were short rather than long-term. Other aspects of foreign policy that might be considered might be the agreements that ensured Henry's freedom from the dangerous alliances of Pretenders and other Yorkists with foreign powers, eg the Treaty of Etaples 1492, renewed 1498. Some candidates might prefer the claims of essentially commercial treaties such as the Magnus Intercursus (1496) with the Netherlands. Some candidates might assess how successful was Henry VII's foreign policy. This will be relevant because the question asks about the most important success, which is comparative. Answers can devote most time to whichever aspect is selected as a priority but good answers will contain a reasonable range. The balance of answers will reflect the weight of the argument but candidates who reject the claim should still show enough understanding and knowledge of marriage settlements to frame a solid paragraph if they are to reach **Band I** or **Band II**.

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.

Social and Economic Issues 1450-1509

8(a) Assess the reasons for the economic and social importance of wool during the period from 1450 to 1509.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important economic and social factor.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Although the economy was becoming more diversified, wool was still of primary importance.

There were some changes with more being exported in the form of cloth rather than raw wool. It provided employment directly and indirectly for many people, from peasants to merchants who exported overseas, such as the Merchant Adventurers. The production of wool provided a living for people such as shepherds, fullers, spinners, weavers and dyers. The economy of the crown benefited from customs duties. Social importance was linked to wool because of the primacy of land in the social structure. Although the nobles were not involved personally, there was a link because much of their income came indirectly from it. The middle orders who were becoming richer sometimes displayed their wealth by charitable gifts and grants to churches. At the bottom, the lower orders sometimes suffered because of the trend to enclosure. High credit should be given to answers that point out that the importance of wool varied regionally. For example, it was more important in East Anglia than in Cornwall (where poor quality wool was dismissed as 'Cornish wool').

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 there were developments in learning during the period from 1450 to 1509.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the importance of the Church in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can provide different answers. The Church provided education and scholars. Private individuals might have founded or maintained schools but they were staffed almost universally by churchmen or by men who had some clerical training. Churchmen were also patrons of learning. Books and manuscripts were collected; libraries were maintained. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge were primarily Church institutions but their interests went beyond theology to embrace law, philosophy and medicine. The Church was an important means of communication with foreign scholars. Even the new ideas, some described as ‘humanist’ were propagated by churchmen. These points suggest some reasons, including the interest of secular and religious patrons. It was indicative of some Renaissance influences. There seems to have been an increase in piety; education and learning were seen as an aspect of this.

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**Henry VIII and Wolsey 1509 - 1529****9(a) How far did Henry VIII continue Henry VII's work in domestic affairs during the period from 1509 to 1514?**Focus: Assessment of continuity in government policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. However, the focus should be on continuity and change but answers can come to different conclusions. The only restrictions are first that candidates must concentrate on domestic affairs; candidates can refer briefly to foreign affairs in an introduction or conclusion but not as part of the main argument. Secondly, the question goes to 1514; discussions of a later period will also be admissible only as part of an introduction or conclusion. Henry VIII was very different in personality from his father. He was young, outgoing, sociable and had wide interests outside governing England. This is relevant because it reflected on his conduct of affairs. Henry VIII's greater interest in foreign affairs meant that he was less concerned than Henry VII had been about the detailed conduct of domestic government. However, very good candidates might note that the King's reputation for a lack of interest in domestic government can be exaggerated. He was very aware of developments. He remained the source of power and guided the general line of policy. Signs of continuity might include the continuation of membership in the royal council. Warham represented continuity in the Church as Archbishop of Canterbury. As for change, Empson and Dudley fell from favour and were executed. Henry VII had been more loyal to reliable servants. By 1514, Wolsey was rising in state and Church (a member of the Council in 1511, and Bishop of Lincoln and Archbishop of York in 1514).

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, to 1529, Wolsey's successes in foreign affairs were much more important than his failures.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about an important minister.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some might agree with the claim in the question; others might disagree. Among his success might be his contrition to the invasion of France in 1513 and the subsequent victory at the Battle of the Spurs and the capture of Touraine. Henry VIII claimed the glory but Wolsey's contribution was important. Wolsey negotiated an advantageous peace with France in 1518 at the cost of surrendering some territorial gains that were probably untenable anyway. It will be relevant to note Wolsey's appointment as Cardinal and then, more importantly, Papal Legate (1518), in view of the importance of the Papacy in foreign affairs. In the early 1520s, Wolsey's success continued. Charles V recognised Henry VIII's importance with a meeting and Francis I of France promised friendship at the Field of the Cloth of Gold. Candidates might conclude that these were hollow victories and that Wolsey did not achieve other significant successes in the 1520s. England's role, and therefore Wolsey's, became subordinate to the more important power-play between the Habsburgs and the Valois. Henry VIII's growing demands for a divorce from Catherine of Aragon was another, ultimately more fateful, problem for Wolsey's foreign policy. By 1529, Wolsey had failed to win Henry VIII territories in France, he could not make England a powerful force that was independent of Spain / the Holy Roman Empire and France and he could not use his foreign influence to end the King's marriage. However, some candidates might claim that his failures were outside his control. The policies that he pursued on behalf of Henry VIII were too ambitious for any minister whereas his successes point to his ability.

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.

Government, Politics and Foreign Affairs 1529 - 1558**10(a) Assess the most important effects of court factions in Henry VIII's reign.**

Focus: Assessment of a claim about an important political development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Specification mentions 'Problems of faction at court (especially the Boleyn... and Howard families)'. The Seymour family is also mentioned but was more important during Edward VI's reign and its omission should not be regarded as a gap in this question. Henry VIII's marriages were certainly closely linked to the influence of factions. The divorce of Catherine of Aragon, marriage to Anne Boleyn and her subsequent fall involved the Boleyns and the Howards. The Jane Seymour episode saw the triumph and almost fatal fall of the Howards. But sound answers should go further than narrate the story of marriages and show an understanding of the nature of faction, linking it to marriage and to other issues. For example, it was important in the religious changes with the Howards being more conservative than Thomas Cromwell and Cranmer. Nobles and other important courtiers were patrons of influence who gathered around them men who had hopes of promotion and favours. They had power in particular regions. Whilst Henry VIII was dominating in many respects, he was also open to influence. This gave the opportunity to factions whose mutual competition was at the heart of government. Factions were both a means of effective government, reflecting the importance of eminent families, and a source of discord and rivalry. Candidates might differ about which effect was more important.

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 different were Mary I's policies in governing England from those of Somerset and Northumberland? Explain your answer. (Do not include religion in your answer.)

Focus: Comparison of success of three rulers.

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 exclusion of religion from the question (to avoid overlap with another question). This should not prohibit tolerance (but not credit) of a brief mention in an introduction or conclusion that broadens out the argument. As with most prohibitions, there are grey areas for example Mary I's marriage to Philip of Spain; some might see this essentially in religious terms but there were also political aspects. Some candidates might point out that Mary's position as monarch was different from that of Somerset and Northumberland. This was not a difference in policy but is a relevant factor because she did not face some of the same restraints as the two ministers. However, this did not prevent the continuation of factions in the council although they were not as dangerous as those under Somerset and Northumberland's rule. Mary continued Northumberland's policy of careful financial management, at least until the war with France. Crown lands continued to be sold to provide a larger immediate income. However, the Queen's attempts to increase taxation were unpopular. She also adopted Northumberland's policy of re-coinage. Mary continued using Parliament to carry through some important measures but she also used her prerogative to enforce her will, for example by participating in the French war. Legislation did not show a sharp break in direction except perhaps that she did not share Somerset's willingness to tackle social problems even if it meant opposing powerful economic interest groups. The Queen did reform the militia and strengthened the navy.

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.

Church and State 1529 - 1558

11(a) Assess the claim that, from 1529 to 1547, the religious changes showed that Henry VIII was not an enthusiastic Protestant.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about a king and important religious developments.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Study Topic begins in 1529 but some candidates might refer to Henry VIII's orthodoxy before that date, for example his book against Luther and the title 'Defender of the Faith'. However, this is not necessary for any mark. To substantiate the claim in the question, candidates might argue that the English Reformation was introduced for political rather than religious reasons. The King was cautious about doctrinal changes. Evidence can be seen in the Six Articles (1539). It might be argued that he was pushed by more determined Protestants such as Cranmer and Cromwell (and Anne Boleyn). Conservatives such as Norfolk and Gardiner survived as long as they conformed whilst Cranmer's position was sometimes uncertain in the 1540s and Cromwell was executed. On the other hand, the Protestantism of Henry VIII can be seen in his denial of papal authority and the assertion of royal supremacy. Changes were enforced by an Act of Uniformity. Those who refused to accept the new Church were persecuted, for example More and Fisher. Monasteries were abolished. Edward VI was educated as a Protestant. In assessing the claim, the better answers, certainly those worth **Band I**, should consider the strength and weakness of the claim, coming to a considered conclusion.

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, by the end of her reign in 1558, had Mary I achieved her aims in religion?Focus: Assessment of the success of a controversial queen.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Mary I's main aims in religion were complementary: to restore Roman Catholicism in England and to rebuild the links with the Papacy. She was soon able to repeal the repeal of the legislation of Edward VI's reign and later repealed the post-1529 legislation of Henry VIII. Unreliable clergy were purged, especially those who were married. Heresy laws and a Treasons Act were introduced. Marriage to Philip of Spain was within her religious aims. Cardinal Pole welcomed back England into the papal fold. In these respects, it can be argued that Mary was successful in achieving her aims. On the other hand, monastic lands were not restored, a major impediment to the restoration of monasteries. The Queen's unpopular marriage led to Wyatt's rebellion. Whilst most people conformed more or less enthusiastically, a significant proportion refused to surrender their Protestant beliefs. Some went into exile; others suffered persecution, including the burnings. Candidates might argue that these were counter-productive. The Study Topic ends in 1558 and candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge and understanding of Elizabeth I's reign. However, it is reasonable to expect some understanding of her accession as proof of the extent of Mary's achievement. Mary failed to establish a Catholic succession. The Protestant princess was widely welcomed.

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.

Social and Economic Issues 1509 - 1558

12(a) How far do you agree that the economic policies of most governments resulted in an increase in poverty during the period from 1509 to 1558?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about governments' economic policies.

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 argued that governments intermittently attempted to relieve poverty. For example, Cromwell conceived a number of schemes to promote trade and industry and address the need for poor relief. However, government policies more commonly increased the burden on the poor. Debasement was an important factor. The cost of wars and foreign borrowing helped to increase inflation and unemployment. Henry VII might be acquitted of blame but not Henry VIII and Somerset. It will be relevant to consider other reasons for poverty to support the argument that there were alternative explanations. For example, there were intermittent bad harvests that could be devastating when they occurred. The incidence of serious diseases could increase poverty. Reference might be made to periodic outbreaks of the plague and smallpox. These would affect particularly London and large towns but could spread to particular rural localities. Rising prices were an important factor: the cost of food might have risen by as much as 300% in this period. The value of wages fell. Government policies to restrict prices were ineffective given such pressures.

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 problems facing people living in towns during the period from 1509 to 1558Focus: Assessment of urban problems in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions and can discuss any two problems— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The Specification spells out the problems that candidates might consider: 'Impact on towns of plague, famine, inflation, changing trade patterns'. Answers in **Band I** should normally suggest which was the more serious. Although the size of the population grew in this period, plague could have devastating effects on towns or localities that were affected. Large towns were particularly prone to severe infection because of unhygienic living conditions but smaller urban communities might also be affected. It might be seen as a matter of luck. Famine, mostly caused by bad harvests, was also periodic. It tended to affect mostly small towns in the very marginal and remote rural areas which were always close to the dividing line between survival and death. They could not take advantage of alternative supplies as could the larger urban areas and even some small towns in the more prosperous rural areas, for example in East Anglia. Inflation was a problem for the lower classes in towns who were dependent on incomes that fell in real terms, whereas the more prosperous urban classes who might have been engaged in trade might actually benefit for charging higher prices. Changing trade patterns were also regional. The population of London and towns in East Anglia and the south-east faced fewer problems than those who lived in more distant towns.

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**Church and State 1547 - 1603****13(a) Assess the problems facing Elizabeth I in dealing with the Puritans to 1603.**Focus: Assessment of a ruler's problems with a religious movement

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might argue that the problems were very serious or less serious. High credit should be given to answers that explain that the extent of the problems varied during the reign. For example, Elizabeth I seemed to have brought Puritanism under control by the end of her reign. Candidates are not expected to have knowledge and understanding of developments in Stuart England; this would be a bonus in assessing her problems but not a requirement for any mark. There were problems at the beginning of her reign in the making of the Church settlement although historians disagree about the extent and strength of Puritan pressures on the Queen at that point. (Examiners should note that AS candidates are not required to have knowledge of the historiography.) Puritans continued to demand further reforms, for example the Vestiarian Controversy. They advocated changes on the Prayer Book. A problem for Elizabeth I was that the Puritans enjoyed support at court. Leicester and even Burghley were sympathetic. Another problem was that Puritans were nationalistic, firm enemies of Catholic powers especially Spain. They could not easily be characterised as enemies of England. There were pressures on the Queen to adopt a more open pro-Protestant, anti-Catholic foreign policy, for example in the Spanish Netherlands. Candidates might differ in their assessments of Elizabeth's problems in dealing with Puritans in Parliament. There were heated debates that broadened out from religion to demands for free speech. However, Elizabeth could rely on the co-operation of most MPs. The growing radicalism of some Puritans and splits in the movement brought further problems, for example with the growth of Presbyterianism. These rejected the established forms of Church government. Grindal posed a problem with his moderate tendencies and it was left to Whitgift to bring the radicals under control.

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 condition of the Church of England at the end of Elizabeth I's reign.Focus: Assessment of the condition of the Church in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The question clearly defines the emphasis of the problem although some latitude might be given about 'the end of Elizabeth I's reign'. This could stretch to the 1590s or even 1588. However, material about the earlier years should be used very carefully to link with the key issue in the question. For example, candidates might argue that Elizabeth I's religious settlement had mostly survived but this does not require narrative of the making of the settlement. They might make the point that the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1587 deprived Catholics of a potential heir to the throne but accounts of her time in England will not be relevant. There were still challenges to the Church of England in 1603 but the Study Topic ends in 1603 and candidates are not required to show knowledge of the early years of James I's reign. However, the determined Catholics were weakened by internal problems within that group and by persecution. Most conformed. Radical Puritanism had also been limited. There were also positive strengths in Anglicanism. The Specification mentions 'The developing association of the Church of England with national feeling'. Some candidates might refer to Hooker's 'The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity' (although this is not necessary for any mark). Apart from his determined prosecution of dissenters, Archbishop Whitgift also paid attention to the standard of the clergy, which was probably improving at the end of the reign.

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.

Foreign Affairs 1547 - 1587**14(a) How far did the accession of Elizabeth I (1558) result in a change in relations with Spain, during the period from 1554 to 1568?**

Focus: Assessment of change in foreign relations.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. In addressing the question ‘How far...?’ some might conclude that there was more continuity than change whilst others might argue in favour of change. The question is based on the second Key Issue and associated Content in the Specification, ‘How and why did relations between England and Spain change from 1554 to 1585? The marriage of Mary and Philip, the maintenance of good relations 1558-68.’ Mary’s pro-Spanish policy was highlighted by her marriage to Philip of Spain and included co-operation with that country against France, leading to war. Initially after Elizabeth I’s accession, both she and Philip II favoured peaceful relations. There were strains, for example because of the actions of privateers. Religion and trade collided when the Inquisition arrested some English merchants. Elizabeth gave tacit support to trading voyages to the Indies (eg Hawkins). Spain suspected England of supporting the Dutch rebels. English soldiers were allowed to help the Dutch rebels but the revolt in the Netherlands was still in its early stages by 1568. Philip II offered assistance to English Catholics but did not plot aggressively against Elizabeth I. English Protestants in Spanish territories, including the New World, were treated harshly. The seizure of Spanish treasure destined for the Netherlands worsened relations. But fundamentally both Queen and King favoured peace rather than outright 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) How important was the succession issue in shaping Elizabeth I's foreign policy to 1587? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of one factor influencing foreign policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. 'How important...?' invites candidates to compare the importance of the succession issue against other factors in foreign policy to 1587, the death of Mary, Queen of Scots. Answers might consider the fact that Elizabeth I did not have a direct heir but succession was important in her dealings with other countries. For example, Philip II hoped for a marriage with the Queen whilst Mary, as a claimant and as Queen of Scotland, was an important element in the equation. There were consequences for relations with Scotland and with France, the patron of Mary. Reference might be made to the Archduke Charles of Austria. French candidates were Charles IX and his brothers, the dukes of Anjou and Alençon. Their suits involved relations with France and with Spain. Other factors that might be considered included religion, with England a Protestant country facing overwhelmingly Catholic and more powerful states on the continent. There were conflicting pressures within England on the consequences for foreign policy, some favouring moderation to Spain, others wishing to take a tougher line. Trade was a factor, especially in relations with Spain.

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.

Government and Politics in Elizabethan England 1558 - 1603

15(a) 'Elizabeth I's personality made the successful government of England difficult.'
How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1558 to 1603?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the personality of an important 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 is based on 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.' On the one hand, Elizabeth I was intelligent and hard-working, interested in affairs of government. On the other hand, her temper was erratic and her vanity made her prone to misunderstand flattery. She was strong willed and was not dominated by her ministers and advisers. Mostly she chose her advisers well but Essex was a mistake. She could be indecisive, preferring often to put off decisions and necessary reforms, for example in finance. She was realistic about England's strength in diplomacy. Her speeches might be seen as evidence of her powers of persuasion but the Golden Speech followed a period when she was at odds with Parliament. Candidates might consider the importance of propaganda in sustaining the Queen's importance, reputation, and popularity. Arguments need to be supported with appropriate knowledge but examiners should be realistic about the amount of detail than can be expected. Weaker answers might fall into two categories: the vague assertions that lack substance or the highly anecdotal that conceal thin explanations or arguments. Very successful answers might be highly selective, considering some aspects of the queen's personality and linking them to specific developments. 'How far...?' invites candidates to consider alternatives. In awarding **Band I** or **Band II**, examiners will not look for evenly balanced explanations but for an awareness of disadvantages and advantage. Personality can be defined widely and can include issues raised by Elizabeth's gender.

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 effectiveness of Elizabeth I's government in handling domestic affairs decline during the period from 1588 to 1603?

(You may include rebellion in Ireland in your answer.)

Focus: Assessment of the success of the later stages of a 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 well agree with the claim but examiners should assess carefully answers that take an alternative view. For example, they might argue that Elizabeth I was still in full control by 1603, in spite of her problems. They would see the balance of problems and success as pointing towards the latter. The question is based on the third Key Issue and associated Content in the Specification, 'How far, and why, did the ...effectiveness of Elizabeth I's government decline after 1588? ...financial problems, the Irish Rebellion, Essex's Rebellion, the parliament of 1601 and the monopolies debate'. Some answers might range more widely, for example to examine social problems, but again their omission should not be interpreted as a gap. Other parts of the Study Topic can be used to provide arguments about the Queen's personal role, her growing isolation at court as older ministers died. Elizabeth's continued unwillingness to acknowledge a successor became less important with the growing certainty of James VI's claims; England would be spared a troublesome succession struggle. 'Decline' might lead some candidates to spend too much time on the period before 1588; this will be relevant because decline is relative. However, the focus should be on 1588 - 1603. Long surveys with relevant but comparatively brief consideration of 1588+ might find it difficult to get beyond **Band 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.

Social and Economic Issues 1547 - 1603

16(a) How far do you agree that methods of agriculture were mostly unchanged during the period from 1547 to 1603?

Focus: Assessment of the extent of change in agriculture.

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 argued that England remained a largely agricultural / rural economy and that most methods remained the same. However, pressures of inflation forced some to make improvements whilst backward regions remained unchanged. Books on agricultural methods were published. Horses replaced oxen in some areas. There were some new crops and improvements to the care of land. But these were not general. Enclosed areas, although they were not considerable in extent, allowed for the adoption of new methods whereas the traditional open fields were less suitable.

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 local initiatives were more successful than government policies in dealing with poverty during the period from 1547 to 1603.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about measures to deal with poverty.

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 Specification, ‘How successfully was the problem of poverty tackled? ...local initiatives, the acts of 1563, 1572 and 1576, the Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1598 and 1601.’ Governments, mostly through the Privy Council, tried to address the problem of poverty in a number of ways but especially through attempts to fix wages and prices and the introduction of laws against speculators in food. The successive statutes that were passed through Parliament showed central governments’ reliance on local officials, especially the JPs. More powers were given to JPs to collect local taxes and deal with vagrancy, an important outcome of poverty. The increasingly harsh anti-vagrant measures showed the government’s policy of dealing forcefully with this aspect of poverty. People should be forced into employment if they were capable of work. Local funds would be used to ‘pump-prime’ employment measures. However, the repetition of legislation might be seen as proof of the ineffectiveness of the governments’ policies. On the other hand, central government was weak in Tudor England and it is doubtful whether any measures might have achieved significant success. Other local initiatives that candidates might consider were acts of private charity, for example the building of almshouses and hospitals. Some of the benefactors were men who had prospered in the larger towns, especially London, and were giving largesse to their places of origin.

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**Politics and Religion 1603-1629**

17(a) Assess the reasons why some members of Parliament wished to limit the royal prerogative during the period from 1603 to 1629.

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

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Both James I and Charles I made open claims about royal prerogative, linking it to Divine Right. James saw it as 'the supremest thing upon earth' whilst kings were 'God's lieutenants on earth'. This led him to be impatient with resistance in Parliament. Charles I, whilst mostly avoiding such statements, was clearly a champion of royal prerogative. But it was not only the theories of monarchy held by the Stuarts that proved controversial. Their policies caused disputes. Candidates might refer to the introduction of a new Book of Rates and Bate's Case early in James I's reign. Religion divided the King from some MPs. Foreign policy, a royal prerogative, was widely unpopular. His handling of the law was challenged by lawyers such as Coke. In Charles I's reign, to 1629, reference might be made to the demands of the Petition of Right (1628) which encapsulated the complaints about the way in which Charles I used royal prerogative. It demanded an end to billeting, arbitrary taxation and arbitrary imprisonment. The circumstances of the Three Resolutions (1629), which also included a protest against popery, can be examined. Some very good answers might also consider changes in the House of Commons, with more lawyers becoming members and more emphasis on common law and parliamentary traditions. The climate changed. For example, Charles I did not enjoy a honeymoon of power but was immediately in difficulty over supplies.

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 Parliament was more responsible than James I for the King's financial problems.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about responsibility for a king's financial 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 argued that Parliament came to realise that they had a weapon in their powers over taxation and that they were insufficiently sympathetic to James I's problems. Neither Parliament nor James I was responsible for inflation but Parliament opposed measures that might have helped the crown to alleviate its worst effects for the monarchy. James I inherited a debt from Elizabeth I. A relatively modest attempt to increase trade duties (the Book of Rates) was resisted. Parliament, as well as the King, would not agree to the settlement that Salisbury / Robert Cecil proposed in the Great Contract (1610). On the other hand, candidates might claim that James I's extravagance was an important factor and he provoked trouble particularly by grants to disreputable favourites. Towards the end of the reign, monopolies were a source of friction. Perhaps James's insistence on his prerogative rights and low regard for Parliament worsened the quarrels over finance.

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.

Personal Rule and Civil War 1629 - 1649**18(a) How far were the policies of William Laud the main reason for Charles I's unpopularity by 1640?**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a king's unpopularity 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 Study Topic begins in 1629 and candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge and understanding of Charles I's reputation from 1625 to 1629. Laud was Bishop of London from 1628 and Archbishop of Canterbury from 1633, exercising a powerful influence not only over narrowly religious affairs. He sat on the Privy Council and advised Charles I on foreign affairs. But his main impact was on religion. He aimed to prevent the drift to Puritan unorthodoxy and impose discipline at all levels. Arminian in sympathies, his preferences (eg vestments, position of the altar, music, kneeling and bowing) seemed neo-Catholic to his critics. His attempt to regain impropriations alienated landowners who had benefited from them. The Book of Sports was unpopular with Puritans. He had a mutually close relationship with the King whose popularity suffered as a result. 'How far...?' should lead candidates to consider other reasons for the King's lack of support. They might examine the financial measures that were introduced during his personal government (eg forest and knighthood fines, tunnage and poundage, ship money). The exercise of personal absolutism and the neglect of parliament can be considered. Some reference might be made to Wentworth / Strafford. However, it might be argued that the Scottish Crisis and the Bishops' Wars were the most important reasons for the end of personal government and proved the most divisive factor in 1640.

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 New Model Army was more effective than other royalist and parliamentary armies in the First Civil War. (1642-46)

Focus: Assessment of an important military development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can be expected to explain why the New Model Army was more effective than the other armies - parliamentarian royalist - and therefore answers in **Band I** should normally be expected to contrast it with other forces although the focus should be on the New Model Army. Emerging from the Self-Denying Ordinance and the formidable Eastern Association, this army was commanded by more determined and able generals (especially Fairfax and Cromwell) than Essex and Manchester. Cromwell in particular displayed a military genius; he was able to inspire and recruit men and disciplined them to be more effective on the battlefield. (It is arguable whether the three armies were different in discipline off the battlefield but most might accept the view of a disciplined, highly moral New Model Army.) It was able to fight nationally whereas previous parliamentary armies had been more willing to fight in their regions. The soldiers were paid regularly (or perhaps comparatively more regularly than other armies because many soldiers in the New Model Army were in arrears at the end of the First Civil War). Essex, Manchester and other parliamentary leaders seemed to be uncertain in their political and military aims. The royalists suffered from a lack of money. Charles I was a poor strategist and Rupert, their most effective military leader, was ultimately worsted by Cromwell. The King's armies suffered from their regional divisions; it was difficult to unite his support in the north and south-west. In assessing answers, examiners should be wary when reading answers that are organised chronologically. Candidates might show change in this way and such answers should not be dismissed as low-level narrative.

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 Interregnum 1649-1660

19(a) How successful was the Protectorate in achieving Oliver Cromwell's aims in domestic affairs from 1653 to 1658? Explain your answer.

Focus: Assessment of the success of a novel constitution in achieving a ruler's aims.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can be expected to explain Cromwell's aims and answers in **Band I** will probably do so explicitly. Other might do so implicitly. There is controversy about his aims: a comprehensive settlement or personal power? But candidates are not expected to show knowledge of historiography at AS Level and examiners will be realistic about their expectations of candidates' ability to handle controversial issues at this Level. Candidates can consider the background to the Instrument of Government; Cromwell had already faced problems in establishing a popular government through the Rump and Barebones Parliament. However, answers should concentrate on the period from 1653 to Cromwell's death in 1658; developments and problems to 1653 should be covered quickly to allow proper time for a consideration of the Key Issue. Many would argue that the Protectorate, as established by the Instrument of Government, was an attempt to secure a balanced constitution, defining the powers of the Lord Protector, Council of State and Parliament. Rejecting kingship, Cromwell believed that a single person at the head of government was necessary and would be acceptable. However, the Protectorate did not solve basic problems. It did not reconcile the royalists whilst believers in the 'Good Old Cause' considered that it betrayed republican principles. Members of Parliament soon became restive at the limitations on their power. The Army's influence was still strong especially on the Council of State. The first Protectorate Parliament was dissolved as soon as legally possible - some believed sooner. Penruddock's Plot proved that active royalist rebels were few and badly organised in England but there was a much wider range of passive royalism. The introduction of the Major Generals convinced many of Cromwell's tendencies to rule through the military. The Humble Petition and Advice might have divided his supporters rather than provide reconciliation. There were exclusions from the first Protectorate Parliament and a larger number of exclusions of radicals from the second. This was dissolved when it attacked the re-shaped Upper House. It is possible to argue that Cromwell could have done nothing to make his government widely popular by 1658; the dissenting groups were too large and too varied. Another aim might be seen as the settlement of religion. Although his policies were resisted by different, and sometimes opposing, groups, one could judge perhaps generously that he was quite successful in this respect. The Protectorate was not a time of harsh religious oppression although he did not settle religion.

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 Republic became unstable after the death of Oliver Cromwell (1658).

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for political instability in a specific period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might argue that the death of Oliver Cromwell removed the one man who could provide stability to the Republic. It will be relevant to consider the situation at the time of his death. However, candidates should not devote too much time to explanations of his rule. There is an argument that the Restoration was inevitable but the most successful answers will focus mostly on the period from 1658 to 1660. Richard Cromwell was unable to impose his authority and achieve a stable rule, although he was not as incapable as was once believed. The republican government was torn by the rivalries of different groups, each too weak to establish itself in power but strong enough to prevent others from taking power. Candidates might consider the role of the Rumpers who were briefly restored. The army officers such as Lambert jostled for power. Although the royalists were still too weak to seize power for Charles II (for example, Booth's Rising), the majority in the country were probably royalist in sympathy. Charles II, advised by Hyde / Clarendon, played a waiting game. A premature invasion might have strengthened the position of the republicans because the army was still strong militarily. The chaos that was resolved by Monck proved the ultimate weakness of the republicans.

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.

Society and the Economy 1603 - 1660

20(a) 'The period from 1603 to 1660 was mostly one of economic expansion.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about economic developments.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might agree with the case for expansion whilst others might disagree. Some yeomen farmers became more prosperous as they enclosed land and became more efficient. Others were not as successful. Tenants often suffered as rents increased. Some urban dwellers benefited when their towns and cities prospered; others shared the decline of their towns and cities. London maintained its leading position but there were also gains for regional centres such as the coal centres in the north-east. Those whose living depended on wool and cloth had a difficult time as foreign competition increased and exporting was more difficult. A minority of merchants were involved in new overseas markets, for example to the Indies. The disturbances of the civil war and the instability of the ensuing republic harmed many, especially royalist supporters. Many of them lost land and fortunes. One would expect answers in **Band I** to consider both gains and losses whereas more moderate answers might focus on one side of the 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) Assess the reasons why fear of witchcraft was strong during the period from 1603 to 1660.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for an important social phenomenon.

The question may be agreed with or rejected inasmuch as candidates can come to different conclusions— no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It has been argued that suspicion of witchcraft had its origins in religious, social and economic factors. Rationalism was growing but the uncertainty of life could best be explained by many as the result of witchcraft. It is probably not a coincidence that accusations of witchcraft increased alongside the growing religious tensions in other aspects of belief in early seventeenth-century England. Social groups and individuals that were isolated were more prone to charges of witchcraft. The phenomenon increased during times of hardship. Although some refuted the existence of witchcraft, their expressions of doubt were drowned by others, including some in high places such as James I. Some candidates might question whether it was a concern of 'many people', as the question states. There were regional differences that are difficult to explain and it might be too easy to make national judgements.

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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY

Unit 2584

SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

January 2007

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: 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.

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'** (ie subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 2583-2586: GENERIC MARK BANDS

AS PERIOD STUDIES

NB

Examiners are reminded that

- 1 for answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark and then moderate up or down according to the qualities of the answer;
- 2 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;
- 3 they are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Mark Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5];
- 4 they are marking out of 45. OCR's computer will double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.
- 5 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.
- 6 If a candidate discusses the wrong topic (eg evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II when the question is on William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award up to the top of Band VI.

ESSAY**Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation**

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

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (eg 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 perspective(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 (ie '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.

England 1780-1846**The Age of Pitt and Liverpool 1783-1830**

1(a) How serious was the Radical threat facing Pitt in the period from 1789 to 1801? Explain your answer.

Focus: An evaluation of the severity of the Radical threat to Pitt.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to focus on the extent of the Radical threat, its ability to achieve its ends, government perception of this, the effectiveness of its leadership and organisation and the extent of the support it could command. If the focus is only on Pitt, the candidate might not be able to go beyond Band II but examiners should consider the argument as a first priority. Certainly Pitt's governments took the message very seriously (the simple policy of governments elected by all adult males without patronage). The fear was that such a simple message (Rights of Man) would spread outside the usual propertied circle to artisans and the common people. Something like a national movement emerged based on an urban artisan leadership (LCS etc), stimulated by the ideas of the French Revolution which were then spread via meetings and pamphlets, hence government action to curb their ability to do this. The leadership was a devoted one (Paine, Cartwright, Tooke and Jebb), their methods (debate, correspondence and Open Air Protest in 1793 and 1795) difficult to deal with and their allies potentially powerful (Dissenters and Unitarians with a group of Radical MPs who introduced Radical Bills). When combined with trading and harvest problems (1794-5) this was serious. Yet from the beginning the religious complexion (Anglicans v. Dissenters) enabled local elites to use Church and King Mobs to threaten Radicals and attack Meeting Houses. There was little chance of Parliamentary motions succeeding whilst the numbers joining the Corresponding Societies remained small (LCS, 5000 at its highpoint). The Radicals were poorly prepared to develop methods beyond meetings and correspondence and governments found it easy to target these. They were driven underground after 1795, their seriousness then dependent on plotting but government spies undermined this.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 would you agree that the Tory governments of 1822 to 1830 were open to all types of reform except constitutional change?

Focus: An evaluation of the Tory governments' openness to reform.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to be careful to delineate the various types of reform- economic, financial, judicial, administrative, religious, political and constitutional- and the various groupings within Toryism to make sense of their answer. This was not necessarily a reformist age and the expectation from government was limited. Nonetheless the events of pre 1822 had focused on reform issues and they continued to be prominent. Most candidates are likely to argue that the governments were more open to economic and financial reform (Liverpool, Huskisson, Peel and a freer trade) than anything else, although Wellington's government was hostile to this, as were many Tory backbench MPs. As with so many reform issues the Pittites were happier to embrace moderate reforms. There was a consensus that Peel's legal and administrative reform was sensible and overdue but religious reforms were highly contentious. The Canningites backed both Roman Catholic Emancipation and repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, but sizeable numbers of the Tories did not. Both were constitutional issues, a breach of the Protestant Constitution, yet Wellington and Peel pushed them through. Clearly there is much here for candidates to discuss- some Tory elements were supportive of religious constitutional change, others were not. However all opposed Parliamentary Reform itself and Wellington's government fell in 1830 opposing this. Earlier Lord Liverpool had been reluctant to consider even minor redistribution. Better candidates are likely to comment on the variety of approaches to reform within Tory governments and to make distinctions as to which type of constitutional reforms were reluctantly accepted, for whatever reason.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 would you agree that France remained the greatest threat to British interests in the period from 1815 to 1841?

Focus: An assessment of the threats to British interests.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Purely a focus on France cannot go beyond a Band III. Candidates will need to assess France in relation to other threats, most notably from Russia, the US or, at particular periods, from Spain and Portugal. A focus on just France and Russia is perfectly proper. Those who argue for France as the greater threat could stress the Vienna Settlement, the concern with French regimes to 1841 (the Bourbons and Louis Philippe), whether France had been too successfully integrated into the European states system, the prospect of French interference in the Peninsula and thus Latin America in 1823 and the Belgian Revolt in the 1830s affecting Britain's strategic interests and the crises generated by Mehmet Ali (how far was he a French puppet?). Against this could be set the timidity of French regimes, largely put in place at British insistence (1815), the successful outcomes of most crises involving France, and the Quadruple Alliance. Russia, even in 1815, could be considered a much greater threat, its armies in occupation of Paris in 1815, the Polish-Saxon Question, Russia's use of the Holy Alliance to counter the western powers, the Greek Question and the emerging Eastern Question which threatened the Mediterranean and the Near East. Thus Russia in this period could be seen as a far greater threat to the balance of power than France. The US also threatened British trade via the Monroe Doctrine, anti-slavery policies after 1833 and Canada. Better candidates may point to different periods proving more of a threat from one country than from others but overall the French threat lessened, despite scares in 1823 and the 1830s, whilst that of Russia deepened, especially after 1828. Another fruitful line of approach is via British interests, assessing France's relative importance as a threat to each.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 would you agree that Castlereagh was more successful as Foreign Secretary than Canning?

Focus: A comparison of the relative success of Castlereagh and Canning.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to make comparison the heart of their answer. Two separate assessments will find it more difficult to access the higher bands. Better candidates will proceed to assess the issues that both dealt with, evaluating their success in terms of securing British interests in both the short and long term. The following are ideal areas for discussion- the Vienna Settlement and the Congress System, the question of Alliances and their purpose, Spain and Portugal, Latin America and the Greek Question. There was debate in all these about how British interests were best served. Castlereagh thought that a Congress System to ease the post war settlement was desirable, Canning did not. Should Castlereagh be given credit for withdrawing from the System once he saw how Russia sought to use it or should the 'success' go to Canning in formally repudiating it? Was Castlereagh moving towards recognition of the Latin American colonies and would have acted similarly to Canning if he had lived? Castlereagh failed to prevent the emergence of the Holy Alliance but Canning curbed it by his handling of the Greek Question to 1827 which had barely begun when Castlereagh was in office. How much credit should be given to Castlereagh for the Vienna Settlement itself- does this alone make him the more successful Foreign Secretary? How far did Canning follow the precepts of Castlereagh's State Paper of 1820? Candidates should be rewarded for their quality of argument based around such issues.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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) To what extent did Peel change the old Tory party into a new Conservative party in the period from 1834 to 1846?**

Focus: An evaluation of the extent to which Peel changed his party.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is perfectly possible to argue that Peel had no wish to change a party that was essentially Tory in bulk but Pittite/Peelite in leadership and that he held to patronage politics and disinterested service to the monarch and the national interest. Candidates could cite much evidence of this- his dislike of Parliamentary Reform, a strong insistence on Law and Order, his concern to maintain Anglican supremacy (his record on Church Reform in the First Ministry of 1834), his tight-knit government of 1841, his maintenance of land in the 1841 Election and the 1842 Corn Law. However candidates could also point to his need to re-broaden the party after 1832, the Tamworth Manifesto, more party organisation, the acceptance of Reform and his desire to frustrate the older paternal Tories on Factory Reform, the Poor Law, finance and the Corn Laws. All of this could be described as Tamworth Conservatism. Clearly Peel failed to change the party into a Conservative one given that both Peelite Conservatives and he himself were driven out in 1845-46 over Maynooth and the Corn Laws. His cabinets were not representative of the Tory party which remained suspicious of Peel's motives and legislative politics. The 1841 Election demonstrates that the party remained Tory in appeal and in type (counties and the small rural boroughs), hence Peel's problems in government. His wooing of a broader vote in the 1830s was of limited success.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 main reasons for the success of Peel's Ministry (1841-46) were its policies of Free Trade and taxation.' How far do you agree?

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for the success of Peel's Ministry.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates might point to failures in the Ministry but contemporaries were impressed with the legislative achievement and especially focused, in the longer term, on Free Trade (the reduction of Tariffs to encourage trade and employment and Corn Law repeal to lower food prices) and taxation (the re-introduction of an Income Tax on the propertied to balance the books pending a trade revival). This helped, or was seen to help, the recovery from the appalling depression that threatened economic collapse and government bankruptcy. The rich were seen to bear the burden and employment prospects broadened. Above all it led to cheap food. Peel was always to be credited with this, particularly amongst the working class. Similarly the middle class gave credit to the government for apparently acceding to the demands of the Anti Corn Law League and for regulating an unstable industrialising economy (Bank Charter Act and Company Act). They would also see it as a success for resisting O'Connell's Irish demands and for the harsh attitude taken to the Chartists. Some might see success in seeing-off the Ten Hour Movement, others would regard this as another example of harshness. Candidates can also take a wider view - much of the success could be attributed to Peel and his Ministry for resolute government after Whig failure. Legislation was well drafted and carefully seen through. The Commons and Lords were well managed at least to 1845-46. The economy recovered after 1843, particularly due to Railway Mania, something Peel was less interested in and less successful in controlling. The Ministry was backed by the Monarchy (Prince Albert) and in many instances could command Whig support (on Free Trade) as well. All were major reasons for success.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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) How far was the British economy mechanised in the period from 1780 to 1846?**Focus: An evaluation of the extent of mechanisation.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Successful candidates will need to be aware of the different rates of mechanisation within the economy, drawing their conclusions from this. There may be more continuity than change in this respect. Textiles would provide a good example for candidates. Although spinning was fully mechanised from the beginning of the period this had the affect of promoting the traditional handloom weavers. Weaving was not fully mechanised until the 1800-20 period. Although cotton was the most advanced and 'factory' based other textiles remained slower to mechanise- wool (post 1810), linen and especially silk (still largely un-mechanised at the end of the period). Iron was similarly mechanised early in the period but its artisan equivalent, blacksmiths, remained traditional throughout. Coal, too, was mechanised via pumps by the late 18th century through to 1820 but transport was much later- in the 1830s and 1840s. Factories however were largely confined to textiles in the period and could often be small scale. The persistence of small workshops or of working from home was considerable, even in textiles. Railways might be considered as relevant to mechanisation. The London economy remained an un-mechanised, workshop one, as did Birmingham, South Yorkshire and the West Midlands. Traditional areas of industry (Kent, the West Country, East Anglia), were non-mechanised and declined. The picture is far from straight forward and better candidates will realise this.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 rural life change in the period from 1780 to 1846?

Focus: An assessment of how rural life changed.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Much will depend on how candidates see the impact of agricultural change, especially enclosures, and the impact of the Old and New Poor Law. Much would depend on area. Enclosure was more common in the South and East as were the practices of the Old Poor Law. Some candidates could see the prevalence of Parliamentary enclosure of waste and common land as changing rural life for the worse. Squatters, Cottagers and small inefficient farmers were forced out, higher rents were imposed. Yet enclosure affected less than half the land and there were gains in cheaper and more plentiful food. The Swing Riots in 1830 occurred in areas relatively unaffected by enclosure. For a large part of the period rural areas were overpopulated so wages were lowered and many migrated internally to towns. This gradually tackled rural problems like under-employment, and even seasonal unemployment, although in the South there was much exploitation of casual labour. The extent of a decline from small landed independence to agricultural labourer can be questioned. The North also remained different- pastorally based and more open to the dual economy with higher wages. More serious in general was the agricultural depression that followed peace in 1815 and persisted throughout the 1820s. In 1834 the 18th century system of outdoor relief came to an end, at least in the South and less eligibility was imposed, often quite ruthlessly to ensure a free labour market on one that was already overcrowded. This created a real change in rural life. However in some respects little changed, especially pastorally and in terms of relative poverty for the majority. Others were ejected from rural life or removed as idle, old, vagrant or unwanted to workhouses.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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) How important was Palmerston's mastery of foreign policy in making him the dominant political leader from 1855 to 1865? Explain your answer.

Focus: an evaluation of the relative importance of foreign policy in Palmerston's leadership.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Some candidates may argue that foreign policy was crucial in ensuring Palmerston's dominance, citing his use of the siege of Sebastopol to engineer the fall of Aberdeen's government and his own elevation to the premiership. He then posed as the Crimean victor, driving the Russians to a peace that they might have accepted earlier. His position was then reinforced by turning the tables on the Radicals over his China policy by calling a snap election in 1857, which saw overwhelming support for the Second Opium War. In the 1860s he made much of the French threat, building Ironclads and fortifications (his 'follies') and he used Italy to create a formal Liberal party in 1859. Despite southern sympathies Palmerston avoided being dragged into the American Civil War, thereby uniting his party and in avoiding confrontation with Russia over Poland. However better candidates might point to two spectacular mistakes – the apparent giving in to Napoleon III over the Orsini bomb plot and the diplomatic defeat at the hands of Bismarck over the Schleswig-Holstein affair in 1863-4. It also put him on a frequent collision course with Gladstone, his chancellor. However candidates will also need to examine the relative importance of other issues in ensuring his dominance – the continued Conservative split, the permanent support of the Peelites from 1859, the disgrace of Aberdeen after 1855, the preparedness of Russell, his old enemy, to serve in his government, the success of Gladstone's economic and financial measures at a time of economic stability and the moderate nature of a reform-minded electorate. All of these, it could be argued, were more important than foreign policy in securing Palmerston's dominance and certainly his electoral victory in 1865 (a majority of 80).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 would you agree that the domestic reforms, including Ireland, of the 1868-74 ministry owed more to Gladstone's colleagues than to him?

Focus: an assessment of the relative importance of Gladstone's colleagues in the reforms of the first ministry.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to focus on the initiative behind reform in the first ministry. The question suggests his ministers were more important than he was and there is much evidence to support this. Forster was the driving force behind elementary educational reform. Gladstone was very reluctant, particularly when it involved State expenditure and threatened to weaken the Church of England. Cardwell dominated the Army reforms and regarded Gladstone as a potential obstacle to his military and strategic ideas. Bruce at the Home Office was responsible for Licensing Reform. Gladstone had a certain distrust of Nonconformity and could see the class issues raised by Drink. He was certainly no strong supporter of Bruce in this respect. Similarly the Trade Union legislation was not one of Gladstone's particular interests and Bruce was left to deal with the Royal Commission's divided findings on the matter. The Secret Ballot Act was privately opposed by Gladstone. He could not see the point in it and had always cherished the pre 1832 political system. It was grudgingly conceded to woo John Bright back to the Cabinet. However candidates could also point to much that was inspired by Gladstone. Anything Irish was dominated by him, to the extent that mistakes were made, especially in his historic approach to Irish Land. Disestablishment and University Reform were all part of a Peelite plan to civilise Ireland and atone for past English misgovernment. The Whigs in the Cabinet were uneasy. He wouldn't even listen to old friends like Cardinal Manning on the Land issue. Gladstone also dominated Administrative Reform and Finance – he was determined to reorganise efficiently local and central government (the Civil Service Reforms) whilst his Chancellors stood little chance of making their own mark. The reform of Higher Education was also very much a Gladstonian preoccupation. A list of reforms that makes little or no attempt to address the question will not be able to go beyond the Band III /IV borderline at best.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 did the Conservatives become the party of Empire and the upholder of British interests abroad during the period from 1846 to 1880?**

Focus: An evaluation of the Conservatives as a party of patriotism and Empire 1846-1880.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. It is expected that the focus will be on the period after 1868. Before this, under Derby, the Empire was rarely contentious and British interests and the methods of achieving them were accepted by most major political groupings. Better candidates may point to some exceptions – Disraelian attempts to oppose Palmerston's China War in 1856-7 and the disagreements over whether to support Austria in Italy in 1859. After 1868 Disraeli made a conscious attempt to rescue the Conservatives from minority status. Part of this was to stress the Conservatives as the 'National Party' which involved stressing the importance of maintaining and defending the Empire against a supposed Liberal plot to undermine it and to accuse the Liberals of selling out British interests abroad (the Alabama arbitration and Russia's abrogation of the Black Sea clauses). This was the theme of both the Crystal Palace and the Manchester Speeches in 1872. However better candidates might suggest that such commitments were rather vague, as indicated by developments when the Conservatives were back in power. Disraeli continued to use such patriotic and imperial devices – candidates could cite the less than successful support for the Ottomans in 1876 (they were accused by Gladstone of Jingoism and of ignoring Christian civilisation) followed by the much more successful challenge to the Russian 'Bear,' once Russia looked like winning her war against Turkey. The stage managing of the Congress of Berlin enabled Disraeli to cloak the Conservatives in a triumphant mantle of patriotism ('Peace with Honour'). With the Empire Disraeli could point to extension in South Africa and the defence of India in Afghanistan but neither proved successful (Zulu and Afghan Wars) and Gladstone exploited this in the Midlothian Campaign of 1879. There is no doubting that after Palmerston's death the Conservatives made much of Empire and patriotism, Disraeli particularly, but others like Derby and Salisbury remained cautious and other issues remained, arguably, just as important – traditional defence of Monarchy, Aristocracy and the propertied Constitution and a defence of the people from the harshness of pure Laissez-Faire and 'harassing legislation'

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 would you agree that Disraeli's role in the domestic reforms of the 1874-80 ministry was limited?

Focus: An evaluation of Disraeli's role in the domestic reforms of his 1874-80 Ministry.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Successful candidates will need to distinguish between areas where Disraeli involved himself and set the agenda and those where he did not. It is important to realise that his major preoccupation was foreign and imperial policy and that he became increasingly ill as the ministry progressed. Much will also depend on whether candidates argue that Disraeli was implementing a policy of Tory Democracy during the Ministry. If he was then his role is likely to be enhanced. If not then the initiative is likely to lie elsewhere, especially with Cross. Certainly Disraeli lacked interest in educational reform, public health, housing and local government. Never a man for detail Disraeli left the initiatives and the legislation to Cross and Gorst or even to MPs like Plimsoll who were responsible for the Acts dealing with these areas. If he had been more involved then they might have been different and less conventional and Gladstonian in their sweep and compass. By 1875 Disraeli was already proclaiming himself satisfied in those areas. He and Cross did not get on. The latter complained of the lack of vigour in social areas and was reminded that the people had been promised relief from 'harassing legislation'. There was little further reform after 1875. Disraeli's role tended to be a political one. He did not stand in the way of the early legislation but was always involved in party political point scoring – anything to do with patronage or with the Church ensured attention. He involved himself in Sandon's Education Act 1876 to preserve Anglican influence in rural Board Schools. He and Cross worked together to modify the Liberal Licensing Act in 1874 which had harmed Tory interests. Disraeli eagerly seized upon Trade Union reform to capitalise on Liberal mistakes and make an attempt at wooing liberal working class and business voters, hence the equal footing in law of employers and employees and the removal of prosecution for strike action. Good candidates will need to strike a successful balance in their answers on the extent to which Disraeli's role was limited.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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.

Foreign and Imperial Policies 1846-1902

7(a) How successful was Britain in securing its interests in the Eastern Question from 1854 to 1878? Explain your answer.

Focus: An assessment of Britain's success in securing her interests in the Eastern Question.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to understand what British interests were at stake in the Eastern Question. In Egypt this involved checking French influence in an area crucial for communication with the East. It could be argued that here Disraeli was very successful in obtaining British control of the French built Suez Canal and of Cyprus to protect naval power in the Eastern and South Eastern Mediterranean in 1878. The Khedive did not become a French puppet. Of greater importance were the Balkans and the Straits, both threatened by the growth of Russian power and ambition and a threat to the balance of power and British trade. Here it can be argued that success was less assured. The Crimean war saw military defeats and military scandals. The Treaty of Paris 1854 did secure British interests in that both rival powers guaranteed Ottoman independence (the preservation of this was a key British policy), the Balance of Power was upheld and neither Russia or Turkey were allowed a fleet in the Black Sea, removing any danger of a threat to Britain's Mediterranean supremacy. The independence of the Balkans was preserved (Rumania). However candidates could point out that such achievement were not always very long lasting (the Sultan's treatment of Christian people worsened, the Black Sea Clauses were abrogated in 1870 or the War had unforeseen consequences (Austrian isolation, abandoned by Russia to its fate at the hands of Prussia and France, dangerous for the Balance of power in Europe and for the preservation of the 1856 settlement of the Eastern Question). Britain failed to prevent the Ottoman and Russian navies entering the Mediterranean in 1870-71. Between 1875-77 Britain lost the initiative (in restraining the Ottoman reaction to Christian rebellion) to the Dreikaiserbund, there were Cabinet disagreements (Disraeli v. Derby) and Gladstone exploited this in his Bulgarian pamphlet of 1876. Disraeli's attempts to disrupt the Dreikaiserbund prevented a settlement and he was lucky in 1877-78 that Britain's policy was rescued by Russia's invasion of the Ottoman Empire in 1877 and by Salisbury's negotiations with Ignatiev and Shuvalov culminating in the Berlin Conference. Britain was also lucky that other powers were horrified by San Stefano and Russia was prepared to negotiate without recourse to war. Nonetheless Derby and Carnarvon resigned. The settlement however secured Britain's interests- a large Bulgaria with a Mediterranean coastline was broken up and Turkey survived, although the insistence on the Straits being closed to Russian warships had to be abandoned in favour of an open waterway and Britain acquired a commitment to protect Turkey's Asian frontier which she could not effectively carry out. Better candidates will be aware of Britain's fluctuating fortunes in the Eastern Question.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 Cecil Rhodes and Joseph Chamberlain to Britain's involvement in Africa from 1868 to 1902? Explain your answer.

Focus: An evaluation of the relative importance of Cecil Rhodes and Joseph Chamberlain in explaining African involvement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Taken as a whole they played a less important role than if just considered for their part in the expansion of the Empire in Southern Africa. General factors such as investment overseas, trade, Great Power rivalry in Europe, the British decision to invade Egypt, missionary activity (in East Africa) etc. clearly played key roles and both men were, in part, representatives of such factors, especially trade and investment, and in Cecil Rhodes case, the role of ambitious men on the spot pursuing their own agenda. Neither played much role in involvement before 1880. Britain was already heavily involved in South Africa before that focusing on the British colonies of the Cape and Natal and the Boer states of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Candidates could point to the discovery of gold on the Transvaal as the key factor in involvement. Cecil Rhodes played the crucial role in exploiting the mineral wealth there (de Beers) and then focused on political control to secure this- he acquired Bechuanaland for Cape Colony in 1884 and founded the British South Africa Company as a means of acquiring territory in what became Rhodesia (fertile and copper rich) from Kings and Chieftains. Clearly he was crucial to British expansion here, both economic (Cape to Cairo railway) and political. He was determined to push for political control of the Boer Republic when Prime Minister of Cape Colony from 1890 and was behind the Jameson Raid in 1896 on the Transvaal which helped trigger the Second Boer War and which did achieve his objective. His vision encompassed a British Africa and beyond and he did work to achieve this in Southern and East Africa. Yet Sir Bartle Frere before him had pursued Imperial Federation in South Africa in the 1870s in a similar manner. Rhodes was far from alone in pushing for more African involvement. Joseph Chamberlain's role is more confined to 1893-1902 when he becomes Colonial Secretary. It could be argued that the post implied a commitment to protect the African Empire and the Zulu Wars already implied control over South Africa. Joseph Chamberlain was the first to link it to a tariff trading system (Imperial Preference) and the raising of revenue for social reform. After the Berlin Conference in 1884 all Colonial Secretaries were aware of the 'Scramble'. Yet Joseph Chamberlain made the Empire central for the Conservative government and after Rhodes' resignation he and Lord Milner worked to build military power to force the Boer issue. The war itself discredited Joseph Chamberlain as the Jameson Raid had done Cecil Rhodes. Both stood for economic imperialism on an Africa-wide scale but from different perspectives (Central v. Local).

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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.

Trade Unions and Labour 1867-1906

8(a) How important were strikes in expanding the influence and power of the Trade Unions in the period from 1867 to 1906? Explain your answer.

Focus: An assessment of the relative importance of strikes in expanding Trade Union power and influence.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to establish the periods when the Trade Unions expanded their influence-1867 to 1880 and 1888 to 1891- with setbacks in the 1890s and early 1900s. Was their expansion due to strikes and industrial muscle or to other factors such as economic and social change, more peaceful methods (lobbying for protection from both political parties) leadership, the consolidation of a skilled working class from 1868, the growing working class electorate (1868 and 1884) or Trade Union organisation in general? Candidates are likely to argue that the gains of the 1870s were not due to strikes. They owed far more to the New Model Unions which specifically ruled out official strikes. They had lobbied the Liberal governments via the new TUC and impressed by their savings, membership benefits and commitment to self help. The Gladstonian and Disraelian legislation granting legal recognition and picketing were both responses to this type of minority, moderate unionism and to the potential of working class votes. Such unions aligned with the Liberals. The 1880s were different, built on the recognition that the New Model Unions represented only a minority of skilled male workers in permanent labour. The New Unions were frequently led by socialists who saw the strike weapon as crucial to advance Trade Union power. Their members were women, casual workers and the unskilled whose only weapon was the strike. 1888-89 saw large scale strikes, especially in the Docks and amongst Gas workers. Although there were successes and the numbers were large, the 'victories' of those years had little positive effect on Trade Union power. They provoked an employer backlash both legally (Taff Vale and the Blackburn weavers' Case) and in organisation (Shipping Federation and the organisation of blackleg labour to break strikes). The result was a retreat for the Unions, precisely because of strikes. In other respects- the founding of a Labour Party to respond to the legal backlash- union power was laying important foundations, but this had little to do with strikes and more to do with Liberal inactivity, class issues and socialism, although candidates could point to the impact of the Engineering lockouts and railway strikes as an important background.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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) Who was more important in the development of the Labour Party to 1906, Keir Hardie or Ramsay MacDonald? Explain your answer.

Focus: A comparison of the relative importance of Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald in the development of the Labour Party.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The most successful candidates should try to avoid two separate accounts and instead compare their relative strengths and weaknesses. It is likely that they will conclude that Hardie was the more important prior to 1906, both outside and inside parliament. MacDonald had to wait until 1906 before becoming an MP, having failed to secure a seat in both 1895 and 1900. Hardie on the other hand was first elected, albeit rather accidentally, in 1892 (until defeated in 1895) and again in 1900 until his death. Inevitably Hardie and his image (the cloth cap and dignity of labour) predominated in parliament. In terms of party development Hardie proved crucial- he helped found the Scottish Labour Party in 1888 (both he and MacDonald were Scots) which was the first party devoted to independent Labour representation, and then the socialist ILP in 1893 (MacDonald joined in 1894). Both men stressed the need to work independently of the Liberals and to create a more broad based Labour party (MacDonald had originally joined the middle class gradualist Fabians in 1886). Both saw the Trade Unions as crucial (support and money), Hardie having organised the mining Unions. His greatest achievement was the creation of the LRC in 1900 and he became its leader in 1906 when it was reorganised and became the Labour Party. It could be argued that MacDonald became more important after 1900 in his role as the first Secretary of the Party. He was a very effective organiser and speaker, working to bring in more Trade Unions and ensuring a large jump in MP numbers in 1906 (2 to 29) thanks to the electoral pact negotiated with the Liberals in 1903. Candidates could use this to assess relative importance as its role in Labour and Liberal history is controversial- did it give too much to the Liberals by compromising the 'independent' status of Labour, or did it ensure a modest breakthrough in numbers in 1906 and beyond, given the disadvantage of the first past the post system for new parties?

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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**Liberals and Labour 1899-1918**

9(a) Assess the claim that the House of Lords provided the most serious opposition to the Liberal party's policy to create a modern welfare state during the period from 1906 to 1914.

Focus: An assessment of the relative importance of the Lords in opposing Liberal welfare reforms to 1914.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Opposition to Liberal welfare reform came from a variety of different sides, the Conservatives, some older Gladstonian Liberals, the medical profession, employers, skilled workers, the Labour party (who thought it did not go far enough and wanted redistributive taxation), landowners and the insurance companies. Candidates will need to demonstrate how the Conservatives used the Lords to veto or delay legislation to 1911, representing some of these 'interests' (Mr. Balfour's poodle). Given the large Liberal majority 1906-1910 such a focus on the Lords was inevitable. They were careful to reject only specific 'Liberal' measures- the 1906 Education Bill, a Licensing Bill in 1908. Other opponents could be 'bought off'- the Friendly Societies by incorporation into the unemployment schemes and the doctors by assurances regarding state employment and financial reward- but the Conservatives and landowners provoked a dangerous showdown in 1910-11 over the People's Budget. Some candidates may argue that the opposition of the Lords was less serious given that they were seen as opposing OAPs and the Dreadnoughts and that the Liberals used General Elections to face down Conservative arguments that their policies did not have an electoral mandate. But on the other hand, the Lords' rejections of the 1909 Budget did lead to a Conservative electoral recovery (100 plus seats) which forced the Liberals onto Labour and Irish dependency and a changed agenda between 1910 and 1914 (focusing more on Trade Unions and Irish issues). Contemporaries certainly considered Lords' opposition to be serious- it provoked a constitutional conflict which defeated the Lords and destroyed Balfour's leadership of the Conservative party. Yet the Lords continued to oppose Irish and Trade Union legislation and still had many powers intact, although arguably they were careful not to oppose welfare issues as they had indirectly done between 1906 and 1908.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 would you agree that the First World War created problems for both the Liberal and Labour parties?

Focus: An evaluation of the problems the First World War created for both the Liberals and Labour to 1918.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can answer in a variety of ways. One way is to compare how each responded to war issues- to the declaration of war in August 1914; to the conduct of war; to the prosecution of it; to issues of liberty; the creation of a Home Front; to franchise issues; to the question of a negotiated peace and to planning for the end of war. Another is to compare the attitudes of both parties- did the war cause more problems for the Liberals or Labour? Initially both Liberals and Labour responded to the wave of patriotism, although both had vocal minorities who opposed, the older Gladstonian Liberals such as Morley resigning, whilst the ILP objected to the class nature of the war. Labour had the advantage of Opposition until 1916 and could exploit Liberal difficulties with organisational problems. Asquith's deficiencies as a war leader (still operating through the full Cabinet) were considerable and led to the Munitions Crisis and Gallipoli in 1915. As a result Conservative opposition had to be bought off by ending a purely Liberal government. The Coalition was unpopular and harmed the Liberals who, as Lloyd George and Asquith clashed over further changes, became increasingly divided until Lloyd George's coup in 1916. Also, unwelcome for many Liberals, but welcomed by Labour, was the increasing economic intervention necessitated by war and the infringement of liberty involved in DORA and conscription (the Home Secretary resigned and 27 Liberals voted against). It could be argued that the bitterness of the Asquith/Lloyd George split fatally divided the Liberals for the rest of the war. Certainly the Lloyd George Coalition was more Conservative than Liberal. In 1918 the Liberals could hardly claim war victory for themselves and were to be further damaged by the inevitability of the 1918 Reform Act which gave the vote to a working class Labour constituency. Labour would be the beneficiary and had already gained brief government experience through Henderson. His area of expertise, industrial relations, benefited Labour. Although sacked in 1917 even this helped Labour retain its 'peace' credentials, as the occasion was his attendance at a socialist peace conference in Stockholm. It also ended the Lib Lab pact and led to Labour reorganisation, important given the large increase in Trade Union membership. By 1918 Labour had survived the hazards of war with firm ideas, robust organisation and money. It had avoided crippling splits (despite the ILP), gained a constituency and had recognition of some socialist values via economic intervention.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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.

Inter- War Domestic Problems 1918-1939

10(a) How far would you agree that government policy towards the mining industry was mainly responsible for the outbreak of the General Strike in 1926?

Focus: An evaluation of the causes of the General Strike.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to analyse government policy towards the coal industry and set it alongside a consideration of other factors- the attitudes of the coal owners, their response to the deteriorating terms of world trade in which British coal was increasingly uncompetitive in a more keenly priced market, the attitude of the strongest of the old unions and a TUC that appeared willing to back them. The role of the press and its owners, especially the Daily Mail, could also be considered as a trigger. Candidates might argue that problems in the mining industry were clearly the root cause of the strike, developing the problem posed by competition from new fuels, deteriorating geological conditions and the failure of private owners to amalgamate, seeing wage cuts and longer hours as the only solution. On the other hand the miners' leadership also refused compromise (Smith and Cook) and were encouraged in this by Red Friday when the government subsidy pegged wages until the Samuel Commission reported. They persuaded a reluctant and unprepared TUC to stand with them and refused to accept Samuel's compromise (wage cuts but not longer hours with promises of reorganisation). Government policy was not unsympathetic to longer term reorganisation but it had returned the industry to private hands in 1921, feared the cost of intervention, certainly wanted to back private enterprise and provided a policy that made matters worse by returning to the Gold Standard in 1925, thus making coal exports even more uncompetitive. It bought time on Red Friday to prepare to resist a strike and perhaps had little intention of seeing Samuel's recommendations through. It certainly opened out the issue by stressing the threat to the constitution, either because it thought it was so or because it was useful propaganda. It certainly was responsible for breaking off negotiations 3 May 1926, using the refusal of the Daily Mail printers to publish an article condemning a General Strike. Given government's pivotal role at this stage, candidates may well agree with the question's assertion.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 govern moderately was the main aim of the Labour governments of 1924 and 1929-31.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: An assessment of the aims of Labour governments in the inter-war period.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to assess the relative importance of the aims of Labour in the period. They should pay particular attention to the word 'main'. Labour's 1918 constitution committed it to state control of industry (Clause 4) and a minimum wage. Socialism was clearly its main aim on paper, involving extension of welfare (housing, non means-testing, abolition of the Poor Law, free secondary education) and of further constitutional reform. However circumstances- economic, financial and political (both governments were minority ones, dependent on Liberal support) conspired to ensure that the main aim was to be moderately reformist and the gaining of government experience. Certainly candidates could point to Ramsay MacDonald's determination to ensure that Labour appeared respectable, responsible and moderate given the scare tactics of the opposition (a right decision given the Conservative manipulation of the Red Scare, the Campbell Case and the Zinoviev letter). The domestic record fits such a case- a rather Liberal Housing Act, some public works schemes, a studious attempt not to favour the Trade Unions and a gesture to German reparations. However candidates can also point to less than moderate policies that contradict the above- how wise was it to negotiate treaties with the USSR in 1924 or to mishandle a legal case involving the editor of the Communist Workers' Weekly? In 1929-31, when unemployment hit, the so called betrayal of MacDonald in 1931 could be used to argue for moderation. Both MacDonald and Snowden were very traditional in their economic outlook, preferring cuts to balance budgets. Henderson, in maintaining that the working class should not bear the burden of this, could also be defined a moderate in Labour terms. He was merely defending the traditional working class. There was no consideration of radical or socialist alternatives, either in 1931 or before (Mosley resigned in 1930). MacDonald acted through his perception of the national interest, attempting to balance working class, foreign bankers and the Conservatives and Liberal party's competing demands. The aim was traditional and moderate to save the pound. It would have required a war for action of a radical or more socialist manner. Thus temperament and circumstances determined moderate governance.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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.

Foreign Policy 1939-1963

11(a) How successful for Britain was its relationship with the USA in the period from 1939 to 1945? Explain your answer.

Focus: An evaluation of Britain's relationship with the USA during the Second World War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Britain's aim in its relationship with the US during the Second World War needs to be understood if its success is to be evaluated effectively. In the period 1939-41 it was to secure as much economic and financial aid as possible to enable Britain to fight, alongside a campaign to persuade the US to abandon its neutrality and declare war on the Axis powers. After 1941 the aim became to ensure that the US prioritised the European war rather than the Pacific and that the US and USSR should not move against British imperial interests. There were also differences over strategic issues (Mediterranean, second front, Italy) and command structures. By 1945, Britain, aware of its weakness and worried at the extension of soviet power, needed to ensure that the US was not too inimical to British strategies and imperial interests. Candidates may argue for a variety of outcomes. Those who wish to argue for success can point to Lend Lease and to the end of neutrality in the earlier period but those who wish to challenge it can point to the hard bargain the US drove on Lend Lease (and the quality of the products delivered), Roosevelt's reluctance to get involved and that her entry into the war was more the result of Japanese and German action than British diplomacy. However Churchill was quick to exploit this, securing a commitment to Europe in December 1941 and a personal relationship with the President which he tried to use, but not always with success. By 1945 Britain had realised her best chances of retaining global status was as an ally of the US (something the Lend Lease encouraged given indebtedness to the US post war). After 1941 there was much friction between the US and Britain over a Second Front, the British being cautious, the Americans more inclined, given their resources, to take risks. Churchill succeeded in securing a Mediterranean strategy (North Africa and the Italy) in preference to an invasion of Northern France in 1942-43 but failed to persuade the US not to pursue an offensive against Japan at the Casablanca Conference. This involved a British commitment to retake the Burma Road to open up supply lines to Chiang Kai-shek. By 1943 the US clearly dominated strategic planning with Eisenhower in overall command but effectively strategy had been co-ordinated from 1941. The secret Quebec agreement was a success for Britain as it required mutual consent for the use of atomic weapons but this did not survive much beyond the war. At Teheran, Britain failed to prevent Roosevelt from acquiescing in the USSR's domination of Central and Eastern Europe, a turning point in underlining the eclipse of British power. Candidates could also assess the success of Britain's relationship with the US at Yalta and Potsdam. The success of the relationship with the US was a fluctuating and difficult one.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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) 'Imperial interests were the most important reason why the British attitude to greater European integration was one of caution.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1945 to 1963?

Focus: An assessment of the relative importance of the Empire in determining Britain's attitude to Europe.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to assess the empire as a factor in diverting Britain from a serious commitment to Europe. It will need to be weighed against others that could be argued were more important- Britain's relationship with the US (who were hostile to British imperialism but wanted her to take the lead in Europe) and the need to ensure her commitment to European defences, certainly the policy of Bevin. Her concern with the USSR which ensured an interest in the European Defence Union until superseded by NATO (US dominated). Another key interest was her global economy and alternative economic trading areas (EFTA etc) and a Europe (especially France) that was not always welcoming. Britain feared European economic control and the protectionism of the European iron and steel community. She also feared her national sovereignty being compromised. Europe in the first half of the period was rebuilding shattered economies and the Empire seemed a more inviting prospect, especially given the need for raw materials and cheap food. Africa especially beckoned. However candidates might point out that imperial interests were in decline and proving a serious drain on British defence resources. India was lost in 1947, there was insurgency in Malaya and Kenya, schemes for the economic development of Africa proved failures and Suez dealt a severe blow to imperial prestige and to Britain's influence in the Middle East. By 1961 such lessons had been learned, Europe had recovered and a Franco/German axis had replaced any hope of Britain being the key Western European player. Britain was thus less cautious about European developments by then. Better candidates might argue that British politicians were not just cautious but actively considered the various plans for Europe, rejecting them on the grounds that they did not suit British interests. Such considerations were usually economic and military and more to do with the British economy and the need to commit the US to Europe than to an automatic preference for the Empire.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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.

Post-War Britain 1945-1964

12(a) 'The social reforms of the Labour governments of 1945-51 were more successful than the economic policies.' How far do you agree?

Focus: A comparison of the relative success of Labour's social and economic policies 1945-51.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can argue for the success of Bevan's and Griffith's social reforms, especially the NHS and housing and the overhaul of national insurance which dispensed with means testing. Universality was a key success and at a time of economic hardship large sums were spent. Future governments didn't repeal any of it. In education, the leaving age was raised to 15 and rebuilding was encouraged. Nonetheless some candidates may point to shortcomings- free at the point of delivery in the NHS was breached by prescription charges, compromises had to be made on the housing programme given the wildly ambitious targets and administrative chaos (prefabs were introduced, squatting was tolerated and there was a squeeze on private building). On education there were few new initiatives and a comprehensive policy was abandoned by Ellen Wilkinson in favour of a socially divisive tripartite division of secondary education. As to economic policies better candidates may be able to make the link between successful economic policies and social ones, stressing that a commitment to Keynesian economic policies of high public spending to control unemployment was the most important as it was the key to prosperity and paying for social reform. However contemporaries would have pointed out that the economic policies were draconian and some would regard welfare resources as better spent on industrial recovery. To defend Labour's economic policies candidates could point to the dire economic circumstances – war bankruptcy, the need for US loans, a balance of payments crisis in 1947 and devaluation in 1949. This required rationing, import controls and the introduction of nationalisation to save teetering industrial giants like Coal, Railways and Iron and Steel. Candidates could discuss whether these were successful or not. Many would argue that they were more successful than the Welfare reforms, especially Labour itself. Only Iron and Steel generated any opposition. A mixed economy became the accepted norm. Others would stress the lack of purpose and economic drive to make a competitive success of them. Their record was a patchy one, existing managers were left in charge and a workforce appointments to management were restricted. Planning was often absent.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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) 'Victory in the 1964 election went to the party that seemed to be the more modern.'
How far do you agree?

Focus: An evaluation of the reason for the Labour victory in the 1964 election.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Modernity needs to be measured against other factors to assess Labour victory. Certainly Wilson was the youngest Prime Minister since 1812 (at 47) and given the mood of change of the 1960s his character contrasted well with the aristocratic Sir Alec Douglas-Home. Wilson stressed modernity (the new technological age) and appeared as both a competent technocrat and a reassuring, pipe smoking manager. He talked much of planning whilst Home proved an ineffective campaigner, weak on television and in handling hecklers. The Conservatives had rapidly lost their association with a modern, affluent society cultivated by Macmillan in the 1950s. After 1959 Macmillan lost the link with modernity appearing, like his successor, as a part of a public school establishment, out of touch with society. The Profumo scandal rocked the public image of the government. However candidates could also stress the importance of other factors. The failure in party organisation after Hailsham's departure (he had run a very effective campaign in 1959) was notable. Economic problems arose which led first to unpopular deflationary policies under Selwyn-Lloyd and then a dash for growth under Maudling. The government was rebuffed by de Gaulle in its application to join the EEC and there was unease over rapid decolonisation and immigration. In 1962 Macmillan's large scale reshuffle, intended to revitalise the party, proved a serious miscalculation, lowering party morale. His resignation as leader was bungled and led to an unseemly power struggle. The obvious candidates, Butler and Hailsham, were by-passed in favour of Home. The image of a divided party was taken into the election. Labour had not been in power since 1951; the Conservatives had in recent years washed much dirty linen in public. Home had no time to develop a distinct campaign despite Conservative attempts to remodel themselves since 1960. They certainly tried but failed to modernise 1959-64. The election of Wilson to the Labour leadership, and his appeal to both working class and middle class Britain, succeeded.

Answers in **Band I and II** will clearly evaluate a range of factors, offering a more or less balanced discussion of the core issues 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 will 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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY

Unit 2585

SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

June 2006

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: 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.

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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 2583-2586: GENERIC MARK BANDS

AS PERIOD STUDIES

NB

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 double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.
- The quality of the English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- If a candidate discusses the wrong topic (eg evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II when the question is on William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award up to the top of Band VI.

ESSAY**Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation**

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

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (eg 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 (ie '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.

Europe 1046-1250**The Reform of the Church 1046-1122****1(a) How important were Urban II and Paschal II to the development of the powers of the Papacy in the period from 1046 to 1122?**Focus: Assessment of papal roles in context

No set answer is required, but candidates will need a good focus upon the terms of the question and will need to assess the contributions of these two Popes to the development of papal power, rights, authority and claims. They may well set this in the context of the aftermath of the Investiture Crisis, though the thrust of the question is these two pontificates. Narratives and descriptions will not be able to engage the question enough to rise **above Bands V or IV at best**. Overt evaluation should merit **Band III and above**, according to quality. A strong focus on 'How important ...' is needed for the higher Bands. Pope Urban II was a reformer and a skilled administrator; there were strong Cluniac dimensions to reform; he continued the Gregorian ecclesiastical reforms, sought a working relationship with the Byzantine Church, further reorganised Church administration, made improvements in Rome, centralised power, developed the idea of the Curia and created a basis for what became the College of Cardinals. Pope Paschal II upheld Urban's stance over lay investiture and bishops' oaths to the Papacy. He made a major stand against Emperor Henry V and created a schism, though his stand maintained the sense of papal power and rights. Arguably, he created the possibility of a compromise over investiture. Like Urban, he supported reforms within the Church. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good and persistent focus upon the contributions of the Popes, set in context, and upon the needs of the question, above all a keen sense of importance. Answers in **Bands 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.

(b) Assess the reasons for the changes in monasticism in the period 1046 to 1122.Focus: Assessment of factors in mainstream religious change

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Developments in this long period can centre upon the waning appeal of the established Orders, above all the Cluniacs, and the growing appeal of Orders such as the Carthusians and the Cistercians. This could be measured by the pace and scale of endowments and new foundations. An answer very much focused on the latter area and well done would merit reward in **Bands I and II**, though an answer which set out to contrast (and explain) developments would be equally so rewarded, again according to quality. Candidates may consider factors such as: the wider religious-spiritual context of salvation, prayers, good works, the Benedictine Rule; attitudes towards austerity and ascetism, land-holding and use, episcopal and papal authority, community life, the location of religious sites, connections to powerful local families, lay involvement and patronage, the role within the expanding reform movement of the period. The Cistercians may well figure prominently in answers as a route to evaluation of the extent of change. That is fine. Answers in **Bands 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. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good and sustained focus on ‘Assess’ and ‘changes’. **Band I** answers will focus clearly on the demands of the question and will 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.

France and the Empire 1152-1250**2(a) Assess the strength of the German monarchy at the death of Frederick Barbarossa in 1190.**Focus: Evaluation of an institution and its ruler

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Answers need a good focus on ‘Assess the strength’ and will need to assess the apparent or real strengths and weaknesses of the German monarchy at the death of Frederick Barbarossa. Assessment of his domestic successes and failures will be one possible route. As ever, there is no set conclusion and the quality of argument is what matters. Candidates must focus on Germany and any references to Italy will need to be kept to a minimum (probably focused upon the effects of his absences). Some sense of his likely goals in Germany will help, as will issues such as: upholding and developing Imperial authority; maintaining good relations with the aristocracy and Church; building upon his resources; protecting territorial interests. Some evaluation of the state of Germany in 1152 and the issue of hereditary principle would also help. Likely areas for consideration include: the state of the royal lands; Frederick’s use of his own Hohenstaufen lands; the independence of magnates; the struggle with Henry the Lion and the breaking of Welf power; problems of government; the lack of unity; relationship with and the use of the German Church; the succession at his death and so contrasts between 1152 and 1190. At Frederick Barbarossa’s death it could be argued that the monarchy was strong enough, well-endowed in lands and wealth and in control of key families. The again, it is possible that strength was superficial only. Answers in **Bands 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. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good, sustained focus on ‘How strong ...?’. **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 in **Bands IV-V** will contain some relevant points but will tend to list and describe rather than analyse relative importance, either across the period or at specific moments. They will have a restricted range. Answers in **Bands VI-VII** will not answer the question.

(b) Assess the reasons why Frederick II clashed frequently with the Papacy.Focus: Evaluation of causation of major politico-religious event

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates are required to consider and evaluate a range of reasons, even though exhaustive coverage is not expected even for the top Bands. Focus upon ‘frequently’ is important and will be a determinant of the top Bands. Much evaluation centres upon a mixture of ideological, territorial, political and personality issues. The temperament and visions of Frederick himself as well as of the Popes, above all Gregory IX, were important. There was a major clash of interests in Italy: Frederick’s position in the Regno and his aim to extend his power in Lombardy; the Papacy’s landed and political interests in Central Italy; the capacity of the North Italian towns to manipulate any Imperial-Papal conflict to their advantage. The effects of this contest in Italy upon Frederick’s position in Germany and his relations with the German Church could be assessed, if briefly, especially in the 1240’s. Other issues of note included the broader background of inherited Empire-Papacy conflict and rival ideological positions on Church-State relations and powers and, perhaps more specifically, Papal unease over Frederick’s unique approach to crusading activity. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good, persistent focus upon ‘Assess the reasons ...’ and the needs 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.

Crusading and the Crusader States 1095-1192

3(a) To what extent was strong leadership the most important reason for the success of the First Crusade?

Focus: Assessment of causation of major historical event

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question. Answers in **Band III and above** will need to assess 'strong leadership' as against several other factors. Answers focused exclusively on 'strong leadership' cannot go beyond **Band III**. 'Strong leadership' might embrace elements such as: the personal role of Pope Urban II and other Church leaders, the place of the Papal Legate Adhemar, the presence of (often powerful) personalities such as Bohemond, Tancred of Taranto, Godfrey of Bouillon, Raymond of Toulouse, Robert Curthose, Hugh of Vermandois, Stephen of Blois and Robert of Flanders. Candidates might point out that often there were internal divisions and squabbles, and that knights and others often provided an element of leadership or direction (notably after the siege of Antioch and in galvanising the drive for Jerusalem). Other factors might include: religious fervour and zeal (the impetus provided by Pope Urban, various religious men on the ground, events such as the Holy Lance at Antioch, the procession outside Jerusalem), military strategy and tactics, the disunity among opponents (eg Sunni and Shi'ite, divided leadership, Turks and Egyptians, Aleppo and Damascus). 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 **Band 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.

(b) How far were divisions among the Crusaders the main reason for the failure of the Second Crusade?

Focus: Evaluation of causation of failure of a main event of the Crusade period

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to focus well upon ‘How far’ and adduce a range of reasons, prioritising wherever possible. No set conclusion is expected. Factors that can be assessed: serious internal divisions, not least French and German; the lack of a coherent, unified, clear command structure; differences between settlers and newcomers; a lack of money and full resources; poor choice of routes; climate and terrain; tactical errors; the role of Emperor Manuel I and a lack of Byzantine support, including naval; the strengths and unity of opponents; the decision to attack Damascus and the overall handling of the campaign; exaggerated expectations; some signs of uneven crusading zeal. Answers will need to evaluate divisions (prior to and on the Crusade) as against other factors, with a sense of prioritisation. Elaboration might include the actions of the French and Germans, the actions of the Emperor, including underlying differences over strategy and leadership between Louis VII and Conrad, 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.

Social, Economic and Intellectual Developments of the Twelfth Century.**4(a) Assess the reasons why popular heresy was a major problem for the Church during the twelfth century.**Focus: Assessment of causation of religious developments

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for – but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates need to focus well upon popular heresy and show a sense of ‘a major problem’ in examining reasons. Definition of the nature of the problem(s) created may well be a feature of an answer in the highest Bands. Factors that might be assessed here are: a dissatisfaction with what was seen as an overly ‘worldly’, even corrupt Church and Papacy; a desire for ‘personal’ religion; a stress on poverty, linked to growing urbanisation and the extremes of visible wealth; the circulation of a reform agenda and critique; the easier spread of ideas, via towns and trade; a more questioning attitude; a sense of missionary activity by those deemed as heretics; the inherent attractiveness of heretical teachings and practices. Many, if not all, of these proved difficult for the Church to combat; initial complacency linked to underestimation of the appeal of popular heresy did not help. Also, support from the better-off sections of society made action difficult; so, too, the sense of close-knit brotherhood proved difficult to break down. Often these features were linked to strong local community ideas and traditions. Some exemplification would be valuable. Answers in **Bands I and II** will have a good, persistent focus upon ‘Assess ...’ and the needs 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.

(b) To what extent was the development of agriculture the most important economic change of the Twelfth century?

Focus: Assessment of the importance of agricultural change in context

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for - but candidates will need to address the question. Identification of the extent, nature and character of agricultural changes is needed leading to the assessment of importance. The best answers will evaluate importance both for agricultural practices and for the economic and social life of Europe. There are a good number of features that can be addressed here. These include: the growth of towns and trade, expanding population to be fed, the sale of agricultural surplus, internal colonisation and expansion, the sale of more goods generating surplus money, a tendency to commute labour services, changes in demesne practices, developments in crop usage and fertilisation of the land, tenurial changes, more regional specialisations in food production. Area examples would be valuable. There were significant developments and advantages, though inbuilt limitations were to be expected. Answers in the higher Bands will evaluate agricultural changes alongside other economic (industrial, commercial, urban). Lower Band answers are likely to focus exclusively upon agricultural changes and be much more descriptive. Higher Band answers will have a good focus upon 'To what extent ...' and will assess agriculture alongside other economic changes. 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.

Europe 1450-1530**The Italian Renaissance 1450 – 1530**

5(a) Assess the consequences for the Renaissance of different forms of patronage during the period 1450 to 1530.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question which should be firmly focused on consequences. The answer will therefore need to be more than just a list of patrons and the works produced by their patronage. Candidates might consider consequences that all forms of patronage had in common such as increased independence and status of artists, as well as sheer quantity, experimentation etc. However some distinction should be drawn between consequences of different forms of patronage eg the incorporation of religious imagery as compared with purely secular forms with supporting examples.

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 ideas of writers such as Castiglione and Machiavelli reflected in the Renaissance from 1450 to 1530?

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should refer to the specific works of these writers and are likely to focus on issues such as the importance of human rather than transcendental values, emphasis on classical values and structures, the importance of civic over religious virtue etc. and better candidates will be able to support with examples. However, they will need to give consideration to the issue of 'how far' and may therefore draw attention to non-Renaissance features such as the aristocratic origins of Castiglione's courtier. A consideration of the circumstances in which Machiavelli wrote the Prince might also be made relevant. Credit can be given for reference to other writers such as Ficino and Mirandola, but candidates can assess the full range of marks without this. Simply writing an account of the views of writers is unlikely to score highly.

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.

Spain 1469 – 1520**6(a) How serious were the problems facing Ferdinand and Isabella at the beginning of their reigns?**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may approach the question thematically or look separately at Aragon and Castile. Both approaches are acceptable but there must be some distinction between the two areas. Problems considered might include Civil war – likely to be considered more serious in Castile – the nature of government, finance and social groupings such as the remensa peasants in Aragon and the nobility in Castile. Candidates will need to make some judgement on the gravity of these problems. The best answers will provide linkages between factors such as the Civil war in Castile – the issue of the succession being exploited by the nobility and foreign powers alike thereby making the situation doubly dangerous. Candidates are expected to focus on the problems rather than the solutions.

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 policies towards the *Reconquista*, *Moriscos* and *Conversos* motivated by religious ideals?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may consider religious motivation in the light of the title *reyos catolicos* and Isabella's known piety and may refer to the fact that desire for *limpieza de sangre* underpinned religious policy. However a variety of other motives should be considered particularly in relation to Granada where candidates might examine issues relating to the nobility, the economy and foreign policy. Candidates might also examine the treatment of the *Conversos* and *Moriscos* by the Inquisition and other policies and assess the importance of religion against other factors such as royal control and the economy. All aspects of the question must be considered to gain access to the full range of marks though equal treatment of each factor is not necessary. 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 Ottoman Empire 1451 – 1529**7(a) How significant was the fall of Constantinople in 1453 for the development of the Ottoman Empire to 1529**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates should recognise the importance of Constantinople in the development of an effective navy capable of challenging Venice for Mediterranean supremacy and its consequent effects on trade. It may also be seen as a springboard for European conquests. Candidates may assess this event within its own terms or set alongside other factors. However due consideration must be given to the fall of Constantinople.

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 factors (to 1529) that made Suleiman the Magnificent an effective ruler.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Candidates may include the nature of his unopposed succession and his inheritance, the advantages of disunity in Europe – particularly in the Habsburg empire as well as his abilities including those as a military leader in campaigns such as the conquest of Rhodes, the capture of Belgrade and the battle of Mohacs in 1526.

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.

Exploration and Discovery 1450 – 1530**8(a) Assess the importance of religion as a motive for Portuguese exploration and empire-building from 1450 to 1530.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers should focus on the religious issues such as the response to the threat of Islam, (particularly after the fall of Constantinople), the need to proselytise and the search for christian kingdoms such as that of the legendary Prester John. However, religious factors should be set alongside others such as economic and political ones and some conclusions reached on their relative importance.

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 contribution of technical advances to the success of exploration
From 1450 to 1530.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Answers will probably focus on the changes in ship design and their superiority over earlier styles for long-range exploration. They could argue that without these improvements exploration could not have taken place. Other advances might also be considered such as map-making, navigation, the use of astrolabes etc. The best candidates will clearly show the importance of the features they are discussing by supporting with examples. Some candidates may well consider these issues less important than other factors but will need to have focused fully on this issue.

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 1496-1560**The Holy Roman Empire 1517-1559****9(a) Assess the reasons why Charles V faced opposition from the princes within the Holy Roman Empire.**

Focus: Evaluation of Charles' relationship with the Princes.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to evaluate a range of factors; these may include the religious developments within the Empire and the development of the Schmalkaldic league, the political position of the princes and the Emperor, better answers may draw links between the two. The issue of the regency and how Charles used it to strengthen Habsburg power may be considered. Candidates may also consider the economic position of the princes.

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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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 dynastic rivalry the most important reason for the Habsburg-Valois wars from 1521 to 1559?

Focus: Evaluation of the causes of the Habsburg-Valois wars.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to consider a range of reasons for the Habsburg-Valois wars; better answers will reach a balanced conclusion as to the most important cause. Candidates should examine the role of dynastic rivalry, as Charles had a medieval outlook and felt it was his duty to defend his inheritance, but may also consider the issue of strategic territory, security and borders, French links with Charles' enemies, political and military advantages, personal disputes with Francis, although this often links to dynastic 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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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.

Spain 1504-1556**10(a) Assess the problems Charles I faced on his accession to the Spanish throne.**

Focus: Evaluation of the problems faced by Charles on his accession to the Spanish throne.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should consider a range of problems and evaluate their relative importance. Answers may include the issue of the lack of unity and the problems it created (although the question is not focused on how united was Spain in 1516), the difficulties Charles faced as a foreigner, the discontented kingdoms of Spain, the urban-noble rivalry in Castile, Castilian resentment of Aragon, commercial concerns over the challenge from Flanders, the threat from the Barbary pirates, his absence from Spain and subsequent departure to become Emperor, many of these issues played a role in the Comuneros revolt and consideration of it is certainly valid.

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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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 Charles I domestic achievements as king of Spain.Focus: Evaluation of Charles' reputation as ruler of Spain.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The focus is clearly on domestic issues and credit should not be given for answers that focus on foreign policy, unless it is related to domestic issues. Candidates should consider a range of issues and evaluate Charles' achievements in each area. They may consider the government of Spain and the development of the Conciliar system, the power of the Cortes, religious stability and how successful he was in dealing with the issues of Lutheranism, Jewish and Islamic groups, political stability after the revolt of the Comuneros, particularly during his absences, economic and financial development.

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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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.

France 1498-1560

11(a) Political problems were solved, financial difficulties were not.’ How far do you agree with this view of the reigns of Francis I and Henry II?

Focus: Assessment of key problems facing the French monarchy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a wide range of political and financial issues that candidates may consider and it would be unreasonable to expect answers to consider all issues, what is important is the quality of the analysis of the problems discussed. Candidates may consider some of the following political issues: the unity of France, the power of the nobles, the development of central government and bureaucracy, the power of parlements and the estates. Many will argue that these problems were only occasional and largely managed, whereas financial problems were perpetual. Candidates may consider the need of the monarch to ‘live of his own’, the difficulties of taxation and the problems of the taxation system, the problems created by inflation, the problems created by endless wars and borrowing leading to bankruptcy, suggesting that financial difficulties were not solved, other issues such as sales of crown lands or one-off confiscations may also be used to show that the crown was struggling.

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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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 challenges facing the French Church to 1547.Focus: Evaluation of the problems facing the French church.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. There are a large number of issues that candidates may consider and these include: relations with the Papacy and the idea of a national church, the Concordat and its impact on French clergy and church relations with the king. Candidates may consider the condition of the French church, but unlike many other areas of Europe it should be noted that it was in good condition. Many answers will focus heavily on the challenge of reform, considering the challenge of the Meaux circle, humanism and the struggle with the Sorbonne. Answers may also discuss the threat and challenge from Lutheranism, which crept into France from c.1519, and the subsequent persecution. Some answers may consider Francis' links, for foreign policy reasons, with the Schmalkaldic League and the boost it gave to Protestantism. In assessing the response to Protestantism many will conclude that the church was successful. Care should be given to ensure that candidates do not focus on Calvinism, as this did not enter France until 1550s.

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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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.

Warfare 1499-1560

12(a) Developments in technology were the most important military influence on the nature of the Habsburg-Valois wars from 1499 to 1560. How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of the changes in the nature of the Habsburg-Valois struggle.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should illustrate their answers with reference to specific campaigns within the Habsburg-Valois wars. Candidates should consider a range of factors and evaluate their relative importance before reaching a balanced conclusion. When considering developments in technology they may consider some of the following and assess their role in determining the nature of the conflict: the rise of infantry power and the dominance of footsoldiers, these developments were crucial in allowing Charles to dominate the Habsburg-Valois wars until the 1530s, the emergence of artillery as these made defensive walls redundant and encouraged offensive campaigns until the development of trace italienne, which neutralized artillery power and ended open warfare from c.1530. These technological developments should be weighed against other factors, such as the cost of warfare, as this had a major impact on the Habsburg-Valois wars in the 1540s and 1550s when both sides were pushed into bankruptcy. This may be linked to the technological changes as they brought about the increased cost. Cost may also be linked to the increasing size of armies needed to fight.

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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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 development of *trace italienne* was the most important reason for the growth in the size of armies during the period 1499 to 1560. How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the growth in the size of armies

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates should evaluate a range of reasons for the growth in the size of armies in the period and reach a balanced conclusion. Some candidates may argue that the growth in the size of armies was limited and this is a valid approach, provided the answer explains why this view has been adopted. Candidates should consider the role *trace italienne* played in the growth in size of armies, linking this to the dominance of siege warfare demanding large garrisons, which were tied down in fortresses and the need for commanders to have large armies to mount the long-term blockade needed to take the fortress. Candidates may argue, with justification, that this was the most important reason because much of the growth came after Pavia, in 1525. Other factors that may be considered include the sheer scale of the Habsburg-Valois wars, the rising importance of the infantry with open battles, the growing importance of artillery. If candidates argue that the growth in the size of armies was limited they may refer to lists being ‘hoped-for’ numbers, rather than actual, disease and desertion and numbers deliberately inflated by fraudulent officers to increase their financial gains.

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. Answer in **Bands III and below** will be less focuses, less evaluative, narrower in scope, more descriptive.

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

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**The Counter Reformation 1545 – c.1600**

13(a) 'The Jesuits were the main factor in the success of the Counter Reformation to c. 1600.' How far do you agree with this view?

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There is a good deal to be said in favour of the argument and candidates should give a substantial analysis of the achievements of the Jesuits. Such answers are likely to include reference to the highly improved discipline and spirituality of the order, their emphasis on education and the establishment of seminaries, their missionary zeal, their influence in 'high' places as well as the influence of particular individuals such as Peter Canisius. To access the higher bands however, candidates will need to give some balance to their answers by ranking the achievements of the Jesuits against other issues such as the Tridentine decrees and the reformed papacy. There are some obvious links to be made with these 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 the Catholic Church recovered by c.1600?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to achieve some balance by considering both the areas where the church is successful and where it is unsuccessful. Examples of the former might include reference to improved discipline and spirituality in the church brought about by the Tridentine decrees and the Jesuits and the improved clarity of matters of doctrine. In terms of lack of success, candidates will recognise that the Counter Reformation marked the permanent loss of ground to Protestantism and the creation of an irreconcilable schism. Both should be supported by specific geographical examples.

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 Reign of Henry IV 1589 – 1610**14(a) Assess the difficulties for Henry IV in re-establishing royal authority in France to 1598.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will need to focus on the context of the Civil wars and the nature of factions particularly religious ones and the problems in coming to terms with these. Foreign involvement and financial issues are also likely to be considered and there is some clear linkage here with the wars. Whilst war weariness, the lack of other obvious leaders and reduction of Spanish interest might be discussed, the emphasis should be firmly focused on their mitigating effects on Henry's difficulties rather than being seen as solutions.

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 Henry IV deal with parlements and the nobility to 1610?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will probably have more to say about the nobility than parlements but will need to consider both to access the full range of marks. Consideration of parlements is likely to focus on opposition to the Edict of Nantes both in Paris and the provinces. All had succumbed to Henry by 1600 except Rouen which did not register the edict until 1609 – although candidates may in fact note that it had already been put into effect. Consideration of the nobility is likely to focus on preventive measures to reduce noble power as well as ways in which he dealt with actual rebellions such as those under Biron and Bouillon. Some conclusion will need to be reached – candidates might suggest success shown by the peaceful accession of a minor.

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 Dutch Revolt 1563 – 1609.**15(a) How important were economic issues to the outbreak and development of the Dutch Revolt to 1609?**

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates will probably outline the economic context of the Dutch Revolt citing such issues as the closure of the Baltic, an English embargo on the cloth trade, decline of Antwerp and the harvest failure of 1565. The best candidates will see linkage between the discontent that these factors created and the political and religious issues involved in the outbreak of revolt. In terms of continuing warfare, candidates may examine this issue from both a Spanish and Dutch perspective; with northern areas no longer a battlefield after 1576, the Dutch economy was able to grow. On the other hand, Spain with economic problems at home was frequently short of money to pay troops which led to frequent mutinies such as the Spanish Fury which sparked off the 2nd revolt, destroyed the offensives of 1589,93 and 1600 and led to the loss of Groningen in 1594. Some conclusion might be reached on the relative importance of economic issues compared with others such as political and religious ones.

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 William of Orange succeed in achieving his aims in the Dutch Revolt?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may argue that some of William's aims changed over time but that there is nevertheless a consistent thread. Aims are likely to include the desire for freedom of conscience and religious toleration throughout the Netherlands, the restoration of the power of the grandees which became a desire to remove foreign oppression and the need to provide some centralised control to overcome the particularism of the states, possibly through foreign assistance. Candidates may argue that he achieved little; that by his death in 1584, Spain still occupied much of the Netherlands, there was little freedom of religion and attempts to create some central control through foreigners had proved disastrous. However, an alternative approach might be to assess achievements at particular points in the development of the revolt, citing the Pacification of Ghent as the high point of his achievements or viewing the independence of the North as a partial success in removing the control of a foreign oppressor. To access higher grades, there will need to be clear links between aims and achievements as well as an assessment of the extent of his achievements.

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.

Spain as a great power 1556-1598**16(a) To what extent was court faction the main problem of Philip II's government?**

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates may ultimately reject the thesis but must give consideration to the impact on government of the rivalry between the two main factions of Alva and Eboli. Discussion is most likely to focus on the paralysing and corrupt effects and the revolt of Aragon, though candidates could equally well argue that faction fighting gave Philip the opportunity to divide and rule. Whatever view is put forward, it must be set alongside other factors such as finance and the economy, the limitations of the structure of government, regionalism and Philip II's own personal approach to government. To access the higher grades candidates will need to reach some conclusion on the relative seriousness of these 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) How successful was Philip II in his religious policies in Spain from 1556 to 1598?

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates might measure success by looking at Phillip's aims as a leader of the Counter Reformation but better students may also see these as complex given his conflict with the Pope. Issues to be examined include his dealings with heresy through the Inquisition, attempts to improve discipline and spirituality in the Roman Catholic church and his relationship with such institutions as the Jesuits as well as his attitude to the Tridentine decrees. Candidates will need to reach some conclusion on his success in these areas.

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**Richelieu and Mazarin 1622 - 1661****17(a) To what extent did Richelieu's foreign policy extend the power of France by 1642?**

Focus: Assessment of a 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. Candidates might see Richelieu's aims as primarily the security of France's borders and the breaking of the perceived threat of Habsburg encirclement by the Empire and Spain. He sent help to the Valtelline / Grisons to encourage rebellion against the Empire (1625). A later intervention was in the War of the Mantuan Succession (1627-31). However, this period was not completely successful for Richelieu. His policies were interrupted by the Huguenot revolt at La Rochelle (1625-29). The Treaty of Cherasco (1631) gained Pinerolo in northern Italy but other gains were returned to the Habsburgs. Candidates can be expected to devote attention to Richelieu's intervention in the Thirty Years' War, first as the patron of Sweden and then as the open enemy of the Hapsburgs. Clear gains were being made by 1642 although Richelieu had to survive the 'Year of Corbie' (1636) when northern France was invaded. Candidates should note that the question ends with Richelieu's death. A conclusion can refer briefly to gains under Mazarin; it can be argued that the foundations were laid by Richelieu. However, this point is not necessary for any mark.

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 Mazarin was faced by rebellion.Focus: Assessment of the reasons for rebellion.

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 and answers in **Band I** can usually be expected to offer some priority of importance. It will be relevant to consider Richelieu's legacy; powerful subjects felt more able to express their grievances under Mazarin. It will be relevant to consider Mazarin's personality, position and policies. The role of King Louis XIV and Anne of Austria, the Queen Mother can be examined. Candidates should be given credit when they note the variety of groups that were involved and their grievances: the different ranks of the nobility (Princes of the Blood and the Sword, office-holders, town rebels and provincial unrest. Unlike Richelieu, Mazarin could not count on the backing of a powerful king. His Italian birth was a disadvantage. His attempts to strengthen central control over local administration and this attack on the *rentiers* provoked trouble. It will be relevant to explain the course of the Frondes - this should not automatically be regarded as low-level narrative because different issues emerged- but accounts should be linked to reasons.

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 Problems of Spain 1598 - 1659

18(a) To what extent were the wars against France the main cause of Spain's decline as a major power by 1659?

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the decline of a major power.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Candidates can argue that other factors were more important than the French wars in causing Spanish decline but answers in **Band I** and **Band II** should normally need at least a sound paragraph on the stated factor. Some might focus on the situation in 1659 (Treaty of the Pyrenees), where France emerged triumphant. However, the better answers will explain 'decline' over a longer period. It will be valid to argue that Spain's decline by 1659 as a major power can be exaggerated but the position had changed to some extent since the beginning of the seventeenth century when Spain had undoubtedly been one of Europe's most powerful countries. Among other causes that might be considered are war against the Dutch, the state of the economy, the social structure that inhibited necessary reforms that might have retrieved Spain's position and the ability of kings and ministers.

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 Philip III and Philip IV personally responsible for the failures of their governments?

Focus: Assessment of the responsibility of rulers for government failures.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners will look for a reasonable balance between Philip III (1598-1621) and Philip IV (1621-65). A proportion of 60:40 either way can merit any mark. Although the most important factor in assessment will always be the overall quality of the argument, a greater imbalance might lead to a lower band than would otherwise be awarded. Philip III can be criticised for his lack of energy in ruling Spain. Responsibility was given to favourites (*validos*). Reference might be made to Lerma and Uceda. Criticism of Lerma has recently moderated but most candidates can be expected to take a hostile view and this will be acceptable if it is well argued, for example by reference to the expulsion of the Moriscos (1609-14). On the other hand, he ended the expensive war with England and agreed a truce with the Dutch. Philip IV's reign saw the controversial ministry of Olivares that ended in revolt. Then Haro was appointed. His reign was marked at home by further economic decline and setbacks abroad, for example in the treaties of Westphalia and the Pyrenees. 'To what extent...?' invites candidates to consider other factors such as the endemic economic and social problems and the continued provincialism.

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 Thirty Years' War 1618 - 1648

19(a) 'France, rather than Sweden, had the greater impact on the course of the Thirty Years' War.' How far do you agree with this view of the period from 1629 to 1648?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the course of a major war.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Answers that focus on only one country, either France or Sweden, cannot rise above **Band III**. A reasonably balanced discussion of both should be the basis of a sound argument with answers in **Band I** and **Band II** coming to a justified conclusion. Some might note the different periods of their greatest influence. Sweden's intervention was crucial from 1630 to about 1635, and especially to 1632 until the death of Gustavus II (Adolphus). This turned the balance of power against the Habsburgs who were in a strong position by 1629 (the Edict of Restitution). From 1635, France's role was more crucial although it had given backing to the enemies of the Emperor from 1629. Answers might consider the implications for the Question of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) although this is not necessary for any mark.

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 the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) on the balance of power in Europe.

Focus: Assessment of the link between an important treaty and the international balance of power.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Answers in **Band I** or **Band II** can be expected to go beyond assertions about Habsburg weaknesses although this factor will be relevant. In assessing the balance of power, candidates might examine the relative strengths of the major states: the Empire, France, Sweden and Spain. France and Sweden gained considerably but in different European regions; the Empire and Spain were the losers. Other states were involved. Brandenburg-Prussia gained Eastern Pomerania, and some bishoprics but it is possible to argue that this did not affect significantly the European balance of power. There were minor gains for Saxony and Bavaria. Switzerland gained independence from the Empire. However, in assessing answers, examiners should regard these other states as optional extras in view of the focus of the Question. ‘impact’ allows for some background. For example, it will be permissible but not required to compare 1648 and 1618. However, this approach should not give way to long surveys of the Thirty Years’ 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.

Social Issues in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century**20(a) Assess the reasons for Dutch economic success during the first half of the seventeenth century.**

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a country's economic success.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners will be looking for the explanation of a variety of reasons and answers in **Band I** can usually be expected to offer some priority of importance. Relevant internal factors might include government policies that encouraged commerce and traders, and a favourable social structure. Commercial interests were supported by some influential religious groups. External factors might include the problems of rivals. Dutch emphasis on trade could be regarded as unique amongst major European states. France and England were not able to compete particularly effectively with Dutch overseas trade especially in the more distant routes. The Dutch were also ruthless with rivals whilst claiming free trade in other countries' regions of interest. The peace with Spain lifted a financial burden whilst Spain was less able to defend its empire in the New World (although the amount of danger to the flota can be exaggerated). The blockade of Antwerp can be contrasted with the growing importance of Amsterdam.

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 can the scientific developments in the first half of the seventeenth century be described as a 'revolution'?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about scientific developments.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Historiography is not an AS level assessment criterion although accurate references should be given credit. However, 'to what extent...?' invites candidates to examine arguments for and against the claim. They might conclude that overall the claim in the Question is valid - or invalid. There is no need for them to spend much time defining what comprises a revolution: a discussion of lesser or greater change will be sufficient for any mark. More important will be the ability to discuss some key scientific developments and assess the importance of these changes. Nor should examiners be looking first for gaps. One can imagine an excellent answer being written on the basis of one sphere of science, for example astronomy. As well as astronomy, candidates might consider changes in a selection from biology, mathematics and physics. Others might note the growing popularity of scientific methods of enquiry and deduction. The number of scientific fields mentioned in the Question will be less important than the ability to explain and evaluate them. Some answers might consider the work of individual scientists but only Kepler and Galileo are mentioned in the Specification; others would be welcome but not necessary.

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**Sweden and the Baltic 1660 - 1718**

21(a) 'Sweden's domestic weaknesses were not overcome during the reign of Charles XI.'
How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about developments in a major country.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Charles XI ruled from 1660 to 1697 although there was a minority and Regency until 1672. The specified period of the Study Topic begins in 1600 and candidates can be expected to discuss all of the reign. Although the assessment will depend fundamentally on the overall quality of the argument, examiners might read some answers that are incomplete because they discuss only the majority years of Charles. As guidance, such answers might be liable to a ceiling of **Band III** but examiners should not apply this inflexibly. Candidates should examine the domestic weaknesses of Sweden in 1660 and consider the reign in view of ultimate success or failure in remedying them. They might consider the comparatively small population in a state that had high aspirations of Baltic and even European power. The economy was faltering. The strength of the monarchy suffered from the problems of Christina's reign (although candidates are expected to have only sufficient knowledge of this to make of the situation in 1660). The power of the nobility was considerable. During the Regency, crown lands were lost; Charles XI later tried to remedy this through a policy of *reduktion*. This had considerable success. He aimed to enhance his absolute powers. The nobles' Council was curbed. The *Rikstag* came under closer control. Court expenditure was cut back. The efficiency of the bureaucracy improved. The army was strengthened but used to back the King's domestic policies rather than to fight foreign wars. Candidates might come to different conclusions; they might argue that Charles XI was very successful or they might judge that some of the most serious problems continued, such as the growing weakness of the economy. Much depended on the personal strength and determination of the ruler.

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 Sweden failed to maintain its international position from 1660 to 1718.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for a country's international decline.

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 contradict the claim that Sweden failed to maintain its international position from 1660 to 1718. In 1660, Sweden added to its gains at Westphalia. The Treaty of Oliva saw the end of rival claims to the Swedish throne. Although there were concessions, Sweden was the dominant Baltic power. In 1718, Sweden was clearly giving way to Russia. Territories in Germany were ceded to Brandenburg, Hanover and Russia. Sweden was no longer exempt from the payment of Baltic dues. The variation will occur in the reasons that are offered. Candidates might consider a variety of reasons and answers in **Band I** can usually be expected to offer some priority of importance. The rise of Russia is likely to loom large in answers and will be very relevant but candidates are expected only to have enough knowledge of Russia to make sense of Sweden's decline. The country was less able to keep other foreign rivals at bay. Candidates can be expected to assess the responsibility of Charles XII (1697-18). Was he unnecessarily aggressive or did he make a brave but futile attempt to save Sweden from its enemies? Answers might argue that, whoever was king, Sweden lacked the resources to maintain its self as a major 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.

France and Europe 1661 - 1715**22(a) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of France's international position in 1661.**

Focus: Assessment of a country's international position at a particular date.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. Examiners will not be looking for balanced answers. It will be possible to merit any mark by offering a one-sided argument, usually in favour of France's strengths. However, there should be some consideration of weaknesses for **Band I**. At least one sound paragraph would be appropriate if the rest of the answer is strong. However, there should be a focus on the position in 1661 when Louis XIV asserted his majority and took full powers of kingship. It is difficult to see how later developments can be made relevant unless referred to briefly in a conclusion. The study Topic begins in 1661 but Key Issue 1 asks 'What was the balance of power in Europe in 1661? France and Europe in 1661, the significance of the Treaty of the Pyrenees and the consequences of the Treaty of Westphalia.' France had gained considerably from these treaties not only in terms of territories but also in the marriage with the Infanta Maria Teresa. She renounced her claim to the Spanish succession but the marriage alliance still gave Louis considerable interest in Spanish affairs. In 1661 France had a strong army and reasonably secure borders. The comparative weakness of other states can be explained because this factor advantaged France. On the other hand, France had a new and untested king. The long wars were expensive to the French economy. Whilst mostly secure, the borders also gave the opportunity for disputes and the threat of an Austro-Spanish alliance was not dead.

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 aims of Louis XIV's foreign policy change during the period from 1661 to 1715?

Focus: Assessment of the extent of change in a ruler's foreign policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question. The focus should be on change (and by implication continuity because the question asks 'How far...?'). The Question is not an invitation to write exclusively about the course of Louis XIV's wars, although explanations must be supported by appropriate knowledge. The focus should be on the King's aims. Some candidates might argue that Louis' aims were substantially unchanged; for example the desire for glory for himself and France, and the desire to strengthen frontiers. Some might see changes in the development of war with the Dutch and later with England. Some might consider a comparison of aggressive / defensive features. The Spanish Succession issue later in the reign might be considered although he showed interest in Spain earlier. It will be difficult to attain **Band I** by arguing that Louis XIV's aims never changed or, on the other hand, that change was complete and continuous. However, examiners will not look for an equal balance between the two arguments. When using their knowledge to support the explanation, candidates should show a reasonable awareness of developments from 1661 to 1715 but it is a long period and examiners should not look first for gaps. The answers will surely consider Louis's aims in the 1660s. It might be reasonable to expect something about his aims in the War of Spanish Succession for **Band I** but not necessarily his aims from about 1710 to 1715. Between these points, examiners will be looking for some highlights but not necessarily a mention of every war. Answers that are organised chronologically should not be undervalued. It is very possible to develop a very good answer that shows changes or continuity between successive stages of policy.

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 Development of Brandenburg-Prussia 1660 - 1713

23(a) 'The development of a loyal army was the foundation on which Frederick William, the Great Elector, built his power in Prussia.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Assessment of a claim about the reasons for 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. 'How far...?' invites candidates to assess the importance of the army against other factors. Candidates can argue that other factors were more important than the army in enhancing the power of the Great Elector but answers in **Band I** and **Band II** should normally need at least a sound paragraph on the stated factor. However, a limiting factor is the reference to his power 'in Prussia'. Foreign policy is therefore not relevant unless mentioned briefly in conclusion to open out the argument. Frederick William lacked an effective and centralised bureaucracy at the beginning of his reign. His authority over the varied provinces was limited (especially by the standards of seventeenth-century absolutism). The army was a means of governing Brandenburg-Prussia more efficiently. There was little distinction between the military and civilian administering. For example, candidates might examine the role of the General War Commission. The Junkers were important in the army. Candidates might examine the other functions of the Junkers under the Great Elector. Some answers might argue for the importance of his personality: energetic, determined and interested in the details of government. It might be argued that tax collecting was as important as making war. He sought, but with uneven success, to unify the provinces but was faced with their very different traditions and social structures. There were important economic reforms. He was comparatively open-minded in religion, welcoming skilled immigrants. Examiners should note the terms of this Study Topic in the Specification because it begins in 1660, not with the accession of Frederick William in 1640, 'While the Specification does **not** require a detailed knowledge of his reign between 1640 and 1660, candidates would find an overview useful'. This should guide the assessment of answers.

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 Brandenburg-Prussia strengthen its international position during the period from 1660 to 1713?

Focus: Assessment of change in a country's international position.

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 fourth Key Issue and associated Content, 'How far did Brandenburg-Prussia become an international power in this period? Relations with France and involvement in the Great Northern War.' By 1660, Brandenburg-Prussia had benefited from the treaties of Westphalia (1648) and Oliva (1660). Some towns and Eastern Pomerania had been added in 1648. Sovereignty over this region was confirmed in 1660. At that point Brandenburg-Prussia was emerging as the most important of the German states. However, success in supplanting Swedish influence in Germany was limited. In wider terms, the state was too weak to act independently and Frederick William played his cards carefully and usually quite successfully. He saw the advantage of a French alliance but he was also willing to support the United Provinces when it seemed profitable. Frederick I took sides against Louis XIV after 1688. Still too weak to be important as an independent agent Frederick I chose the right side in the conflicts against France from 1689 until his death in 1713. On the other hand, he might be criticised for his policies in the Great Northern War. His indecision exposed his state to invasion. In this Question on Brandenburg-Prussia's international position, it is possible, but not necessary, to claim that the recognition of Frederick I as King of Prussia (1701) gave him and his state added prestige.

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.

Social Issues in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century**24(a) Assess the importance of the nobility in French society in the second half of the seventeenth century.**

Focus: Assessment of the importance of a social class.

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 Study Topic, ‘What were the main characteristics of the French economy and society? Louis XIV and the social hierarchy in France’. It is not easy for candidates to distinguish between the nobles’ role in society and political and economic affairs but the more successful candidates in **Band I** and **Band II** will make links if they deal with these wider issues. Nobles represented the peak of French society (after the crown). They had considerable importance in the provinces. The larger families had extensive estates and powers of patronage and influence. Marriage alliances created ‘networks’ of noble families. Even the lesser nobility had a social importance. It was the ambition of many office holders to gain entry to the nobility, often by making false claims. In spite of the growing absolutism of Louis XIV and the significance of the court at Versailles, the nobility were still socially very important. It will be relevant to discuss the importance of Versailles for the nobility. In assessing their importance, the more successful candidates in **Band I** and **Band II** will go further than description but will explain reasons and, in **Band I**, might be expected to provide explicitly or implicitly some 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) Assess the reasons for the importance of Amsterdam in the Dutch economy in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for the importance of a city.

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 third Key Issue and associated Content in the Study Topic, 'What were the main characteristics of the Dutch economy and society? The influence of merchants in the United Provinces, the importance of Amsterdam and foreign trade'. The Dutch economy depended unusually heavily on foreign trade; candidates might explain the reasons why this was so. Amsterdam was the centre of this trade. The role of the merchants based there was dominant. Goods were imported from and re-exported to many parts of Europe and the wider world. The non-commercial part of the Dutch economy was far less important.

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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY**Unit 2586/01****SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS****June 2006**

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: 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.

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'** (ie. 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg. 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 (eg. $5 + 15 + 45 = 65$, 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 eg. '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, eg. 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg. '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 2583-2586: GENERIC MARK BANDS

AS PERIOD STUDIES

NB

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 double the mark on grading so that the paper is out of 90.

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

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

Europe 1789-1849**The French Revolution 1789-1795**

1(a) To what extent was economic crisis the main cause of the revolutionary events of 1789?

Focus: Evaluation of causes.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: In discussing the role of economic crisis candidates may explore the relationship between some of the following and the events of 1789: Storming of the Bastille/the Great Fear; the price of bread (unground grain because of drought) and the October Days; the role of the Crown's financial problems and the calling of the Estates-General. We can take economic to cover both the economy more widely and the issue of Crown finances. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors, such as: the incompetence/indecision/reluctance to accept change by the king; new ideas and political groups; frictions over the Estates-General; the problem of the veto. Candidates may usefully show the interrelationship between such causes and between shorter term and longer term 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 reasons why the Terror came to an end in 1794.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates should discuss a range of reasons, but comprehensive coverage is not required to score highly. There should be both explanation of individual reasons and discussion of their relative importance and/or linkage to meet the 'Assess' instruction. Reasons evaluated may include: victory in war (beginning in the autumn of 1793), defeat of federal and counter-revolution, defeat of sans-culottes and also the impact of Robespierre's attempt to purify the republic and the Great Terror. In relation to the latter, candidates may comment that the Terror became most extreme at the very point when the rationale for its existence had diminished.

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.

Napoleon and Europe 1799-1815

2(a) To what extent did Napoleon's domestic reforms maintain the revolutionary principles of equality, liberty and property?

Focus: Evaluation of policies.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may deal with each of the principles separately but less effective answers may tend to lump the principles together. For the highest bands, there should be evidence of evaluation of all three principles, but do not expect balance. What matters is the quality of evaluation. In relation to Liberty candidates may well argue that it was not maintained by reference to censorship, police, arbitrary arrest, *livrets*, dictatorship and so on. On the other hand, candidates may point to freedom of conscience (Organic Articles). On equality, candidates may give a more balanced assessment, pointing (in favour) to issues such as equality before law and meritocracy. This may be balanced against the legal inferiority of women, slavery and the qualifications on meritocracy where wealth and property were important. Finally on property, candidates may well argue that this principle was maintained and point to the reassurance given to the holders of '*biens nationaux*' in the Concordat and Civil Code, and the prominence given to men of wealth and property in the administration at local and higher levels and Napoleon's desire to secure the support of the propertied classes.

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 Napoleon's downfall the result of his own mistakes?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates must deal adequately with the issue raised in the question, even if they wish to argue that other factors were more significant. In relation to the question focus, candidates may point to Napoleon's inability in naval warfare, and the 'mistakes' in Spain and Russia. They may also point to the murder of Duc D'Enghien and Continental System. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as the growing weakness of the French army, the lessons learned by Napoleon's enemies, the consistent opposition of Great Britain, the role of the Fourth Coalition and so on.

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.

France 1814-1848**3(a) How successful was Louis XVIII in healing the divisions in France during his reign?****Explain your answer.**Focus: Evaluation of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: On the positive side candidates may discuss the limited opposition, lack of revolts and no revolution, the importance of the Charter, the peaceful succession of Charles X. On the negative side candidates may point to the White Terror, the growth of the Ultras, republicanism, liberal criticism and the shift to the right after the murder of Berry – both the event and the aftermath suggesting that wounds were not healed. The conclusion may be that Louis XVIII ‘papered over the cracks’ and was fortunate in the sense that France was ‘exhausted’, but move to right towards end of reign and succession of Charles X indicated old wounds would be re-opened. However, no particular 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 Louis-Philippe responsible for his own downfall?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for overthrow.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates must deal fully with the issue posed in the question even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more important. In considering the role of Louis Philippe candidates may discuss issues such as his 'weak' foreign policy, his 'bourgeois' image, his unwillingness to consider change at home, his appointment of Guizot, and his lack of strength and resolve in 1848. Such considerations may be balanced against other factors such as the role of economic crisis, lack of popular support for the monarchy from the start, the pressures for political change, the political divisions in France, the growth of republicanism (and Bonapartism) and so on.

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.

Revolution and Repression in Europe 1815-1849

4(a) Assess the reasons why liberal and nationalist movements had little success before 1848.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for lack of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Possible reasons which may be discussed include: ideological divisions – different views of liberal and nationalist aims in Italy/German Confederation/Austrian Empire – *Kleindeutsch* v. *Grossdeutsch*, Republic v. constitution. Differing views in different states which were sometimes in conflict – Hungarian nationalism v. Austrian liberals. Candidates may also consider the lack of popular support, repression (censorship, Metternich's policies) the opposition of Church and princes, and the lack of economic and social circumstances that might provoke change.

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 revolutions in 1848 in the Austrian Empire caused by economic factors?

Focus: Evaluation of the causes of revolutions.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: The economic causes of the revolutions must be dealt with adequately to score well. These include longer term developments (urbanisation, population growth, industrialisation) as well as the short term crisis that emerged in the mid-1840s. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors such as the impact of revolution in France, the growth of liberal and national movements (especially in Hungary, but also Austria, northern Italy and Bohemia), Metternich's declining influence from late 1830s, structural problems of Austrian Empire and so on.

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**Italy 1830-1870**

5(a) Assess the reasons why those who wanted political change in Italy had little success before 1848.

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for lack of success.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may discuss some of the following issues: those advocating change were divided in aims – e.g. Mazzini, Balbo, Gioberti; Metternich's repression in northern Italy and the influence of Austria through the peninsula; Church opposition; lack of sympathy amongst established governments; the lack of popular support; the lack of proper foundations ('Italy a geographic expression'; no national language, economic and political division).

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 actions of Napoleon III the main reason for the unification of Italy to 1870?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for Italian unification.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates must deal with issue of Napoleon III to score well. We can expect treatment of France (Plombières, the war of 1859, Napoleon III's acceptance of Villafranca, and then the annexation of the central duchies in exchange for Nice and Savoy, Napoleon III's acceptance of Piedmont's invasion of the Papal States to stop Garibaldi) and of the French withdrawal from Rome in 1870. They should balance treatment of this against other factors such as Cavour's diplomacy/Piedmont's role, Garibaldi, Italian nationalism, Austrian weakness/isolation and the roles of Prussia and Great Britain.

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.

Germany c.1862-1890**6(a) To what extent was the unification of Germany the result of economic factors?**

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for German unification.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates will need to balance economic against other factors. Most will consider the impact of the *Zollverein*, others will also consider Prussia's economic progress in the 1850s and the relative decline of Austria. Candidates may link the *Zollverein* with calls for German unity, others may argue that Prussian economic strength provided the resources for the military might that would secure unification in three wars. Other factors discussed may include war and diplomacy, the role of Bismarck, German nationalism, the international situation and the weakness of Austria.

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 Bismarck achieve his aims in domestic policy in the period from 1871 to 1890?

Focus: Evaluation of domestic policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates need to identify Bismarck's aims – unity of the Empire, elimination of opposition (especially '*Reichsfeinde*'), maintenance of executive power against the Reichstag, dealing with threats to the status quo – especially socialism etc. These aims need to be tested against achievements/results. Candidates may evaluate the success of the *Kulturkampf* and the attempt to destroy socialism, as well as Bismarck's shifting political alliances.

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.

France 1848-1875**7(a) Assess the reasons why the Second Republic failed to survive.****Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the failure of the Second Republic.**

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may point to the circumstances of the Republic's foundations, the divisions amongst the revolutionaries, and the parties of 'Order' and 'Progress', and its early crisis in June 1848, the victory of conservative elements and the election of Napoleon. Candidates may also argue that the real catalyst for ultimate failure was the ambition and success of Louis Napoleon and weaknesses of the Constitution and discuss the movement from republic to empire during 1851-1852.

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) How far should Napoleon III's domestic policies be regarded as successful?

Focus: Evaluation of domestic policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: In relation to success, there may be discussion of social policy and economic policy – railways, free trade, banking etc. There may be discussion of the development of Paris (slum clearance), the nature of government and the move to a more liberal constitution. This may be balanced against criticisms of Napoleon III's style of government, the growth of criticism and opposition and the limitations to domestic success (e.g. criticisms of free trade). Success may be judged against criteria such as aims, outcomes and context.

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.

Russia 1825-1881**8(a) How far did Nicholas I achieve his aims in his rule of Russia?**

Focus: Evaluation of domestic policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates will need to establish Nicholas I's aims – these might be described in terms of autocracy, orthodoxy and nationality or as maintenance of Tsarism and defeat of opposition. Candidates may in this context discuss issues such as repression, the Poles, serfs, education, the role of the Church and evidence of growing opposition. No specific judgement 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) How successfully did Alexander II deal with the problems he faced in Russia? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of success in domestic policy.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may seek to identify problems such as serfdom, maintenance of autocracy, nationality, the growth of opposition, local government, the army, law, education, the economy etc. Success may be judged in terms of contrast between the start and end of the reign and the impact of Alexander's policies. There may well be full consideration of a limited range of key areas such as serfdom, government, and the law – such answers can access the full mark range – comprehensive treatment is not required. Reward quality of assessment, not simply range of treatment.

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**The American Civil War 1861-1865****9(a) How effective was Davis' political leadership of the Confederacy from 1861 to 1865?**

Focus: Evaluation of a political leader.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates coverage of leadership may involve discussion of appointment of generals and involvement in the conduct of the war, relations with ministers and quality of appointments, handling of public opinion and criticisms, handling of issues related to war effort such as recruitment, taxation, civil liberties, states' rights etc., and, of course, degree of responsibility for defeat in the war. Effectiveness may be judged against aims, outcomes and/or context.

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) 'Lee's generalship was the main reason it took so long to defeat the South.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for length of war.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may well point to the brilliance of Lee's generalship from the peninsular campaign in 1862, through Antietam, Fredericksburg to Chancellorsville. This may be balanced by some discussion of Gettysburg and Grant's final pursuit of Lee. In such discussion candidates will need to link their treatment to 'took so long'. However, candidates will need to balance such discussion against other factors – Union strategy, poor generalship, events in the West, the overall strategic position, the time it took to harness the North's superior resources effectively, and so on.

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.

Politics and Reform 1877-1919

10(a) 'Trusts were the main issue facing presidents in the period from 1877 to 1896.' How far do you agree?

Focus: Evaluation of the issues facing governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: The issue of trusts was certainly important and was an issue for every administration in this period and subsequently. However, there were other issues such as civil service corruption, currency, tariffs and trade, agrarian revolt and so on. Candidates may choose to argue that different issues were more prominent at different times or seek to give an overview.

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 Progressivism on American politics in the period from 1896 to 1919.

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of a political movement.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may seek to discuss the nature of progressivism – a diffuse movement of reform at political, economic and social levels arising out of the challenges of modern society and conditions. General aims were to place public good over private interest for the betterment of society and this approach influenced politics in the early 20th century, though its real impact on policy and legislation may seem limited to some restrictions on trusts, some attempts to deal with corruption, some democratization of the political process, some move to ‘expertise’ in government, some labour legislation and prohibition.

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.

Western Expansion 1846-1900

11(a) To what extent was mining the most important reason for the opening up of the West from 1846 to 1900?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for a development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates must deal with the role of mining in opening up the west and can point to the impact of various mineral finds – especially those in California and the Dakotas. The importance of mining needs to be balanced against the importance of other factors such as cattle ranching, the railroad, federal encouragement of settlement and so forth. Better candidates will need to provide relative evaluation of a number of factors and show how they are interlinked to score in the higher bands.

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 Native Americans were unable to hold on to their lands during the period 1846-1900.

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the downfall of the Native Americans.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may consider a range of reasons – pressure of westward expansion – westward migration from the east coast, incompatibility of nomadic and settler lifestyles, extinction of the Buffalo, mining, cattle ranching, railroads but also military inferiority (Indian Wars), the failure of treaties, federal policies towards reservations and so forth.

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.

Race Relations in the South 1863-1912**12(a) Assess the reasons why Reconstruction had limited impact on the position of Blacks in the South.**

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the impact of a development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may point to the efforts made by the federal government to improve the lot of Blacks – constitutional amendments, Civil Rights acts, the Freedman's Bureau. They may suggest that these had limited impact because of the opposition in the south and the poor socio-economic position of Blacks, without education, money or property that placed them at an immense disadvantage that formal legislation could not reverse. We may get discussion of 'black codes', prejudice and the activities of the white vigilante organisations such as the KKK, the limited impact of Black politicians and political rights, the lack of political will and the emigration of Blacks to Kansas.

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 Supreme Court decisions in undermining the position of Blacks from 1863 to 1912? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of a factor in shaping a development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: We can expect discussion of the impact of such Supreme Court Decisions as the Slaughterhouse cases of 1873 and the *US v. Cruikshank* in 1875 (undermining 14th amendment). In 1883 the Supreme Court threw out the 1875 Civil Rights Act and in *Plessey v. Ferguson* (1896) the principle of 'separate but equal' was established. In 1898 the decision in the *Mississippi v. Williams* case undermined Black voting rights. Candidates may argue that the actions of the Supreme Court tended to confirm the undermining of Black rights that was already taking place in the South, although, in the last case, for example, the case encouraged further discrimination and the introduction of 'grandfather clauses'.

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**Russia 1894-1917**

13(a) 'The weakness of the opposition was the main reason the Tsar was able to survive in the period from 1894 to 1914.' How far do you agree?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the Tsar's survival.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates may well point to the evidence of weakness (degree of support) and division amongst opponents of the Tsarist regime (e.g. between SRs, Kadets and Marxists – and within Marxism) and examine the failure of the 1905 revolution in this context. However, they need to balance such treatment against other factors enabling Nicholas II to survive – tradition of autocracy, repression, limited reforms, some able ministers (Witte, Stolypin), the loyalty of the army and so on.

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 Nicholas II bring about his own downfall in the February Revolution (1917)?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for the Tsar's overthrow.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates must deal with issue raised in question and balance this against other factors. There may be discussion of the Tsar's character, his weak will, indecision, his poor choice of, or ditching of able, ministers and advisers, poor decision-making at crucial times, his role in the First World War and so on. This may be balanced against the growth of opposition, the long history of social and economic problems, the problems associated with industrialisation, the pressure for constitutional government or revolution, the impact of the First World War and so on.

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 Causes and Impact of the First World War c. 1890 - 1920

14(a) How important were troubles in the Balkans from c1890 in causing the outbreak of the First World War? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the role of a factor in bringing about the First World War.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Troubles in the Balkans can be taken to include the Bosnian crisis of 1908, the Balkan Wars of 1912-13 and the crisis caused by the assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand in 1914. The main aim for the candidates, however, is to assess why developments in the Balkans ended in a world war involving the great European powers. They may point to the impact of Austro-Russian rivalry in the Balkans and its links to the wider 'Eastern Question', and link such tensions to the Alliance system and the wider issues of nationalism, militarism and rivalry amongst the Great Powers in the early 20th century.

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 main impact of the First World War on Britain from 1914 to 1920 was the increase in government power.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of war on the home front.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Candidates will need to deal with the increase in government power even if they wish to argue other impacts were more important. There may be discussion of DORA, and its ramifications, especially in terms of transport, industry, food supply etc. Candidates may also deal with the impact of losses, conscription, impact on the economy, the role of women, post-war problems and so on.

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.

Italy 1919-1945

15(a) To what extent were economic problems the main reason for the rise of the Fascists to power in Italy by 1922?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for a political development.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: In relation to economic problems candidates may discuss the impact of economic dislocation, unemployment, inflation etc. and the poverty of rural areas as a cause of popular unrest and disillusion with the post-war governments. They may link such analysis to growth of socialism and communism, the disorder on the streets and the strikes/unrest associated with the 'two red years', the desire for strong government and order. They may also point to other reasons such as disillusion with the peace treaties and the growth of nationalism, the actions of the fascist squads and the charisma and leadership of Mussolini. This may be linked to the fears of the elites and middle classes and, of course, the attitudes and decisions of the government and King in 1922.

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) 'Propaganda successes, but little real achievement.' How far do you agree with this view of Mussolini's economic and social policies to 1940?

Focus: Evaluation of economic and social policies.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Many may focus on an assessment of the various 'battles' – grain, lira, births etc. – and contrast the claims made and the actual impact. Others may range more widely to discuss other policy areas – education, corporativism, religion, military and so forth. What matters is not the breadth of treatment but the quality of evaluation. In this case the focus is on the degree of convergence between the way policies were portrayed and their actual outcomes.

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.

Germany 1919-1945

16(a) How successfully did the Weimar Republic overcome its post-war problems during the 1920s? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the success of governments.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: Problems identified may include: humiliation and psychological impact of defeat, economic dislocation, the impact of Treaty terms, political division and unrest, inflation, problems of introducing democracy. Candidates may point to short term failure/crisis (1919 – 23) followed by some qualified success in the mid- to later- 1920s when some economic advance and political stability began to emerge. Some will point to the fragility of the recovery and cite the collapse from 1929.

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 main reason Hitler faced so little domestic opposition from 1933 to 1939 was that he brought real benefits to the German people.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Evaluation of reasons for lack of opposition.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Key points: The issue of 'real benefits' must be dealt with even if candidates wish to argue that other reasons were more important. Candidates may: contrast the order (albeit with concomitant restrictions) of the Hitler period with the disorder and chaos of the Weimar years; refer to the economic 'recovery' after 1933, especially the fall in unemployment; refer to the 'benefits' enjoyed by many workers through provision of cheap holidays and leisure activities; refer to the foreign policy successes (credit these but note these not required in specification) from rearmament, and re-militarisation of the Rhineland through to the *Anschluss* with Austria and the annexation of the Sudetenland. These 'benefits' may be balanced against other reasons, especially those associated with the machinery of terror and lack of freedom built up after 1933 – SS, Gestapo, concentration camps, propaganda, indoctrination, censorship etc.

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**International relations 1919-1941**

17(a) How effective was international diplomacy in the 1920s in resolving international disputes? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of international diplomacy during the 1920s.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

The effectiveness of international diplomacy in these years should be the main emphasis. Perspectives on the roles of the major powers could provide a useful way into evaluation. Answers may evaluate the circumstances of treaties and agreements made. The focus of Locarno on Germany's borders with France and Belgium (not in the east), the diplomatic rehabilitation of Germany and entry to the League, Stresemann, Austen Chamberlain and Briand's personal roles. Kellogg-Briand should also provide a contrast with Locarno. There may be treatment of individual crises (e.g. Corfu and the Greece-Bulgaria dispute). Overall evaluation of the effectiveness of diplomacy should be 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.

(b) Assess the view that Germany alone was responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939.

Focus: German foreign policy contribution to the outbreak of WWII.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers may focus on the developments of the 1930s, though a longer perspective, certainly back to Versailles Treaty is possible. Clearly the foreign policy of Hitler after 1933 is important, though continuity as well as contrast may be picked up by candidates. Challenges over the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia and Poland may be evaluated. The role of Germany needs to be balanced against other factors such as: the legacy of WW1, British, French and the League's responses, the context of international aggression (Italy and Japan).

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 USSR 1924-1953

18(a) How successful were Stalin's domestic policies in modernising Russia during the years to 1953? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of Stalin's domestic policies.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers could draw on much material to develop discussion, with particular emphasis on Collectivisation and the Five Year plans. Modernisation should be interpreted loosely and counter-arguments may stress the downsides of the attempts to drag the Soviet Union into the twentieth century. Links may be drawn to Soviet success in the Great Patriotic War. There may be concentration on the 1930s – this is legitimate and should be rewarded across the mark range in relation to the quality of the analysis and evaluation. That said many better answers may consider the challenges met by the USSR up to Stalin's death in 1953. More sophisticated answers may link attempts at social engineering, the Purges and development of his control of the Party to the idea of modernisation.

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 strengthen the USSR's position in Europe from 1945 to 1953? Explain your answer.

Focus: Stalin's policies towards Europe, 1945 to 1953.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers should concentrate on Soviet control of Eastern Europe; evaluation of the effectiveness of economic, political and social constraints; Stalin's divide and rule tactics of recently liberated states and the imposition of Moscow's own brand of communism and Comecon. There may be some discussion of the response of the West, and Poland, Germany, Austria, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Perspectives back from 1953 will enable strong evaluation of Stalin's success in building dependent satellites.

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 Cold War in Europe 1945-1989

19(a) How successful were the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan in containing Communism in Europe to 1956? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan up to 1956.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

There is no need for answers to go to 1956 or attach any specific significance to 1956. Answers may use the context of the development of the Cold War from 1945 and the institutions of government sympathetic to Moscow in Eastern Europe. Answers might include discussion of moral support for Western style regimes, economic pump priming, relative strength of communist parties in Italy and France, the tradition of democracy in the West, the response of the Soviet Union to the Marshall and Truman doctrines and imposition of Moscow style regimes in the East.

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 great a threat did the revolts in Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968) present to Soviet control of Eastern Europe? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of the effects of the revolts in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

Answers will need to evaluate the impact of each revolt although there is no need for absolute balance. One way of dealing with the question may be for candidates to draw out similarities and differences. Consideration might be given of: Nagy and Dubcek the growth of liberal pressures, nationalism, economic difficulties, level of sympathy for the USSR, role of the Church, the attitude of the West and influence of developments elsewhere in Eastern Europe.

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 Cold War in Asia and the Americas 1949-1975

20(a) Assess the reasons why there was an arms and space race between the USA and USSR in the 1950s.

Focus: Evaluation of rivalry between the USA and USSR in the 1950s.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A range of different factors may be considered: The Soviet development of the atom bomb, Nato and the Warsaw Pact, containment, the arms race, the Korean War, Dulles, Iran and Baghdad pact, Sputnik, decolonisation in SE Asia. The contexts of ideological, political, military and economic rivalries could all be 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.

(b) Assess the reasons why the USA failed to prevent a communist victory in Vietnam.

Focus: Evaluation of the USA's policies in Vietnam.

No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.

A range of factors could be included in any answer: impact of the division of Vietnam in 1954, the nature of the regimes in South (and North) Vietnam, strategies used by the US politically and militarily, failure to win over South Vietnamese peasants, determination, organisation and tactics of Vietcong/North Vietnamese, loss of popular support in USA.

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 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY

Unit 2587

SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS June 2007

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: 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.

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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 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)

- 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.
- 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*).

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.

[‘A very good balance’ means that evidence for the final judgement is drawn both from the Passages and from contextual knowledge but not that the whole response must be equally balanced between use of the Passages and contextual knowledge. Own knowledge need not be extensive or exhaustive as long as it provides supported evaluation of the views in the Passages. The Passages need not necessarily all be evaluated, although the main views expressed in them should be. The degree to which this is done successfully may help to decide where in the Band the answer should be placed.]

- 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.

[Answers in this Band are likely to be less well developed in some way. The Passages may be less well used, one view may be barely evaluated, the judgement may be based mainly on the Passages or contextual knowledge may not be equally well linked to the Passages. The Passages should be the main focus of the answer and there should be some supported evaluation, but it does not need to be lengthy.]

- 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.

[Answers may consider the views in the Passages in general terms without much detailed reference. The judgement may be incomplete or not made at all or all the factors/arguments may be seen as equally valid/important. There may be quite limited use of contextual knowledge, or it may not be wholly relevant to the key issue, leading to incomplete, unsupported evaluation. The argument should be mostly clear.]

- 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.

['Imbalance' means a response where the contextual knowledge is the main focus and the Passages are glanced at in passing, often to confirm the arguments put forward from own knowledge. Alternatively there may be some interpretation of the Passages which is linked to the key issue but no real evaluation. Some confusion may creep into the argument.]

- 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.

[Answers may describe the Passages, perhaps with little reference to the key issue or to the interpretations in the Passages. The argument may not carry much conviction or be made clearly. Contextual knowledge may not be well related to the key issue or indeed to the Passages. Evaluation will probably be slight.]

- 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.

[These answers are not likely to be focused on the key issue and the argument may be impossible to follow. There may be misunderstanding of the Passages.]

- 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.

Charlemagne

1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D about whether Charlemagne and the scholars associated with him were doing anything new in their revival of learning.

[15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Passages **B** and **D** agree valuable work was done by scholars and that the inheritance of classical antiquity was saved along with the literal word of God in the Bible.

Differences: Passage **B** argues the scholars were transmitters but not original thinkers, whereas passage **D** sees Charlemagne setting up new schools which were free and reshaping society in an unprecedented ferment.

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 Charlemagne wanted to improve learning because his **main** aim was ‘the reshaping of society in accordance with the beliefs of Christianity’ (Passage D Line 37). [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 Passage **A** we hear the voice of Charlemagne himself urging a far-reaching reform of the Church and Learning in the most urgent terms and connecting the two intimately and this tends to support King’s view in **D**. Riché in **C** stresses earlier parallels for the reform, but fails to connect culture and reform of the Church. Nor does Riché mention, as King does, Charlemagne’s personal commitment and the extent of his involvement in the palace school and other measures. In **B** Fichtenau offers an assessment of the importance of what the Renaissance achieved which does not disagree in a sense with King because he says: ‘It was done in the belief that worldly knowledge was a useful servant of theology.’ Fichtenau understood the link between Church and Learning, but for him renaissance meant something more distinctly cultural and he had, therefore, a different attitude from King. Candidates could refer to other evidence to support the view, such as efforts to improve the education of administrators and use of scholars in government. They could also suggest that Charlemagne was motivated by his personal beliefs.

*Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.*

*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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.*

2 To what extent was recruiting troops the main problem Charlemagne faced in attempting to conquer the Saxons?

[45]

Debate: how important was recruitment among the Saxony?

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.

Historians have generally agreed that in seeking to conquer the Saxons Charlemagne faced grave problems of distance, weather and poor roads. More recently, some have stressed that the divisions of the Saxons and the decentralised pagan society made conquest difficult. There were parties amongst the Saxons, most obviously the friends of Widukind, and it was therefore very difficult to come to terms with the Saxons as a whole. In addition Charlemagne was never free to focus on the Saxon war because he was distracted by wars elsewhere – the classic example is 778 when a defeat in Spain triggered a Saxon revolt. More recently historians have tried to assess how far the military effort strained Frankish resources. Some have suggested that the king deflected the energies of the military followers of the great lords into raiding and conquest which was profitable and popular because it yielded booty, land and governmental jobs. Others have seen the long war as a terrible strain on resources, causing dislocation in the fabric of the empire which was particularly apparent after 800.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3 Assess the view that the later part of the reign of Charlemagne (after 800) was a time of dissolution and decay. [45]

Debate: How far the later period of Charlemagne's reign was a period of decay.

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.

We have much more information about the internal affairs of Charlemagne's Empire in the period after 800. It is not at all clear why so many more Capitularies have survived. Some have argued that it was because the empire was in difficulties and the emperor was vainly repeating prohibitions against ills, perhaps as a consequence of his impotence. The argument used is that once expansion had ended after 800, the nobility turned from external aggression to internal aggrandisement to expand their positions. In the process they used their command of the governmental machine to their own advantage. But historians have also suggested that these ills were always present and that in the late reign the emperor was really trying to do something about it. The repetition of prohibitions was a sign of determination, not impotence. Candidates need to be clear about the nature of the ills portrayed in the capitularies and other sources and to relate these to the general argument.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

King John**4(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D about the relations between King John and his barons. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both passages agree that relations between King John and his barons were poor. In passage **B** the Braose family were pursued at enormous expense and passage **D** abounds with examples of untrustworthiness on John's part.

Differences: Passage **B** indicates John's treatment of the Braose family was a great error and made relations worse. Passage **D** suggests that from early on in the reign John was seen as unreliable by contemporary well-informed witnesses.

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's personal failures were the main reason for the descent of England into civil war in 1215.

[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 Passages **B** and **D** it is certainly alleged that John's personal failures were considerable and responsible for at least some of his problems with the barons. It can be argued, as Gillingham does, that he was untrustworthy and that this was at the root of his problems, and candidates should be able to illustrate this. On the other hand all kings were, to an extent very changeable and historians have suggested that arbitrariness was in the nature of Angevin government. But although Gillingham and Painter opt for personal qualities, they do not deny that other factors were at work. Holt in Passage **C** is very clear that it was the need to reconquer his continental possessions that urged John on to press his barons, and candidates will know that no king could simply abandon claims and prestige. But Holt goes further and suggests that the barons were their own enemies, in that they were prepared to engage speculatively with the king in the exploitation of 'feudal incidents' – and, thereby, were the authors of their own problems. Innocent III in Passage **A** suggests that the barons were much to blame for the problems. Of course candidates will know that Innocent had special reasons for taking this stand, but even so they will equally be aware that many of the barons, like the Northerners, were inveterately opposed to John for particular reasons, and that, therefore, they should bear some of the blame for the eventual breakdown.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

5. Who was the aggressor in the war which broke out in 1202, King John or Philip Augustus? Explain your answer. [45]

Debate: Who was to blame for the outbreak of hostilities between the two kings in 1202.

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.

It can be argued that John was not to blame for the outbreak of war in 1202, and indeed historians have suggested that he was not in any way wanting conflict at this time. The marriage with Isabella, it can be argued, was highly advantageous and worth the giving of offence to her fiancé. Rather, it has been suggested, Philip Augustus wanted war and handled the matter of the appeal of Hugh the Brown in a way that surprised John and provided himself with a maximum of political and military advantage. As against this Philip might have hesitated if he had thought he faced a formidable enemy. John had been forced to Le Goulet by his need for recognition and the settlement impoverished him. He then trusted Philip, apparently assuming that Philip Augustus would not press the matter of Hugh the Brown's appeal. In addition, it could be argued that John invited attack by failing to reaffirm the old alliances with the Empire and other powers. John made no effort to exploit the discontents of various vassals in the north and east of France who distrusted Philip. It is debateable how far the supposed 'pro-French' stance of the Norman baronage had any influence, but this certainly needs to be discussed, notably in relation to John's ruthless use of mercenaries. Moreover, it can be argued that John had never prepared for trouble because his defence of the duchy always seemed to be something of an improvisation.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

6. To what extent was King John personally responsible for the failure of the campaign of 1214 to defeat Philip Augustus? [45]

Debate: How far John's role in the failure of the 1214 campaign was crucial.

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 should emphasise that John had worked hard to achieve the grand coalition against Philip Augustus. Careful diplomacy and vast subsidies had welded together discontented French rebels, wary great princes and the Welf claimant to the Empire, Otto IV. Few would deny the display of competence involved in all this, though, of course, John paid a heavy price at home as a result of his financial demands to build the coalition. The forces he sent to aid the coalition were well led and the naval victory at Damme in 1213 showed John's forces had real strength and it had forced Philip to flee from Flanders. The plan for John to attack Poitiers while the allies, with an English contingent, moved from the north, was a sensible one. But John was unable to follow up immediately because his relations with his barons had deteriorated badly. It was not until February 1214 that John landed in France. His campaign has often been criticised because after some successes, notably the capture of Angers on 17 June, he fled before Prince Louis of France's smaller army advancing to the relief of La Roche-aux-Moines. Candidates may well point to John's earlier failures in the field, though they must also acknowledge his successes, like Mirebeau. Moreover, he suffered no real losses and it can be argued that even in retreat at La Rochelle, he was compelling the French to use 800 knights and a commensurate number of foot to watch him, detracting from their effort against the allies. John was hardly responsible for the defeat at Bouvines which was the result, arguably, of tactical failures by the allies.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Mark Scheme 2588
January 2007

AS/A2 HISTORY

Unit 2588

SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

January 2006

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: 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.

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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 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.

V

- I (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.

Philip II**1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and C on Philip II's motives in foreign policy. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both passages agree that Philip's main aims were to defend the Catholic faith and his inherited lands. They agree that 'reputation' was important to Philip.

Differences: Passage **B** says Philip's motives were consistent and passage **C** says they varied. Passage **C** sees 'honour' and 'reputation' as his main motives while passage **B** considers 'reputation', religion and security as equally important. Passage **C** sees his policies as aggressive opportunism in contrast with the religious mission described in passage **B**.

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 Philip II's foreign policy was inconsistent. [30]

What matters here 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 focuses on whether Philip II's policy was consistently driven by religious motivation, national security or a Grand Strategy for global domination. All the Passages consider Philip's duty to uphold Catholicism, but whereas Passage **B** suggests this was consistently a priority, Passages **A** and **C** discuss inconsistencies, Passage **D** argues 'he was no crusader' and Passage **C** supports this with his truce with the Ottoman Turks. Evaluative own knowledge might include peace with the heretic Elizabeth I until 1585, relations with Rome and war against the Catholic Henri IV from 1593 to 1598. Passage **A** claims he was politically inspired but inconsistent: defensive in the 1570s and 80s yet aggressively imperialist in France in the 1590s, supporting a turning point around 1580 in Passage **C**. Passage **D** suggests other Catholic powers also acted for political motives under the cloak of religion. Opportunism underpins the view of an inconsistent policy in Passage **A**, openly raised for consideration in **C** and hinted at in **D**, though the thrust of **D** is that his many commitments undermined consistent policy and produced 'crisis management'. Passage **B** sees no inconsistency in pursuing religious mission, reputation and security whereas **D** hints that religion and politics diverged and concludes that reputation always came first. Examples of pursuit of reputation might be Lepanto, Portugal and the Armada. Own knowledge might also include 'Grand Strategy' as a consistent alternative view.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

2 Assess how effectively Philip II controlled the administration of mainland Spain. [45]

Debate: How far did Philip II control 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.

Analysis may be made of the effectiveness of Phillip II's inherited and extended conciliar system: overlapping councils, paper correspondence; of his use of corregidores and local officials: their limitations, poor communications, corruption. A discussion concerning the effectiveness of his financial administration might include his dependence on foreign loans, juros and asientos; taxation problems; balanced with an evaluation of factors such as war, imperial commitments and inherited debts. Debates about the power of the Cortes may be considered. There may be reference to the effectiveness of his social and religious control, which might include references to the Aragonese and Morisco revolts and an evaluation of Inquisitorial power in the light of relevant historical debates. There may be assessment of Philip's personal 'sedentary' management style, his mistrust of ministers and factional rivalry; control of the law, 'fueros' and local grandee power, in the light of debates. References to real or apparent 'absolutism' may be relevant if linked effectively to administration. As this is a broad topic, candidates do not need to include all the above material to reach top Bands.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

3 To what extent did Philip II's relationship with the Spanish Church place his own authority above his religious duties? [45]

Debate: Philip II's role as champion of Catholicism.

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 centres on whether Philip II lived up to his inherited role as defender of the Roman Catholic Church or whether he was politically motivated to extend his own power over Spain. Traditionally he was seen as the champion of the Counter Reformation, and many historians have held firm to the view that he was driven by a religious mission to serve God. This debate needs to be firmly anchored in his relationship with the Spanish Church. Other historians have questioned his religious motivation in the light of clashes with the Papacy over implementation of the Tridentine decrees on the national Spanish Church, the powers of the Inquisition (the subject of its own debate) and the powers of the Jesuits within Philip's territories. The cases of Carranza and Perez, the Morisco and Aragonese Revolts, the political and social uses of the Inquisition might be used as evidence in argument. Some historians view Philip as following political motivation under the cloak of religion, while there are some who accept his statement that religion and politics were identical. Throughout there should be focus on Philip's relationship with the Spanish Church.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Elizabeth I**4(i) Compare the views in Passages C and D on the reasons why Puritan influence was limited. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both Passages show how Elizabeth used her ministers to limit Puritan influence in and out of Parliament, but especially in the House of Commons.

Differences: Passage **C** focuses on the role of the Queen who rendered powerless even ministers who wanted reform, while **D** blames the extreme language of some Puritans for alienating the moderates and suggests Field and Wilcox were over optimistic about what they could achieve.

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, after 1559, there was widespread support for a more Puritan Church of England. [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.

The Passages all argue that some influential members of the laity supported further Church reform. **A** states that the House of Commons wanted to extend the preaching ministry as advocated by Puritans, while **B** argues for gentry support of these preachers in various ways. **C** refers to MPs and Lords who supported reform and **D** argues that influential gentry encouraged Field and Wilcox. However the extent of support for reform is challenged. Passages **A** and **C** both argue that the Queen did not support further reform of the Church of England. They also argue for lack of government commitment, although this is argued less clearly in **C** which makes it clear that some Lords including Leicester were for reform. There is also disagreement about the position of the bishops. **A** stresses that the bishops wanted a learned ministry, but **B** suggests that they were against non-conformity and Presbyterianism and **D** shows how Elizabeth's last Archbishop of Canterbury moved against the Puritans. Candidates may refer to other incidents in which attempts to legislate for further reform of the Church of England were countered in Parliament. They may refer to the deaths of many leading reformers by the late 1580s, or they may argue that by the end of Elizabeth's reign a theological justification for the structure of the Church of England had been clearly stated while most clergy, brought up under the new regime, were able to work within its constraints. However, there is also plenty of evidence that despite the lack of political activism in the 1590s, local evangelism was cultivating Puritan piety, with clergy and godly laity strongly opposed to the ceremonial aspects of the Prayer Book.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

5 Assess the view that Elizabeth I never had any intention of marrying. [45]Debate: The Marriage Question

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.

A range of arguments have been put forward by historians on this question. It can be argued that Elizabeth was a career woman who had no intention of jeopardising her power by becoming a wife. Set against this could be the possibility of a marriage treaty that denied her a husband political role. Elizabeth told parliament that she would consider marriage if the opportunity arose, and candidates could consider whether it did not arise because Elizabeth blocked marriage proposals or because the Privy Council could not agree on a candidate. Psycho-history may be referred to. There is an argument that childhood family and personal experiences determined that she would be averse to marriage. This argument is, however, not based on historical evidence, although historical circumstances are used to generate the argument. Candidates may consider Elizabeth's reactions to individual candidates for her hand in marriage, but particular examples need to be related to the general question in order for the response to reach Bands I and 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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

6 To what extent did Elizabeth's policies towards England's Catholics achieve their aims? [45]Debate: extent of Catholic survivalism as a result of government 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.

Candidates would benefit from setting out the aims of the legislation, for example to enforce conformity, prevent rebellion and to eliminate the influence of priests including Jesuits. While knowledge of the relevant legislation is needed, candidates who mainly describe the laws should not be rewarded highly. In relation to the enforcing conformity, candidates may discuss the various theories about the extent of Catholic survivalism, the extent of recusancy and the success of the missionary priests in supporting Catholic survivalism. Regarding rebellion, candidates may argue that the lack of serious rebellion after 1569 suggests success, while an alternative argument may be that it was only the success of the spy network employed against Catholic plotters that saved Elizabeth from danger or that, similarly, it was Privy Councillors forcing the Queen's hand against Mary, Queen of Scots in order to remove the danger she posed, rather than the laws themselves, that led to success in the face of Catholic treason. Candidates may discuss the level of success enjoyed by Catholic priests, comparing the impact of Elizabeth's policies with the short-comings of the missions.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Oliver Cromwell**7(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and B on the Rump's plans for elections. [15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: The Passages agree that the Rump hurried through the Bill concerning its dissolution, suggesting a sense of urgency that had not existed previously.

Differences: Passage **A** argues that the Rump was trying to perpetuate itself, that is, there would be elections only where seats were vacant, while existing members would continue to sit. Passage **B** denies this. The Passages disagree on when the elections were to be set up. Passage **A** saying not before November 1654 but Passage **B** arguing the dissolution had been put forward a year. The differences between the Passages can be seen as simply factual, but behind these differences are contrasting opinions about what the Rump was trying to do. Candidates who recognise that the factual differences illustrate contrasts in the historians' views on the Rump's reluctance to relinquish power should be rewarded more generously.

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 Cromwell dissolved the Rump because it did not follow the religious policies he wanted.
[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 **C** emphasises most strongly that Cromwell was motivated by religious concerns. Passages **B** and **D** also refer to religion as a motivating factor, although both do so somewhat sceptically, and do not mention specific policies. Both of these Passages suggest that Cromwell used the excuse that he was carrying out God's will when he dissolved the Rump. Candidates may expand on the view that religion played an important role by referring to legislation such as the Blasphemy Act and the Adultery Act in contrast to Cromwell's and the army's desire for relative religious tolerance. Passages **A**, **B** and **D** concentrate on the situation regarding who held power, examining the implications of the Rump's attitudes and actions regarding how fresh elections might affect this. All three of these Passages imply that the hostility of the Rump towards the army and its aims lay at the root of the problem. Candidates may use their knowledge of the army's programme and of the Rump's actions to develop and illustrate this point. They may argue that religious differences lay at the root of the hostility and that hence the apparently contradictory views of the historians may be reconciled. On the other hand it would be equally valid to include material on other aspects of the Rump's policies which had created antagonism between army and Parliament, such as the failure to reform the legal system, suggesting that there was far more than religion at stake.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

8 'A spectacular rise from almost total obscurity.' To what extent is this a fair judgement of Cromwell's career to 1646? [45]

Debate: the nature of Cromwell's early career

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 aspects to this statement that can be called into question and to reach Bands I and II candidates must address both. The first is the extent to which Cromwell's origins were obscure, and the second is the extent to which his rise was spectacular by 1646. Candidates may focus on either or both of these points. Cromwell's social standing varied considerably before 1640, and it is this more than anything else that has called into question his status. Material on his descent from the younger son of a knight, his changing economic fortunes prior to 1640 and his political experiences in Huntingdon and in the parliament of 1629 could be used to illustrate the debate. The extent to which his rise to power can be viewed as spectacular depends on how his contribution to the Long Parliament is assessed. The extent to which he was listened to and his role in parliamentary committees are relevant here. His military successes and the progress of his career in the parliamentarian army from the summer of 1642 could be used to illustrate his rise to power in the latter years and to reach a judgement on its speed and extent.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

9 Why, despite his commitment to parliamentary rule, did Lord Protector Cromwell rely so much on the army from 1653 to 1658? [45]

Debate: the apparent inconsistency of Cromwell's 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.

There are two contentious issues here and to reach Bands I and II candidates must address both. Firstly, there is the question of whether or not Cromwell was, as he said, really committed to parliamentary rule as a priority, and secondly there is the question of the extent to which he was reliant on the army. Candidates may recognise that these issues are part of a debate about Cromwell's primary aims – was his desire to create a godly nation at the heart, so that any other aims were subordinated to it and the end justified the means; was Cromwell too authoritarian to be able to work with a parliament that challenged his aims; was Cromwell influenced by the roots of his power lying with the army? Candidates may also question the extent to which he was reliant on the army, perhaps arguing that he was moving towards a government with greater civilian influence by the time of his death. The Rule of the Major Generals for example, can be viewed as a misleading label since there was heavy reliance on civilians in local government during this period. Candidates may address either or both of these issues.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Peter the Great

10(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D on the attitudes of other European countries to Peter the Great's Russia. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: The Passages agree that European countries were greatly affected by Peter's foreign policies and that there was considerable change in attitudes.

Differences: Passage **A** claims that the established powers were disconcerted by the sudden rise of Russia and the impact on the balance of power, while passage **B** sees Peter being welcomed as a great power and Louis XIV even considered a marriage alliance.

Answers in **Band I** 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 may miss some points and may 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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant

(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that Peter the Great's achievements in foreign policy have been exaggerated. [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 might judge that the Passages fall into two groups. Passages **B** and **C** broadly support the claim but Passages **A** and **D** challenge it. Passage **B** begins by describing the changes as revolutionary but continues by referring to the limits of changes ('not completely secure by 1725'). The argument is based on a view of the domestic situation which undermined Russia's external strength. Candidates might consider the last sentence in the Passage: the possibility that Russia might revert to its previous weakness after Peter's death. Passage **C** gives attention to Peter's limited success outside the Great Northern War but even the judgement of this conflict is cautious. Passage **A** is a contrast. It judges that Russia's position was transformed. Passage **D** considers that Peter's foreign achievements were greater than domestic advances. In referring to own knowledge, candidates can be expected to draw particularly on their knowledge of the war with Sweden but the Specification also mentions Turkey and Persia. Answers might expand on the references to other regions in Passage **C**. Candidates should focus on an argument when using their own knowledge and examiners will not expect much detail. For example, a reference to the Treaty of Nystadt (1721) should be sufficient to summarise the outcome of the Great Northern War.

Answers in **Bands I** and **II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**11 Assess the problems that faced Peter the Great on his accession in 1696.
[45]**

Debate: How serious were the problems at the accession to power of 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.

There is an argument that Russia posed considerable problems to any tsar but particularly to Peter with his energetic and reforming ideas. Traditional influences were strong. Russia was largely isolated from western Europe at the end of the seventeenth century and the extent and significance of western influence was very limited. The contrary argument is that, although small in extent, western influence was important in some respects and there was evidence of change that Peter could harness. The Study Topic is based on the reign of Peter the Great himself and candidates are expected to have only a general knowledge of previous reigns. Russia's access to the west was limited because it was largely cut off from the Baltic. There was little trade with the west. The social structure was very traditional and the influence of a reactionary Church was strong. On the other hand, there were changing influences at court, during the reign of Alexis (1645-76). Peter himself was well acquainted with the foreign community in Moscow. The assessment of the problems can include the strength given to a determined tsar by his personal absolute powers. This diminished, but did not negate, the problems. Peter did not have an efficient bureaucracy to hand. Good answers will assess the relative weights of the problems.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

12 How far did Peter the Great change the Russian nobility?**[45]**

Debate: Assessment of the effects of Peter the Great's policies on the nobility.

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 might conclude that Peter made little difference to the nobility; cutting off beards was a superficial act. Others might argue that relations between Tsar and nobility changed significantly and that the functions of the nobles were transformed. For example, there is a debate over the effects of the Table of Ranks (1722). It might be seen as opening up the nobility to promotion by merit or as an ineffective step that in practice reinforced the influence of traditional groups. In spite of his personal willpower and ruthless methods, Peter found it difficult to impose extensive change on the nobility at large. There was certainly some change. For example, many nobles were forced to live at St. Petersburg and they were expected to conform to western cultural norms. But their social positions were not seriously weakened and Peter had to rely on them to implement many of his policies.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

**Mark Scheme 2589
January 2007**

AS/A2 HISTORY

Unit 2589

SYLLABUS-SPECIFIC MARKING INSTRUCTIONS January 2007

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: 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.

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'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 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];
- They 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)

- 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.
- 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*).

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.

[‘A very good balance’ means that evidence for the final judgement is drawn both from the Passages and from contextual knowledge but not that the whole response must be equally balanced between use of the Passages and contextual knowledge. Own knowledge need not be extensive or exhaustive as long as it provides supported evaluation of the views in the Passages. The Passages need not necessarily all be evaluated, although the main views expressed in them should be. The degree to which this is done successfully may help to decide where in the Band the answer should be placed.]

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.

[Answers in this Band are likely to be less well developed in some way. The Passages may be less well used, one view may be barely evaluated, the judgement may be based mainly on the Passages or contextual knowledge may not be equally well linked to the Passages. The Passages should be the main focus of the answer and there should be some supported evaluation, but it does not need to be lengthy.]

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.

[Answers may consider the views in the Passages in general terms without much detailed reference. The judgement may be incomplete or not made at all or all the factors/arguments may be seen as equally valid/important. There may be quite limited use of contextual knowledge, or it may not be wholly relevant to the key issue, leading to incomplete, unsupported evaluation. The argument should be mostly clear.]

- 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.

['Imbalance' means a response where the contextual knowledge is the main focus and the Passages are glanced at in passing, often to confirm the arguments put forward from own knowledge. Alternatively there may be some interpretation of the Passages which is linked to the key issue but no real evaluation. Some confusion may creep into the argument.]

- 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.

[Answers may describe the Passages, perhaps with little reference to the key issue or to the interpretations in the Passages. The argument may not carry much conviction or be made clearly. Contextual knowledge may not be well related to the key issue or indeed to the Passages. Evaluation will probably be slight.]

- 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.

[These answers are not likely to be focused on the key issue and the argument may be impossible to follow. There may be misunderstanding of the Passages.]

- 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.

Napoleon I

1(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages C and D on the Civil Code
[15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both accept some, at least of Code as 'reactionary'.

Differences: Passage **D** sees no good in it whereas **C** praises much of the Code. **D** sees the clauses dealing with Revolutionary principles such as liberty and equality as 'largely without substance', whilst **C** praises these clauses as reflecting the Revolution, of confirming the rights of all Frenchmen and central to the essence of the Code. Meanwhile **D** interprets the Code as pandering to the interests of the 'wealthy men of property' and as a cynical codification of law to reflect Napoleon's personal aims. It also discriminates against the propertyless and women.

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 Napoleon's rule during the Consulate brought real benefits to the French people. [30]

What matters here 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.

A and **D** provide evidence that the Consulate served not the interests of the French people but Napoleon himself. **D** accepts some benefits for the property owners as does **A** (purchasers of 'biens nationaux'). **D** stresses that some groups got little out of Napoleonic rule (workers and women). **A** stresses the stifling of democracy, liberty and initiative and the return to ancien regime absolutism. **B** and **C**, however, provide a more positive interpretation if not a ringing endorsement. **B** points to the stability and order brought to France and the securing of rights and opportunity and educational progress. **C** praises the benefits secured by the confirmation of rights won by Revolution.

Candidates have much they could include to elaborate, illustrate or refute. There may be references to a 'police state' and restrictions on freedom, discussion of how far there was equality of opportunity, elaboration of the how Napoleon sought to woo the bourgeoisie, limit the rights of workers and women. There may be explanation of other benefits such as financial and economic reform and so on.

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 and 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 may miss some 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 the main impact of Napoleonic rule in Europe (outside France) was to stir up resentment and opposition. [45]

Debate: what was the impact of Napoleonic rule.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

Candidates may well discuss some of the following in support of the contention: the overt opposition expressed in Spain with the attempt to impose French rule; the opposition of the Pope in 1809, the taking up of arms at different times and then together by 'allies' like Austria, Russia and Prussia, the stirrings of German nationalism in opposition to the French, the peasant resentment at conscription and taxation, the resentment and opposition to the impact of the Continental System and so on. However, such discussion needs to be balanced against the alternative view that in some areas and amongst some groups French rule/influence was welcomed – amongst the Poles, early Italian 'nationalists, allies like Bavaria, those that benefited from changes introduced by the French (generally the middle classes) such as the Code Napoleon and, where it occurred, the attacks on aristocratic and church privileges. Candidates may also point to other impacts such as the tempering of French rule to local circumstances, the abolition of serfdom, the rationalisation of administration, the reorganisation of states and the end of the Holy Roman Empire, and so forth. Some may argue that the validity of the judgement depends on which part of Europe you examine or the relative strength of French influence and control and draw examples to support such a judgement.

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 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 of 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 view that Napoleon brought about his own downfall. [45]

Debate: What were the main reasons for Napoleon's downfall.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The reasons/explanations of Napoleon's downfall have been the subject of much historical interpretation. Those arguing in favour of Napoleon's culpability have stressed his over ambition, loss of grip on reality, growing imperviousness to criticism and belief in his own rightness and destiny, key strategic and political mistakes (Continental System, Spain, Russia etc.) and failure to take generous offers of peace (1813). Such explanations have to be balanced against those suggesting other reasons – Napoleon's declining health, the growing inadequacies of the French army, the determined opposition of Britain, the increasing capability of Napoleon's enemies, the growth of opposition in Europe and in France.

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 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 of 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 A and C about the reasons why the Conservative party leaders wanted to pass a Reform Act. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both Passages agree that the Conservatives needed a success and this was a motive. Passage **A** refers to previous failures and Passage **C** to failure leading to a return to opposition and to Disraeli's intention to promote a successful measure. Passage **C** also mentions Disraeli's need to promote his personal cause in the party. Both Passages indicate the party was disunited on the issue, but **A** says it wanted action and **C** that Disraeli held the party together so party unity could also be a motive. Neither Passage suggests that enfranchisement of the working classes was a motive.

Differences: There are differences of emphasis. Passage **A** refers to pressure from the Press and interest from the educated classes which underlines the Conservative determination to avoid giving votes to the lower classes. Passage **C** is more concerned with Disraeli's personal desire to defeat Gladstone, although the Passage argues it was not his main motive. Passage **A** stresses the need for a consistent policy, but Passage **C** makes it clear this was not a priority for Disraeli.

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, may miss some points and may 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 how far the main reason why the Conservatives were successful in passing the Second Reform Act of 1867 was because of Disraeli's tactics. [30]

What matters here 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** and **B** both suggest that Derby, the Conservative leader was a force ensuring the passing of the Act and candidates may know that the initiative came from him. These Passages also refer to pressure from outside Parliament which made the Conservative Party more ready to accept reform. Candidates could mention the Hyde Park meeting and other examples. Passages **A** and **C** both indicate how the Conservatives needed a success which helped the bill through, even though some right wing Conservatives resigned from the government as Passage **B** shows. But the main factor coming from Passages **B**, **C** and **D** is that Disraeli followed unprincipled and opportunist tactics and most historians are agreed on this verdict. The Passages give some examples and candidates may be able to provide others, perhaps arguing that Disraeli needed a personal success. There are some redeeming features in his actions; in Passage **A** the need to pass the Act is seen as a paramount aim, justifying Disraeli's attitude and Passage **D** refers to Disraeli's desire to give ordinary people a say in affairs (although Passages **A** and **C** dispute this). The other explanation found in Passage **B** is that the fluid nature of the party political system was what really allowed Disraeli's opportunism to be successful and candidates may well accept this judgement and support it with details about the fragmented state of the parties.

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 and 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 may miss some 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 Gladstone's defeat in the 1874 election the result of disappointment with the legislative programme of his ministry of 1868-1874? [45]

Debate: the role of the various factors leading to Gladstone's defeat in 1874.

What matters here is not the conclusion the candidates come to but the quality and breadth of their discussion of the evidence. An overall judgement needs to be reached.

The debate is centred on two rival explanations. The first suggests Gladstone was to blame and cites his failure to satisfy Liberal hopes in the Education Act, Trade Union reforms and Ireland. In addition the Licensing Act was seen as illiberal and the reforms to widen opportunity as limited. The second argues that Disraeli in his 1872 speeches laid out a more attractive approach with his emphasis on living conditions and a more vigorous foreign policy. His references to *exhausted volcanoes* and *harassing legislation* were also telling. The Conservatives are also seen as being better organised. Candidates may well argue that Gladstone was unlucky and that the disestablishment of the Irish church and his moral attitude to foreign affairs deserved the plaudits of the electors. They might also refer to his lack of leadership qualities and to the divisions within Liberalism and the role of Chamberlain. Some kind of judgement is needed for the higher Bands, moving beyond an assertion that both factors were to blame.

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 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 of 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 were Disraeli's foreign and imperial policies guided by any consistent principles? [45]

Debate: Did Disraeli follow any clear principles in his policies or did he improvise as he went along?

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.

This debate is centred on two alternative explanations. One view suggests that Disraeli was originally against colonial expansion but then favoured a forward policy. He bought the Suez Canal shares on a whim and made Queen Victoria Empress of India to keep in with her, or even in exchange for becoming the Earl of Beaconsfield. He was a dangerous war-monger over the Eastern question and the Berlin settlement was short-lived. He gave his colonial underlings no clear guidance and then complained when they made their own, disastrous, decisions. The alternative interpretation is that Disraeli did have an overriding aim, albeit the rather vague idea of increasing British influence and prestige and thereby winning votes. The above examples can be seen in this light and his determination to baulk the advance of Russia as the keynote of his policy in the Eastern crisis. His criticisms of the weak Liberal foreign policy could be mentioned. Candidates should cover a range of examples for the higher Bands but not every aspect of foreign and imperial affairs need be mentioned. Judgements may make distinctions between some aspects of policy where Disraeli could be seen as consistent and others where he is less so.

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 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 of 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 B about Bismarck's reasons for going to war with the Danes in 1864. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both passages argue that Bismarck went to war with Denmark in order to defend German interests. Passage **B** states that Denmark precipitated the crisis by attempting to incorporate the Duchies whilst passage **A** says Austria and Prussia took joint action against the Danish constitution.

Differences: Passage **B** claims that Bismarck had not been planning a war when the crisis first broke out whereas passage **A** says it was his intention to conquer the duchies. Passage **B** says that Bismarck had a number of outcomes in mind and Passage **A** to some extent agrees that a war with Austria was not a natural consequence of the defeat of the Danes.

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 Bismarck deliberately manipulated the Schleswig-Holstein crisis to bring about war with Austria. [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 should be aware of Bismarck's "master plan" theory and his later claim that he used the quarrel over the Duchies to compromise and pick a quarrel with Austria, which led to her defeat and the formation of the North German Confederation. Passage **B** argues that Bismarck could not have planned so far ahead and was only looking for a "Prussian solution" to the Duchies – in fact he was not necessarily planning to annex the Duchies to begin with – as such there is little sense of Austria being manipulated. Passage **D** argues that the Schleswig-Holstein crisis was an important step on the way to victory over Austria but it does not suggest that it was planned as such – rather Bismarck was more intent on dealing with his Liberal critics at home. Passage **A** explicitly argues that it was not a trap for Austria. Although Bismarck is disparaging about Austria and was willing to use her in the short term, a war with her was not an inevitability. Passage **C** demonstrates Bismarck responding to more immediate concerns and as such does not mention a future conflict with Austria. From their own knowledge candidates might argue that the Treaty of Gastein was no more than "papering over the cracks" and that there was little genuine effort made to reach an acceptable solution with Austria. They may also mention the meeting with Napoleon at Biarritz in 1865 and the alliance with Italy in 1866. Another possible line of argument might be to evaluate the pressure placed on Bismarck by the Liberals and German nationalists, the Army and the King to confront Austria.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

8 To what extent were economic factors, such as the *Zollverein*, more important than political ones in the unification of Germany from 1858 to 1871? [45]

Debate: Evaluation of the importance of factors which led to the unification of Germany.

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 should be familiar with a range of factors that led to the unification of Germany and the relative importance historians have given these. The essay requires an evaluation of the importance of economic factors such as the *Zollverein*, railways, Prussia's economic growth ("coal and iron") in terms of their importance in bringing about unification. These then need to be set against political factors such as German nationalism, the contribution of the Liberals and the diplomacy of Bismarck. Some candidates may well argue that economic factors and political ones are in fact inter-related – such as the strength of Prussia's army.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

9 How far do you agree with the view that the German constitution of 1871 was no more than ‘thinly disguised Prussian absolutism’? [45]

Debate: Evaluation of the nature of the German constitution of 1871

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 demonstrate that they are familiar with the main features of the 1871 constitution and which elements could be described as authoritarian and which as Liberal. Likewise, they need to consider to what extent Prussian institutions (the Crown, the Chancellor, the army) dominated the constitution. In terms of interpretations they need to evaluate the arguments of those historians who claim that 1871 was a defeat for the Liberals and those who say it was a victory. Clearly some will show how Bismarck was prepared to make concessions to his liberal opponents (such as male universal suffrage) – these concessions then need to be evaluated in terms of their significance and importance.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Roosevelt's America 1920-41

10(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and C on Hoover's attitude to the role of government in dealing with the Depression. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities:

Passage **B** suggests Hoover believed in local initiatives to deal with problems associated with the Depression. Passage **C** suggests he believed in all remedies short of Federal intervention. Passage **B** suggests that the Depression was caused by global factors outside immediate government control. Passage **C** also suggests that he supported self help and voluntaryism as a way of dealing with the depression, not the government.

Differences: In Passage **B** Hoover blamed overseas factors. Passage **C** doesn't mention these. Passage **B** suggests Hoover saw unemployment as local issue for city and state government to create public works not the federal government. Passage **C** saw Hoover accept federal intervention but only in a supporting role.

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.

10(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that President Hoover has been blamed too much for his handling of the Depression in the years 1929 to 1933. [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** suggests that Hoover was clearly to blame for his handling of the Depression. The passage states that Hoover believed that the Depression had global causes and, therefore, it required an international effort to solve it. This is reinforced by other information in the passage that, in 1931, fearful of an unbalanced budget, Hoover was unwilling to act decisively and also, the passage states that Hoover had a character flaw where he wouldn't admit when he was wrong and was not willing to adapt his policies to meet changing circumstances. Passage **B** suggests the opposite. Hoover actively attempted to deal with the Depression throughout his presidency. He called a special session of Congress to discuss the problem; he speed up public works such as the Boulder Dam and most importantly of all, in 1932, he created the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The latter was the most radical federal intervention into the economic sector in US History up to that time. Passage **C** suggests, like Passage **A** that Hoover was inflexible in his views in meeting the problems created by the Depression. For instance, he believed in voluntarism and self-help. According to the Passage, these were wholly inadequate responses to the problems created by the Depression. However, the Passage also states that Hoover did encourage federal spending to get the US out of Depression. Passage **D** suggests that Hoover faced an unprecedented crisis never experience by a US resident before. It also states that Hoover was willing to abandon voluntarism, once it was proved that it was wasn't working. Passage **D**, therefore, supports Passage **B**. In particular, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of 1932 was a milestone in federal support for the economy. When FDR became president, in March 1933, he continued to use the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help meet the problems of the Depression. Using outside knowledge candidates may mention that Hoover tended to keep to trusted Republican economic policies in 1929-1930. However, once it became apparent that the normal business cycle would not bring recovery he became increasingly involved in using Federal power to help the economy recover. It was not Hoover's policies which were a major problem but those passed by Congress. The Hawley-Smoot tariff of 1930 made the international trade depression worse, thus acting as a major obstacle to recovery. Much of the contemporary criticism of Hoover came from the fact that he was the wrong man in the wrong place at the wrong time and that his personality, when compared to the more charismatic FDR seemed to suggest a lack of interest and purpose in dealing with the Depression. During the 'lame duck' period (November 1932 to March 1933) Hoover offered FDR the chance to work together to solve the Depression, an offer FDR refused.

Answers which use of the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**.
Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

11 To what extent was the United States isolationist in foreign policy in the period 1920 to 1932? [45]

Debate: An evaluation of the nature of US 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.

Candidates will be expected to discuss the nature of US foreign policy in the 1920s. The decision by the Senate not to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and the USA's refusal to join the League of Nations are examples of a supposed new isolationist approach to foreign affairs. Harding's references to normalcy during his presidency reflect this view. Isolationism is usually associated with US attitudes to Europe. However, support for the Open Door policy in the Far East, in particular, China also can be seen in this light. In addition, support for disarmament, as shown in the Washington Treaty on Naval Disarmament in 1922 reflects an attitude which was against intervention abroad. However, US followed traditional dollar diplomacy. The Dawes and Young plans show decisive US intervention in German affairs in the 1920s. There was continued US intervention in Central America, most notably Haiti and Nicaragua. The Hawley-Smoot tariff is an example of isolationism during the Depression. To counter this view the moratorium on reparations and the cancellation of Inter-Allied Debt suggests that the US was not completely isolationist during the Hoover years.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

12 'More successful in dealing with the problems of agriculture rather than industry.'
How far do you agree in this view of the New Deal in the years from 1933 to 1941?

[45]

Debate: How far the New Deal was a success

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 mention the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; the TVA, Rural Electrification; the Second Agricultural Adjustment Act as examples of effective intervention by FDR in agriculture. The problems of flooding and soil erosion in the Tennessee valley were dealt with effectively; farm incomes rose and rural electrification brought about a revolution in the countryside. However, FDR did little to aid sharecroppers in particular AAs. The Dust Bowl of the mid 1930s affected whole states (Oklahoma and Arkansas in particular).

In industry the NRA failed to bring economic recovery and was struck down as unconstitutional by Supreme Court. However, the PWA, WPA and other public works schemes did stimulate industry, in particular the construction industry. However, by 1941 US economy was still only in partial recovery.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Lenin and the Establishment of the Bolshevik Revolution 1903-24**13(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages B and D on Lenin's attitude towards the New Economic Policy. [15]**

Candidates should bring out the similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both passages agree that Russia was in crisis in 1921. Passage B refers to the 'explosive situation' whilst passage D refers to 'Russia's urgent need for food'. Both passages agree as to the severity of the situation in Russia in 1921. Passage B refers to 'horrific famine and mass cholera' whilst passage D, although not quite as dramatically, concludes that War Communism had 'clearly failed to deliver the goods'. Both passages are also similar in terms of the aims of the NEP – to encourage the peasants to produce more grain. Passage B talks of the peasants regaining the incentive to raise production, whilst passage D concludes that the peasants cannot be forced but must be persuaded to produce more.

Differences: The passages differ in that passage B discusses the success of the NEP – higher grain production, food consumption and livestock levels whereas in contrast passage D focuses on the intended rather than the actual outcome.

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, may miss some points and may 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 the four passages and your own knowledge assess the view that by introducing the NEP Lenin betrayed Bolshevik ideology solely to help ensure the survival of the Bolshevik Party in power. [30]

What matters here 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 it needs to be related to the debate set out in the passages.

The state of the economy was to prove crucial to the survival of the Bolshevik Party in power. War Communism had proved to be deeply unpopular and thus Lenin was forced to introduce the NEP. Three of the four passages (**B**, **C** and **D**) clearly indicate that the introduction of NEP was a necessary response to the critical level of agricultural production and a response to the failure of previous policies. Passage **B** refers to the 'explosive situation in 1921' and Passage **C** offers a more blunt assessment – 'NEP was born out of failure and defeat'. Passage **D** refers to the failure of War Communism and that even 'state terror' had failed to coerce the peasants into compliance. Passage **A** represents the Soviet view that the NEP was a betrayal of Communist principles and led to a return to the corrupt and class-ridden society which the events of 1917 had been designed to sweep away. Candidates could use their own knowledge to support the argument that the NEP was a necessary, pragmatic response to a critical situation and that Lenin was fully aware of the unpopularity of the policy in certain quarters. His ban on 'factionalism' at the Tenth Party Congress in 1921 followed shortly by his abolition of all political parties except the Bolsheviks and increased censorship could be seen as clear indications of his intention to maintain unity and stifle dissent.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

14 Assess the importance of the 1905 Revolution and its consequences in contributing to the final split between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1912.

[45]

Debate: What were the main reasons for the final Bolshevik/Menshevik split.

What matters here is not the conclusion reached but the quality and breadth of the discussion. An overall judgement needs to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

The initial split between the two factions of the Social Democratic Party took place in 1903 and thus the events of 1905 certainly did not create the divide. The debate about tactics a small, highly dedicated revolutionary party (some candidates might mention What Is To Be Done, 1902) as opposed to the Menshevik belief in a much more broadly based party, was a debate which raged throughout the period from 1903 to 1912. The 1905 Revolution did have an impact, initially in the short term bringing the factions closer together but this 'reconciliation' did not last and soon there were differences over attitudes towards Duma elections, the attitude of each faction towards other political parties and in the lead up to 1912 disputes over the Bolshevik willingness to carry out armed robberies in order to raise funds. The 1905 Revolution also sharpened the differences between Lenin and the Mensheviks over the pace and direction of revolutionary activity. The Mensheviks were confirmed in their desire to see gradual change and their willingness to consider cooperation with liberals in the early stages of revolutionary transformation. Liberals and were arguing for a rapid transformation towards a "proletarian" revolution. The final split between the two factions which took place in 1912 can be seen to have been made more likely by the events of 1905 but the split was certainly not brought about entirely by the events of 1905. Some candidates may argue that the decisive split took place between the two groups. On the other hand some candidates may try and argue that reconciliation was a possibility and that the events of 1905 and beyond widened and deepened the divisions between the two factions culminating in final split in 1912.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant

15 Assess the importance of Lenin to the Bolshevik seizure of power in October 1917. [45]

Debate: The relative importance of the role of Lenin in the October revolution

What matters here is not the conclusion reached, but the quality and breadth of the discussion. An overall judgement does need to be reached. Candidates should have a sound grasp of the nature of the historical debate.

There needs to be a sharp focus on the role of Lenin in order for candidates to reach the top bands – the April Theses; Lenin’s ability to identify and appeal to the needs of the masses and, in conjunction with Trotsky, the decision to delay the seizure of power until the meeting of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets; thus allowing the Bolsheviks to claim that they were taking power on behalf of the people. Candidates are likely to discuss the weaknesses/mistakes of the Provisional Government (continued involvement in the war; the Kornilov Revolt; divided leadership and a failure to address social and economic problems). The problems of the Provisional Government allowed the Bolsheviks to exploit the situation by identifying themselves with the aspirations of the people (‘Peace, Bread and Land and All Power to the Soviets’) and because the Bolsheviks were the only party who were implacably opposed to Russia’s continued involvement in the First World War. In terms of interpretations some schools of thought place the role of Lenin at the centre of the debate whilst others, although acknowledging his importance, consider other factors to be equally significant.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Chamberlain and Anglo-German Relations 1918-39

16(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and D about an alliance between Britain and the USSR in 1939. [15]

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Both see fears in Eastern Europe about Russia (**A** 'the terror felt in these states' and **D** Beck telling Chamberlain of his fears and Romania also having fears). Both do show there were uncertainties and delay. On the whole, though as the hostile tone of **D**'s first sentence shows, the interpretations are more different than similar.

Differences: **A** sees Chamberlain and the foreign office as baffled by Russian intentions in offering an alliance and therefore uncertain of what to do; **D** sees a series of factors leading to justifiable suspicion on Chamberlain's part rather than a sort of bewilderment. These factors are not included in Churchill's assessment – Stalin's distrust of the west, the difficulties of a democratic PM in making an alliance with a Communist dictator and Russian weaknesses. In **A** there is a clear judgement about what Chamberlain should have done; in **D** there is a feeling that Churchill had been over influenced by Maisky and that rational arguments existed against an alliance. **A** sees a fatal delay, **D** only refers to a delay based on justifiable suspicions.

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, may miss some points and may 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.

16(ii) Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that British leaders did not make a Soviet alliance in 1939 because they were not committed to 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.

The debate here is whether Appeasement had such a hold on the government even after March 1939 that there was no real will to help Poland or go to war, so the Russian alliance was not seen as important, and even seen as likely to provoke Hitler needlessly, or whether there were too many practical problems involved with the alliance and that Russia was not necessarily seen as a key factor in the event of a war.

C has the clearest interpretation: the guarantees in Eastern Europe were unenforceable without a Russian pact. The British knew this; their war preparations were slow anyway and Chamberlain's idea was to keep the door open for further talks – a Russian alliance would have made this more difficult rather than easier. Thus there was a deliberate policy of merely going through the motions of negotiations. This could be discussed in terms of the low level and slow moving mission sent to Moscow; there could be knowledge of the limitations of the Polish guarantee; knowledge of Chamberlain's reluctance to go to war in September; there could be discussion of the extent of preparations. **A** draws back from actually saying all this, but the implication is there – if the alliance with Russia were as significant as Churchill said, why did the government not do it?– he suggests a confusion rather than a deliberate policy, a failure to regain the initiative. Against this can be argued that the Russian alliance either was or was not seen to be as significant as Churchill claims. This is certainly the case with **D**'s view.

However, though Charmley justifies Chamberlain's failure to rush into an alliance with all sorts of problems, the view is clearly set out that Chamberlain was worried that the alliance would make a war more likely rather than less – does this indicate that Chamberlain was eager not to provoke Hitler and back up any guarantee? Candidates could discuss just how far there were any plans to actively support Poland with or without Russian input? The French had the Maginot line and the Maginot mentality; British conscription and a BEF would not be effective enough to launch a counter attack in France; aircraft production was not developed with a view to helping Poland. **B** does seem to see Chamberlain in more proactive mood, with an intention to actually help Poland and Romania.

Like **D** there are practical problems – particularly the unwillingness of Poland to actually be helped. However Chamberlain does not seem from this evidence to have done much – he refused to make contact with Stalin (this could be contrasted with his meetings with Hitler and Mussolini.) Where this interpretation differs is in the intention of the British government – they gambled on actually getting Russian support and they did actually agree on military negotiations. They are shown here not as unprepared for war but incompetent and outmanoeuvred by Hitler and Ribbentrop in getting an agreement. This interpretation can be criticized: when Chamberlain was determined on a course of action, he moved very quickly, as over the flights to Hitler in 1938. However, it does point out Russian distrust – candidates might link this to previous exclusion from negotiations in 1938 – a point that Churchill does not raise. It may be that this rather than British unwillingness is a key point.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

17 Assess the view that British policy towards Germany from 1919 to January 1933 was determined by a desire to support democratic government in the Weimar Republic. [45]

Debate: The relative importance of a possible explanation for British 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 discussion here is about motives. The Kaiser had been blamed to some extent for the war – hence the virulence of the campaign to ‘hang the Kaiser’ and the militaristic expansionist had been seen as part and parcel of the Imperial regime. However, at Versailles, little allowance was made for a new democratic regime struggling to establish itself. By 1924 there was more sympathy and the Dawes Plan seemed to recognize the problems of the Weimar regime; thereafter there seems more evidence – the invitation to join the League of Nations; the willingness to leave revision of eastern frontiers at Locarno open and the early withdrawal from the Rhineland may have been responses to encourage the greater democracy of the Stresemann Era. Resentment of French hard line tactics may have been the result of a willingness to see if a parliamentary regime could change Germany. The Stresemann-Briand era is the high point of this, but a counter indication is that policy did not alter much after January 1933 even when the reports from the British ambassador warned of the brutality of the Hitler regime. Counter arguments stress not internal developments in Germany so much as internal developments within Britain and her Empire. These include economic problems and the desire to keep defence spending down; rising costs of Imperial defence; a public revulsion against the bloodshed of war; a belief in internationalism (though this could be linked to a new support for German democracy – internationalism and a more parliamentary Europe were linked ideas) and a desire to return to ‘traditional’ foreign policy based on isolation from continental 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 recognizes 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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

18 How far did Britain benefit from the Munich Agreement of 1938? [45]Debate: Assessment of consequences of major foreign policy decision.

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 centres not on the justness or the reasoning behind Munich, but on its consequences. One view was that Britain had thrown away an opportunity, lost the potential support of Stalin, lost the 35 divisions that the Czech army might throw against Hitler; lost the chance to have a just cause in the defence of a democracy; lost the chance of a possible German coup against Hitler. It also gave Hitler a chance to bolster his position by another bloodless coup and time to build up his forces. All this meant that it put off the day when Britain would have to confront Hitler until a less favourable time as well as reducing Britain's moral authority and therefore did not benefit Britain.

Against this are two arguments. One that it benefited Britain by avoiding an unwinnable war for a doubtful cause. Britain was in no position to fight and the end result – Czech domination would have been the same, except that Prague would have been destroyed and millions more killed. Britain would not have got the support of Russia and would not have had a chance to build up its forces and especially its air defences. The argument goes that no British interest was involved and Britain would have gained little by war. This sort of argument is sometimes extended to 1939 and argues that Britain gained little by going to war then. A more usual argument – often put forward by Chamberlain apologists is that it gave Britain vital time and therefore did benefit Britain. It gave her a year to build the RAF, introduce radar and spitfires, conscription and a BEF. It showed Chamberlain as doing all possible to avoid war and so got a more solid public opinion behind war in 1939 and had a huge effect on dominion and US opinion.

All of these arguments have been subject to considerable criticism and there is little consensus. What sort of war was Britain ready for by 1939? Had those months made such a huge difference, given the very large boost of German armament and the addition of Czech resources and the diminished possibility of having to face a threat from Russia that resulted from Munich? Did the heroic search for peace really influence the USA? Was public opinion really so decisive or was it manipulated in 1938? Did Munich actually make war more likely by a) encouraging Hitler b) making any future 'sell out' so much more difficult? Did it undermine Chamberlain's authority and therefore drive him to a more problematic commitment to defend Poland – a state without natural frontiers or such an effective army and defences? The focus needs to be on consequences.

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 recognizes 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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Stalin and the development of the Cold War in Europe 1941 – 55**19(i) Compare the views expressed in Passages A and B on aid for Greece and Turkey.
[15]**

Candidates should bring out both similarities and differences in views expressed in the Passages.

Similarities: Passages **A** and **B** both suggest that the USA exaggerated the threat posed by the Soviet Union and communism to ease the passage of aid through Congress. **A** states that *'To overcome the unwillingness of Congress to provide foreign credit, Truman had to link the spending to the fight against Soviet expansionism'* whilst **B** states *'Aware of the difficulty of persuading cost-conscious Republican Senators to vote the sums necessary, Truman emphasised the communist danger, painting in lurid colours the likely spread of communist regimes in Western Europe and the Middle East if Greece and Turkey fell.'*

Differences: The Passages differ about the actual situation in Greece at the time Britain withdrew aid in 1947. **A** suggests *'The situation in Greece and Turkey was not critical. The communists were not in sight of winning the Greek Civil War'* whilst **B** argues *'The Greek government, despite the assistance of British aid and troops, had been unable to prevent the communist rebels from securing control over the bulk of the Greek hinterland by 1947. The Greek communists were supported by Tito's Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.'* Therefore although both passages see Truman exaggerating the threat, **B** does see a need for aid because of the situation in Greece at the time.

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 threat posed to Europe by the Soviet Union from the end of the Second World War to 1947 has been grossly exaggerated. [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.

Candidates who focus their answers on grossly as well as exaggerated are most likely to be successful. Passages **A**, **B** and **C** all suggest that the threat to Europe was exaggerated. **C** suggests that *'There is no reason to suspect the existence of a Soviet plot to swallow up Europe or Asia. The evidence points in the other direction. The USSR's economy was in turmoil and Stalin quickly demobilised the bulk of the country's massive army.'* In **C** Ward also states that *'Defensive thinking dominated Stalin's foreign policy in the post-war years'*. Many candidates may identify Ward's views as revisionist. **B** supports Ward's views stating that Truman used *'alarmist talk' 'painting in lurid colours the likely spread of communist regimes in Western Europe'*. **A** also states that *'Truman transformed the doctrine of containment into a national crusade'* in order to win support for economic aid for Europe. **D**, which is liable to be labelled as orthodox by many candidates, exposes the real threat to Eastern European countries by Stalinist expansion after the war. In terms of own knowledge, candidates may wish to discuss the influence on US policy of Kennan and the Riga Axioms. They may wish to discuss the internal strength of communist parties in countries such as France and Italy. A balanced conclusion might suggest that the threat to Western Europe was exaggerated but that the threat behind the Iron Curtain was not, or at least was not grossly exaggerated.

Answers in **Bands I & II** will address the key issue in the question. Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge will have a **ceiling of Band II**. Answers which use own knowledge but none of the Passages will have a **ceiling of Band III**.

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 may be incoherent and will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

20 Assess the view that disagreements about the Second Front were the most important cause of tensions between the USSR, the USA and Britain during the Second World War. [45]

Debate: The issues that divided the USA, the USSR and GB from 1939 to August 1945.

What matters is not the conclusion the candidates come to 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 at this level should be well informed as to how the USSR endured the brunt of the suffering against Nazi Germany and the extent of Stalin's frustrations in relation to the timing of a second front in the west. Candidates may argue that from 1942 to 1944 this was the most important cause of disputes. Candidates should understand that following the launch of Operation Overlord this was a declining area of dispute. Candidates ought to contrast this cause of disputes with others such as arguments about the future of Germany and the increasing unease of the allies at the Red Army's actions in Eastern Europe, most especially in Poland. Candidates may trace disputes about Poland back to The Nazi- Soviet Pact of 1939 and the Tehran Conference of 1943. Candidates might argue that the 'Percentages Agreement' between Churchill and Stalin in 1944 suggests that Churchill was happy with the creation of 'spheres of influence' in Eastern Europe as long as GB 'got her share'. Candidates may demonstrate an understanding of how disputes about the shape of post-war Germany became more critical in 1945, and will be likely to refer to Yalta and Potsdam. Candidates may well suggest that issues arose at the very end of the war in relation to the USA's possession and use of atomic weapons against Japan. A valid line of argument would make the case for the causes of disputes changing and evolving through time in line with the fortunes of war. Equally validly the deep-seated differences between the west and the USSR could be seen as having united such unlikely partners in a stormy relationship.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

21 Assess the importance of the Berlin Blockade (1948-49) in the development of the Cold War in Europe during the period from 1948 to 1955. [45]

Debate: The importance of the Berlin Blockade in the development of the Cold War in Europe during the period from 1948 to 1955.

What matters is not the conclusion the candidate comes to 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 are likely to consider the Berlin Blockade as an important event in the development of the Cold War from 1948 to 1955. Candidates are likely to discuss the reasons for the blockade and should prove capable of attributing blame to both the USSR and the USA. Candidates are likely to stress the importance of the Berlin Airlift and the eventual outcome. Despite the rhetoric of the Truman Doctrine the Berlin Blockade arguably marks the first failure of Soviet expansionism. Arguably the final division of Germany into West and East Germany was a consequence of the failure of the blockade, although candidates could suggest that this was inevitable by then. Candidates may well wish to compare the importance of the Berlin Blockade to the importance of other events in this period e.g. the Czech Coup of 1948, the Soviet Union's development of the atomic bomb in 1949, the formation of NATO in 1949, Stalin's death in 1953. The USSR's development of the atomic bomb by 1949 was certainly a very significant landmark in the development of the Cold War, opening the US up to McCarthyism and the fear that they were losing the Cold War. Stalin's death clearly marked the end of an era, although candidates may argue that the crushing of the East German revolt in 1953 suggested little had changed. Candidates who make a similar point about Hungary in 1956 should be rewarded, although as this event is outside the specification knowledge so it must not be expected. Candidates who use events outside Europe (also not in the specification) during this period to support their answer should be rewarded. However, the focus of the question is the Cold War in Europe so answers that suggest that the fall of China or the Korean War were more important in the development of the Cold War in Europe in this period are invalid.

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 will be fragmentary and irrelevant.

Mark Scheme 2590
January 2007

Unit 2590/11 & 12 January 2007

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'** (ie subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 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 (eg 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.

England 1066-1228**The Government of England 1066-1216****1 To what extent did the role of officials in English central government change in the course of the period from 1066 to 1216?**

Focus: evaluation of the degree to which the role of officials changed.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Under William I officials performed the same sort of household and personal service as Anglo-Saxon officials had done, but from the reign of William II officials began to take a more important role in central government. Arguably most important was the chief justiciar whose origins lay in the work of Ranulf Flambard under William II, developed under Roger of Salisbury and reached its apogee with Hubert Walter from 1193 to 1198. From Henry II's time the office of chief justiciar was a great office of state and its incumbent had control over the Exchequer as well as virtually running the country in the king's absence, so enabling English government to continue to flourish despite royal absenteeism. The office of chancellor also grew in importance from the reign of Henry II, developing under Richard and especially under John with Hubert Walter. At a lesser level, as government became increasingly centralised with the growth of systematic control over finances and centralisation of justice, officials were used in a wider range of capacities. For example, they were essential for recording proceedings when sheriffs were brought to render account at the Exchequer, or for the administration of writs, a growing practice especially from Henry II's reign, and were used in the great investigations into administrative, financial and judicial practices in the later part of the period. However, candidates may wish to argue that most of these changes began in the Anglo-Norman period and that subsequent changes were more ones of degree than kind. Moreover, however important their role became, even the greatest officials were still under the control of the king as Henry I's dismissal of Flambard or Stephen's dismissal of Roger of Salisbury demonstrates.

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 (eg 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 main turning point in the development of English common law in the period from 1066 to 1216 came in the reign of Henry II.' How far do you agree with this judgement?

Focus: assessment of the relative importance of developments in the reign of Henry II compared with other factors in the development of English common law.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Henry II provided much of the impetus for the development of English common law and much of the machinery. For example, he made use of the returnable writ, professional justices, general eyres, grand and possessory assizes which, with their systematic procedure and popularity brought more business into the royal court, tightened up criminal law with the Assizes of Clarendon and Northampton, and made increasing use of juries. However, candidates should evaluate his work in the light of the contribution of other factors. Some may wish to argue that Henry II was building on earlier foundations such as the work of Henry I in using local justiciars, the unifying nature of Anglo-Saxon kingship, the Anglo-Saxon writ, and the shire and hundred courts, or the contributions of feudalism (well-established principles of tenure and feudal courts leading to more standardisation) or of canon law and the church courts whose practices eg sworn inquisitions, were adopted in royal courts. They may argue that any of these was the main turning point or that there was a number of equally important 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 (eg 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 'In the period from 1066 to 1216, the reasons for the periodic breakdown of English central government remained the same.' To what extent do you agree with this analysis?

Focus: analysis of the reasons for the breakdown of English central government.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are likely to concentrate on the reigns of Stephen and John for this is when English central government came nearest to breakdown. Other rebellions did not lead even to relative breakdown of government, although some candidates may draw comparisons with reasons for other rebellions. There are certainly similarities between the causes in the reigns of Stephen and John. In both, personality played a part: Stephen was brave but unreliable and unable to see tasks through; John was also regarded by his barons as unreliable, opportunist and cruel. In neither case did this encourage baronial loyalty. Baronial self-interest was a factor in both. Barons were suffering from the difficulties of having two overlords, in England and on the continent, and took steps to limit these. In both cases the king was present in England for most of the time, in contrast with the majority of kings of the period for whom absenteeism was commonplace. This meant that they, rather than their officials, bore the brunt of the resentment of their barons. In both the king failed to keep the support of the church. Stephen was deserted by Henry of Blois, the papal legate, whose initial support had been crucial to his accession and John was excommunicated and the country placed under interdict. However, there are also changes. Stephen's disputed succession divided his barons from the start whereas John succeeded to the throne without a problem. Barons under Stephen took advantage of the prolonged civil war to build up their authority in their local areas whereas civil war was short-lived under John. Stephen's involvement in Normandy meant that he was unable to concentrate fully on the developing situation in England. John's loss of Normandy led to tension with the barons when he tried to raise taxes to fund his unpopular wars there. John was in part also being blamed for sixty years of strong Angevin rule. The main underlying reason for any rebellion was a failure in the essential cooperative relationship between the king and his barons.

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 (eg 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.

Key Theme: Crown, Church and Papacy 1066-1228**4 'Personality was the main reason for the changing relations between kings and their archbishops of Canterbury.' How far do you agree with this assessment in relation to the period from 1066 to 1228?**

Focus: analysis of the relative importance of personality compared with other factors in the changing relations between kings and archbishops.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Personality seems to play a part in the changing relations. Whereas William I had a very good relationship with Lanfranc with both working together for the establishment of effective Norman rule and some church reform, Anselm and William Rufus quarrelled from the start over a range of issues including taxation, recognition of the pope and the quality of the Canterbury knights supplied by Anselm. That Anselm was later able to establish good working relations with Henry I might seem to lend weight to the personality argument. The Becket affair could also be seen as caused partly by Becket's personality: his desire to play to the full the role of archbishop. However, candidates should also examine a range of other factors. On both sides principles were important, especially when exposure to the growing church reform movement fractured the traditional perception of the relationship between church and monarch. Once Anselm's return from exile brought England into contact with the Investiture Contest he was concerned to uphold its principles while the king was keen to preserve his traditional rights. William I and Lanfranc had not had this problem, as England had remained free then from Gregorian Reform. The Investiture Contest itself was no longer an issue after Anselm and Henry I established a compromise but other aspects of the growing power of the church were. Becket took a stand on the treatment of criminous clerks and the power of ecclesiastical courts. Henry wanted to ensure just treatment of wrongdoers in the royal courts. Innocent III felt able to intervene in the Canterbury election because of the growth of papal power in the twelfth century and because, on grounds of church reform, he wanted a canonically elected and consecrated archbishop. John felt unable to accept an archbishop foisted on him. On the other hand, for some the main principle seems to have been cooperation with the king: this could explain Lanfranc's and William's relationship and also the good relations enjoyed by Richard I and Hubert Walter where Walter put concerns of government before the church. Some candidates may wish to point out that it is anyway very difficult to separate personality from other factors prompting individuals to act in a particular way.

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 (eg 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 'The reasons for papal intervention in English affairs were characterised far more by continuity than by change.' To what extent do you agree with this assessment in relation to the period from 1066 to 1228?

Focus: assessment of the extent to which reasons for papal intervention remained the same.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Behind all papal intervention the main reason arguably remained the same: maintenance or strengthening of the papal position. Intervention would not have been possible without the advances in papal power made during the period as a result of the papal reform movement and each intervention was an opportunity for the pope to strengthen his authority further. However, there are variations in the more precise reasons for intervention.

Political reasons play a part throughout the period. Gregory VII sent a legate to William I to persuade him to become his vassal; Alexander III threatened an interdict in the hope of resolving the Becket dispute; and Innocent III suspended Langton for refusing to excommunicate the rebellious barons. Church reform was also a factor throughout: Gregory VII's attempt to summon Lanfranc to Rome was because he wished to promote Gregorian reform in England; over a century later, Innocent III intervened in the Canterbury election because he wanted a canonically acceptable election, in line with the principles of church reform.

Whether or not popes intervened to support archbishops or to undermine them seems to have depended on what most enhanced their interests at any given time. The pope supported Anselm against William Rufus in the interest of church reform. Innocent II made Henry of Blois papal legate to undermine Canterbury since popes were becoming suspicious of primatial authority. Candidates will need to look at a range of examples and decide whether there is more continuity than change.

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 (eg 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 was the papal reform movement most responsible for the development of English monasticism during the period from 1066 to 1228?

Focus: evaluation of the importance of the papal reform movement compared with other factors in the development of monasticism.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The new monastic orders which reinvigorated English monasticism from the reign of Henry I owed their origin to the papal reform movement and were under the special patronage of the pope. These, the Cluniacs, and particularly from the middle of the twelfth century, the Cistercians, offered a purer and more attractive monastic life, in contrast to the increasingly worldly Benedictines. Without these new orders there would probably have been no golden age of English monasticism. However, it was not only their papal patronage which made them so potent a force: their organisation, taking their orders direct from their mother houses abroad, gave them a strength and power which made them attractive to founders of monastic houses. Moreover, the unique nature of the Augustinians, living the canonical life but continuing their work in the community, and providing a rule for a wide range of small monastic houses, proved attractive to some. Some candidates may also point to economic factors, especially in the establishment of Cistercian houses.

The foundation and endowment of monastic houses also required royal or noble patronage: without this they would not have had the funds to enable them to continue. Moreover, this would not have been forthcoming had patrons not seen a benefit to themselves or their families: salvation through meritorious deeds. This remained the fundamental reason for the development of English monasticism throughout 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 (eg 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 ‘Social and economic conditions were always a factor, but rarely the trigger.’ Assess this view of the causes of rebellions in Tudor England.

Focus: Assessment of social and economic factors in causing rebellion.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Social and economic conditions were a factor in most rebellions. Complaints about taxation, enclosures, food prices, landlord-tenant relations, occurred throughout the Tudor period and were the main grievance in the 1489 (Yorkshire), 1497 (Cornish), 1525 (Amicable), 1549 (Ket) and 1596 (Oxfordshire) disturbances. However, arguably they were less prominent or key issues in the case of Simnel, Warbeck, the Pilgrimage of Grace, Western, Wyatt, Northern Earls and Essex rebellions. Some candidates may focus on ‘rarely the trigger’ and/or challenge the premise of ‘always a factor’. Good candidates are likely to assess the relative importance of social and economic conditions as a contributory/major cause of rebellion and set this against other factors, but it is important that social and economic conditions remain the focus of candidates’ responses.

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 (eg 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 did the political stability of Tudor England depend upon government legislation?

Focus: Assessment of government legislation in maintaining political stability.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Government legislation was one of many factors responsible for upholding political stability during this period. Parliamentary statutes and Acts of the Privy Council underpinned effective administrations and strong leadership of central government. Retaining was tackled by Henry VII in 1487 and 1504, and attainders dealt with traitors; Henry VIII used and extended the treason and heresy laws; and Elizabeth introduced recusancy and penal laws. Enclosures were tackled in the Acts of 1489, 1534, 1536, 1549, 1551, 1555, 1593 and 1597, and by commissions in 1488, 1517 and 1548-9. Unemployment and trades were regulated by Acts in the 1550s and by the Statute of Artificers (1563), and poor laws were passed in 1531, 1536, 1572, 1576, 1598 and 1601. In addition, Books of Orders were issued to control local markets, and towns such as London and Norwich were encouraged to develop relief schemes. In addition to legislation, the crown relied heavily on the nobility, gentry and clergy, and upon JPs, sheriffs and lieutenants for enforcing the law and upholding stability. Better candidates may suggest that while government legislation often led the way, political stability depended very much on people's respect for and fear of the government. Moreover, government intervention could raise the bar of expectation and occasionally caused rebellion (as in the case of Ket).

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 (eg 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 To what extent did the nature of rebellions change in the course of the Tudor period?

Focus: Evaluation of aims, forms and types of rebellion during this period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

How candidates define 'nature' will determine their line of argument. Some will examine the size and extent of rebellions and link these features to the motives of rebels. For instance, the 1536 and 1549 rebellions were far larger than those facing Henry VII, Mary and Elizabeth. Some candidates may reflect on the nature of leadership and organisation: the camping rebellions in 1549 were very well controlled and planned compared with those of Wyatt and the Northern Earls. Changing objectives also resulted in changes to the nature of rebellions. Henry VII faced armed rebellions intent on overthrowing him whereas disturbances in 1525 and 1536 targeted Henry VIII's chief ministers. Politically motivated rebellions (in 1487, 1497, 1536, 1549, 1554, 1569 and 1601) required the rebels to be armed whereas demonstrations against taxation (1489, 1497, 1525) and enclosures (1549 and 1596) were non-violent protests – and the rebels of 1536 always claimed to be peace-loving pilgrims. It might also be pointed out that after the Reformation, the clergy and religious issues became more prominent until 1569, and this made mid-Tudor society more unstable. Some candidates may point to the decline in frequency, size and level of violence as the century progressed, and seek to explain this 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 (eg 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 Assess the importance of the alliance between Scotland and France in shaping Tudor foreign policy during the period from 1485 to 1603.

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of the Franco-Scottish alliance upon Tudor foreign policy making.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

England's foreign relations were conditioned by developments in Scotland and France for much of the period, and certainly until the 1560s. The Auld Alliance détente ensured that Henry VII needed to befriend Scotland before he embarked on his Breton invasion and the treaty with France at Etaples enabled him to threaten Scotland in 1497. Henry VIII and Somerset regarded French presence in Scotland to be a serious threat to English security and waged war in 1512-14 and 1542-50. Failure to secure a marriage between Edward and Mary Stuart left problems for Elizabeth but the Scottish rebellion of 1559-60, death of Francis II and Treaty of Edinburgh ended the Auld Alliance. After 1560 relations between England, Scotland and France improved, while those with Spain deteriorated. Attempts by the Guise to restore French influence in Scotland failed to materialise and served to strengthen Elizabeth's relations with Catherine de Medici and James VI. Candidates need to focus on the period 1485-1560 and compare these years with the later period. Better responses will be aware that Elizabeth's growing friendship with the crown in Scotland and France enabled her to take a more aggressive stance towards Spain, the Netherlands and America. Some candidates may consider other factors that shaped Tudor foreign policy but they are not required for any particular band and should not be the dominant theme of the essay.

However, 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 (eg 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 Which was more important in determining Tudor foreign policy: national security or economic gains? Explain your answer.

Focus: Comparison of political and economic factors in determining foreign policy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Some candidates may argue in favour of national security, highlighting Henry VII's willingness to interrupt Burgundian trade in order to secure the arrest of Warbeck and Suffolk; Henry VIII's war with France and Scotland in defence of his borders in 1512 and 1542; Somerset's Scottish expedition in spite of the financial cost; and Elizabeth's conflict with Spain that interrupted trade with the Netherlands. Some candidates will opt for economic gains and assess the financial, trading and commercial benefits from particular policies, notably friendship with Spain and the Netherlands for much of the period. Candidates need to show links between both political security and economic gains and the resulting foreign policy. This may well be achieved by comparing political and economic factors reign by reign or by comparing them sequentially. Some candidates may conclude that political security was always the main objective. However, a case can be made for the increasing importance of world trade in Elizabeth's reign and her willingness to support explorers and trading companies against Spanish protests, which put the country at risk of war and invasion. Candidates who only consider one element and make no attempt at a comparison should be confined to a ceiling of Band III.

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 (eg 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 reasons for the deteriorating relations between England and Spain in the course of the Tudor period?

Focus: Explanation for worsening Anglo-Spanish relations during this period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Between 1489 and 1571, the terms of Medina del Campo underpinned Anglo-Spanish relations. Marital links, economic agreements and rivalry with France bound England and Spain together and provided the basis of a fairly stable relationship. Before the Reformation, English monarchs were Roman Catholic but after 1534 the increasingly Protestant English Church (except for the years 1553-58) angered Charles V and Philip II. By the 1560s, religion, marriage, trade and an Anglo-French détente were reasons for the changing and worsening relations with Spain. Expect candidates to focus on Henry VIII's divorce, the Scottish rebellion, the French wars of religion, the Dutch Revolt and Drake's piratical activities as key turning-points in the deteriorating relationship, with perhaps the personalities of Elizabeth and Philip as pivotal. The best essays are likely to explain the changes thematically and examine several developments over time.

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 (eg 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 Assess the reasons why the crown found it difficult to work with parliament for much of the period from 1558 to 1689.

Focus: Explanation for the generally poor relationship between the crown and parliament.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to refer to the personalities of the monarchs, specific government policies, and parliament's increasing constitutional power. How effectively the crown managed parliament was often the key to a successful relationship. Difficulties usually arose when either the crown or parliament assumed an uncompromising stance or became confrontational, most obviously during James I and Charles I's reigns. Candidates are likely to see the 1620s, 1640s and 1680s as low water marks, and contrast them with the reign of Elizabeth, though Charles II enjoyed a honeymoon of sorts for much of the 1660s.

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 (eg 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 religious issues affect the development of the monarchy in England from 1558 to 1689?

Focus: Evaluation of religious factors in influencing the monarchy's development.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Religion was a constant theme in the development of the monarchy during this period. As Supreme Governor of the Church of England, monarchs were responsible for upholding the Act of Uniformity and overseeing the spiritual welfare of their subjects. For its part, the Church had an important impact on the development of the monarchy. It supported legislation against Roman Catholics and puritans in Elizabeth's and James's reigns, and strengthened the monarchy's authority. The growth of Arminianism and Charles I's attachment to it, however, rendered the possibility of an absolute administration and created political tension with a fiercely patriotic House of Commons. The political and religious power of bishops, the attempt by puritans to change the Church in the 1630s and 1640s and Charles I's endorsement of Laud's reforms in England, Scotland and Ireland, led to civil war, military defeat and abolition of the monarchy. Anglicanism was restored in 1660 and neither Charles II nor James II were able to widen the religious franchise. Attempts to establish greater toleration for minority groups only served to increase political tension and led to the Glorious Revolution and further restrictions on William III. Some candidates may consider other issues (eg financial and political) but this is not required for any band.

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 (eg 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 Compare the strength of the English monarchy in 1558, 1660 and 1689.

Focus: Comparative evaluation of the monarchy at different times.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

In 1558 there were few practical and even fewer theoretical limits to the monarch's authority. Elizabeth called herself 'absolute', and meant it. Her constitutional powers were undefined and loosely applied. She became the Supreme Governor of the Church, ruled the state with considerable political strength and only relied on parliament for additional finances. Although theoretically above the law, she nevertheless governed with the consent of her subjects. By 1660 the powers of the crown had been legally limited in terms of finance, religion and politics, but Charles II used his prerogative to slip his bonds and ruled with relative impunity. In 1689 in the wake of the Glorious Revolution, the monarchy's constitutional and political powers were further curtailed, with religious, financial, political and military restrictions. On balance the monarchy was less strong in 1689 than in 1558 or 1660, particularly in respect of its constitutional and legal powers, but it was financially more stable and still capable of acting independently of parliament. Better candidates are likely to compare the monarchy's condition in 1558, 1660 and 1689 thematically; less effective answers are likely to assess the monarchy sequentially and offer fewer links and comparative assessments.

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 (eg 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 Assess the reasons why the strength of anti-Catholic feeling in England varied during the period from 1558 to 1689?**

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for fluctuations in anti-Catholic feeling.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The strength of anti-Catholic feeling varied in the course of the period. In Elizabeth's reign it was most intense in the 1580s when plots to free Mary and kill the queen occurred, when Jesuits and missionaries were at large, and when the threat of invasion hung over the country. Legislation against Catholics began in 1570, intensified in 1581 and continued until 1593. Anti-Catholic sentiments re-commenced with the Gunpowder plot, the rise of Arminianism, the Thirty Years' War, Charles I's marriage and foreign policies and the growth of the Counter Reformation in continental Europe. Cromwell was a staunch Protestant and denied Catholics any tolerance purely on religious grounds. Charles II's pro-Catholic/absolutist tendencies and his links with France ensured Protestant MPs stayed alert but the Popish plot and attempts to exclude James between 1678 and 1681 saw feeling reach fever pitch. Anglicans, lawyers and MPs expressed concern at James II's favouritism towards Catholics which climaxed in 1688. Better answers may assess and explain why concern over Catholics in England rose and fell but never totally disappeared.

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 (eg 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 How far did government attitudes towards English puritans change in the course of the period from 1558 to 1689?

Focus: Evaluation of changes in government attitudes towards puritans.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Elizabeth wished to embrace all subjects and tolerated most puritans until the 1580s when separatists wilfully confronted the Church and state. As a result of the war with Spain and publication of the Marprelate Tracts, 1588-93 were particularly difficult years for puritans. James I was willing to tolerate them but distrusted Presbyterians and as increasing numbers of MPs adopted Puritanism and criticised his religious, foreign and financial policies, the government clashed with the parliaments of 1621 and 1624. Any puritan who failed to conform to High Church principles was persecuted by Charles I and Laud in the 1630s but civil war, victory for puritans and the abolition of bishops ensured puritans were generally well treated by Commonwealth governments. The Restoration of bishops, Anglicanism and Charles II, who had no time for puritans, again saw them under threat but now without the protection of parliament. James II may have sympathised with Protestant non-conformists but could not advance their condition in the face of an implacable parliament and irresistible Anglican Church. The Glorious Revolution brought some tolerance in government attitudes due to William's Calvinism and Whig pressure. Most candidates are likely to take a chronological approach to this question but reward candidates who look for thematic developments and assessments.

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 (eg 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 'James I managed religious problems more successfully than any other ruler from 1558 to 1689.' How far do you agree with this view?

Focus: Comparative evaluation of James I and other rulers in handling religious problems.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Better responses are likely to assess religious problems facing James I, how effectively he dealt with them, and follow this through thematically to compare him with other rulers (including Cromwell). James faced discontented puritans in the Church and parliament, pressure from the Papacy and Catholic plots, Anglican resentment towards Arminians and pressure to assist his Protestant son-in-law in Bohemia, yet his latitudinarian and cautious approach ensured religious problems never got out of hand. Neither Charles I, Cromwell, Charles II nor James II handled religious problems as well. Only Elizabeth stands comparison and some candidates may favour her above James although, arguably, her difficulties were not so complex as those facing the Stuarts and, of course, some of James' problems were inherited.

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 (eg 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 How far did the French Wars of Religion mark a turning-point in the development of the French nation state from 1498 to 1610?**

Focus: Evaluation of French wars compared with other moments of change.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates need to see how the wars of religion affected the development of the nation state by examining the condition of France before and after 1562. The long wars had a dislocating effect on society and the economy, slowed down political centralisation, led to two faiths co-existing rather uneasily, tarnished the monarchy's reputation for absolutism and reduced the status of France as the dominant power in Europe. Candidates should reflect on how far France's development 'turned' or continued after 1562. Political, foreign, religious, economic, social and cultural themes are all relevant. Some candidates may suggest alternative turning-points (eg reign of Francis I or end of the Italian wars), which is fine provided they first assess the impact of the French wars of religion.

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 (eg 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 Which French monarch did most to advance the power of France during the period from 1498 to 1610? Explain your answer.

Focus: Comparison of monarchs in the development of French power during this period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates are likely to focus on either Francis I or Henry IV. Francis strengthened the internal condition of France in respect of legal and administrative reforms, the political power of the monarchy and the authority of the state in relation to the Church but weakened her finances and standing as an international power. Henry IV played a key role in rehabilitating France both domestically (resolving religious and social divisions, laying sound economic foundations and restoring the political authority of the crown) and internationally (in respect of Spain, Savoy, the Valtelline, the United Provinces and Cleves-Julich). Some candidates may give credit to Louis XII and Henry II but few will claim that Francis II, Charles IX or Henry III did much to advance French power. Expect the best answers to define 'power of France' and compare their chosen monarch(s) with others across the whole 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 (eg 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 importance of economic factors in the development of a more unified French state from 1498 to 1610.

Focus: Assessment of economic factors in the development of a unified France.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should be able to comment usefully on economic factors eg the effects of rising population levels, the impact of inflation on different social groups (notably the crown, nobility and peasantry), measures taken to overcome financial difficulties, the impact of war upon patterns of trade, and the development of commerce, transport and industry, especially under Sully. Some candidates may compare economic factors with other developments (eg religious uniformity and divisions, administrative reforms, growth of royal power) but these are not needed for any band. This question is about economic factors and better candidates are likely to link these directly to the development of 'a more unified state'.

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 (eg 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 difficulties facing the Papacy in its attempts to reform the Church from 1500 to 1600.

Focus: Evaluation of different problems confronting the Papacy.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates may reflect on some of the following difficulties that faced the Papacy: (1) The scale of corruption in the Church in 1500 in most European countries as well as the Papal States and Curia.

(2) Few training colleges and most clerics were poorly paid and of limited education; and the spiritual welfare of people was widely neglected.

(3) Many monasteries contributed little to communal or spiritual life.

(4) Papal anxiety about calling a general council but one was needed if reforms were to be universally applied.

(5) Uncertain support for reform from secular powers (eg Charles V and Francis I) whose involvement in Italy until 1559 frightened many popes into a state of inertia.

(6) Renaissance popes were materially minded and stood to lose political power and wealth from reform.

(7) Protestantism became very popular and the doctrine of Lutheranism and Calvinism challenged the beliefs and legitimacy of the Papacy and Catholic faith.

The better essays will probably examine a range of difficulties and explain why reform was slow to take off and patchy in its 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 (eg 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 Did the Council of Trent or the new religious orders make the greater contribution to the revival of the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century? Explain your answer.

Focus: Comparative assessment of the effectiveness of Trent and the new orders.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Most candidates will compare Trent and the new orders. Some will do so sequentially; others by themes. Trent defined Catholic doctrine after years of uncertainty and challenges from Protestantism, rejected compromise, re-asserted papal authority, stressed the role of bishops and underlined the value of education in the training of priests and spiritual welfare of the laity. Yet by 1563, the Catholic Reformation was already well underway, most notably due to the work of new orders. Here the Jesuits will figure in most essays although better answers will consider other sects. Countries visited, numbers converted, their educational and social activities could be considered but so might the limitations to their achievements eg jealousy of many groups towards the Jesuits, hostility of secular rulers, opposition from Catholic males towards females, local activity of many new orders and progress made by Protestant missionaries.

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 (eg 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 Explain why the sixteenth-century Catholic Reformation was generally more successful in some parts of Europe than in others.

Focus: Assessment of the reasons for greater success in certain areas of Europe.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Several explanations may be put forward:

(1) The progress made by Lutheranism (in much of Germany and Scandinavia), Zwinglianism (in much of Switzerland), Calvinism (in parts of Germany, France, Scotland and north-east Europe) and Protestantism in England before the Catholic Church took steps to counter their popularity.

(2) Secular rulers in northern/western Europe took control of their churches' land and wealth for spiritual and political power; neither the emperor nor the pope could stop them.

(3) Calvinism appealed more to urban and trading communities, which were mainly in western Europe.

(4) Catholic beliefs of Spanish, Portuguese and French monarchs, and their use of tribunals (eg the Inquisition and state courts) stamped out or controlled heresy.

(5) Activities of Jesuits and missionaries in eastern and southern Catholic lands reinforced traditional beliefs; and rural groups were more attracted to the Catholic faith and practices.

(6) Proximity of the Papacy to Italian states and work of new orders, bishops and inquisition kept Italy mainly free of heresy.

Candidates should try, wherever possible, to link their explanations to particular areas of Europe. Some candidates may point to exceptions to the statement which is fine.

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 (eg 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 Who was most responsible for the decline of Spain as an international power in the seventeenth century: Philip III, Philip IV or Charles II? Explain your reasons.

Focus: Comparative evaluation of 17th century Spanish monarchs.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must 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 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 Charles's 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, 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. Some may blame Philip II for bequeathing a poisoned chalice although he falls outside the specification. **For marks in Bands I and II**, answers must compare all three kings and, by inference, their governments, before reaching a 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. **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 (eg 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 How do you explain the financial difficulties that beset Spain in the seventeenth century?

Focus: Explanation for Spain's financial problems.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Expect most candidates to examine some of the following difficulties: limited sources of revenue; unequal tax system; self-indulgent and incompetent government officials; high expenditure due to court costs, war and overseas possessions; inherited debts and juros payments; declining silver bullion; debasement; inflation; lack of political will to effect reforms. Better candidates should be aware of periods of improvement as well as deterioration, of change as well as continuity, perhaps focusing on Lerma, Olivares, Haro and Oropesa, and organise their argument thematically.

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 (eg 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 'Possessing an overseas empire was more important than social changes in weakening Spain in the seventeenth century.' How far do you agree with this statement?

Focus: Comparison of empire and social factors as a cause of Spain's decline.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Spain's large and extensive overseas empire (references might include some but not necessarily all of Netherlands, Milan, Naples, Sicily, North African towns, Mexico, Peru, West Indies, Philippines and Portuguese colonies) was a serious drain on her resources in terms of defence (financial, military, naval) and war (targeted by trading, colonial and naval rivals). Spanish governments failed to make the most of trading potential, and the silver, goods and prestige the empire brought to Spain were more than offset by attendant problems. Social changes also weakened Spain: a declining population until the 1680s; increasing poverty and rising rural unemployment widened the gap between rich and poor, privileged and unprivileged, and caused riots and revolts; famine, disease and war worsened living conditions for many Castilians who also shouldered the burden of taxation. The Church did little to strengthen society – the Inquisition may have created social tension, and the expulsion of the Moriscos further weakened the economy and society. Provided candidates discuss both elements of the statement, they may weight their arguments disproportionately; other factors that weakened Spain are not required for any particular band.

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 (eg 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 Ascendancy of France 1610-1715

28 Assess how different social groups were affected by the ascendancy of France during the period from 1610 to 1715.

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of the rise of France on social groups.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should link the impact of France's rise in power to different social groups, and most probably to the nobility, clergy, merchants, urban dwellers and rural peasantry. The growth of centralisation, increase in taxation, expansion of the army, long periods of warfare after 1635, the growth of Paris and other large cities, the creation of Versailles, and religious developments, all had an effect on most social groups. Better responses may well organise their answers thematically according to either different social groups or particular effects resulting from the rise of France.

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 (eg 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 How far did Mazarin's administration (1643-1661) alter the direction of French domestic policy during the period from 1610 to 1715?

Focus: Assessment of Mazarin's domestic policies as a turning point in the development of France.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

Some elements of Mazarin's administration continued the policies of Henry IV, Sully and Richelieu: his attempts to raise revenue, to politically weaken the nobility and parlements, and increase the centralisation of government. The outcome of his domestic policies, however, changed the direction of future French policies. The Frondes affected Louis XIV's view of Paris, parlements, the clergy and nobility, and altered his attitude towards appointing principal ministers, especially foreigners. Better candidates will be aware of developments during Louis XIV's reign that were not apparent during Mazarin's administration eg desire for religious uniformity, the king's personal intervention in political affairs, the role of Versailles, and increasing focus on economic policies.

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 (eg 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 How strong was the monarchy's absolutism in France during the period from 1610 to 1715? Explain your answer.

Focus: Evaluation of French absolutism during this period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

French kings claimed to be absolute, subject to God alone. Louis XIV in particular exercised considerable power, ruling the Church, commanding the largest army in Europe, and presiding over the most advanced administration centred on Versailles. The monarchy was much stronger under him than under Louis XIII yet both rulers faced limitations when extending taxation, raising troops, governing provinces, controlling nobles (especially princes of the blood), managing parlements, suppressing minority religious groups, and eliminating administrative inefficiency and corruption. Better responses will be aware of continuity and change over time (eg contrast royal minorities with periods of greater authority), and the differences between theoretical and practical absolutism illustrated by the reigns of both Louis XIII and Louis XIV.

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 (eg 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 ‘Political thinkers continued to support despotism more than limited monarchy.’
Assess this view of the development of political ideas during the period from 1661 to 1796.**

Focus: Assessment of a judgement of political thought over an extended period.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected.

Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The Specification mentions Diderot, Rousseau and Voltaire. One hopes for wider references but answers that mention only these three can merit any mark if the argument is sufficiently good. Some candidates might challenge the quotation but it is doubtful whether any of the *philosophes* advocated monarchy with very limited powers. For most eighteenth-century thinkers, the advocacy of rights and the opposition to privilege went along with support for strong monarchs. Good candidates might consider whether this went as far as support for despotism. There was certainly a change from the almost universally accepted ideas of the reign of Louis XIV; candidates might mention Bossuet. Divine Right afforded very extensive powers to the King. Obedience should be unconditional. In the eighteenth century, political thinkers were seeing government as a science, controlled by laws. They opposed wilful kings, not strong rulers as such. Even Rousseau saw an important role for the state.

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 (eg 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 Assess the claim that absolutism in Russia under Peter the Great and Catherine the Great was characterised more by continuity than change.

Focus: Assessment of a claim about change and continuity in Russia.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The Specification (and the Question) mentions Peter the Great and Catherine the Great. Candidates are not required to show knowledge of other Russian rulers in the period for any Mark Band but wider accurate references should be rewarded. They might argue for the greater claim either of continuity or change. Answers might be organised thematically or chronologically; the second approach should not automatically be dismissed as thoughtless narrative. In this context, narrative should be seen as accounts that are not connected to an argument. ‘Good’ narrative might be seen as relevant accounts that are closely connected to an argument. Answers might be constructed sequentially but it is probable that this thematic approach might be more successful for most candidates. The range of factors that can be considered is wide but it will be necessary to link them to absolutism. For example, answers that simply record changes or continuity in religion will not merit as high a mark as those that link religion to absolutism, for example showing how Peter the Great curbed the power of the Orthodox Church and enhanced his own power. Even accepting the need to be aware of alternative explanations, it is difficult to see how one might argue either for complete continuity or for change; the discriminating factor for the most successful answers will be the ability to synthesise the assessments of a variety of points and come to a cohesive conclusion.

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 (eg 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 How far was France influenced by the Enlightenment during the period from 1661 to 1789?

Focus: Assessment of the link between the Enlightenment and social change.

The question may be agreed with or rejected – no set conclusions are to be expected. Answers might argue that France was heavily or slightly influenced. Candidates must address the theme over the full period.

The question is based on that part of the Specification that mentions ‘the claim that society [was] influenced significantly by Reason and enlightened ideas... social change and the Enlightenment’. Arguments should be supported by appropriate examples. One would expect some explanation of the term ‘Enlightenment’ and its main features. There were signs of social change that affected particular classes, which were also those groups to which new ideas appealed. More liberal religious and economic ideas were in the air. Censorship became unpopular. There was an interest in the social basis of society. Perhaps paradoxically, some nobles, who were at the heart of the *ancien régime*, flirted with the new ideas by reading books and engaging in discussions in the salons, not linking the new views with their own positions. On the other hand, there were limitations. The large majority of the population in the lower orders were unaffected by the Enlightenment, at least directly. Only some of the nobility were sympathetic; most remained wedded to traditional ideas of government, religion and society. The kings were not personally very enlightened. It might be claimed that the reign of Louis XIV was mostly untouched by enlightened changes and that the movement belonged more properly to the eighteenth century. The period ends in 1789; this gives an opportunity to discuss the causes of the French Revolution. How important were enlightened ideas as a contributory factor? But this should not occupy too much of the question.

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 (eg 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 2007**

Unit 2591/11 & 12

January 2007

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'** (ie subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (eg 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;
- 'Re' 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 (eg 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 (eg 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 eg '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, eg 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, eg '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 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 (eg 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.

Britain 1793-1921**Britain and Ireland 1798-1921****1 Assess why revolutionary Irish nationalism succeeded in the period 1916 to 1921 but failed in the period 1798 to 1916.**

Focus: evaluation of revolutionary nationalism.

No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Better candidates might take issue with the assumption of failure before 1916, arguing that a tradition of violence and martyrdom was maintained at regular intervals (Tone, Emmet etc) but the achieving of a Republic, radical or otherwise, remained a distant prospect. The best answers will compare the two periods, explaining the changes that led to Ireland's partition and the creation of a southern state. Throughout the period British governments remained committed to the Union, using considerable force, (military and police) to maintain it. Candidates could cite numerous examples of this from Wolf Tone's Rising to the Anglo-Irish War of 1919-20. Post 1918 however, Britain was overstretched and public opinion was less likely to condone a 'civil war' on its doorstep. The attempt to use special forces (Black and Tans) backfired and created popular hostility in Ireland and on the mainland. Just as Gladstone was more convinced of Home Rule when Parnell could be seen as the elected representative of most of Ireland, so Lloyd George could see that Sinn Fein represented the same democratic will. All that could be salvaged were strategic interests, the monarchy and Dominion status. To win a guerrilla war as practised by Collins was not likely. Lloyd George, hell bound by party, could see this. Another factor to be considered is the headship and organization of revolutionary nationalism. Until the 1880s it tended to be secret, underground and only extensive if linked to agrarian grievances (Tone, Emmet, Young Ireland, Fenians and Davitt and the precarious relationship with Parnell). The initiative lay with Constitutional Nationalism (Parnell and Redmond) and Home Rule until the Great War, clearly a key factor in explaining a changed climate. Candidates could also focus on the role of Sinn Fein as developed by Griffiths, De Valera, and Collins, combining military tactics with political ones (exploiting the Easter Rising and the Great War, conscription and the 1918 Election). Cultural nationalism from the 1890s could also explain the post 1916 success in providing a Gaelic inheritance and framework for independence. Better candidates may also introduce a foreign dimension, the failure of the Directory to assist properly the 1798 rising, no foreign intervention in the 19th century, German gun running, the migration and the creation of Irish America (funds and leadership in the later 19th and early 20th century) and the pro-'self determination' mood of post 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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 'British governments, in their efforts to make the Union work, were generous to Ireland in the period 1800 to 1921'. How far would you agree?

Focus: assessment of the British governments policy towards the Union.

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 argue that governments were more generous in the second half of the period than the first when the climate of opinion remained very suspicious of Ireland in most respects. Better candidates will realise the 'generosity' was in evidence more in some areas than in others. On matters of **Law and Order** governments took a hard line throughout the period, crushing of Wolf Tone saw much slaughter, Habeas Corpus was frequently suspended to allow coercion (in the 1820s and 1840s during O'Connell's mass mobilisations), repression under 'Bloody Balfour' in the late 1880s, the response to the Easter Rising in 1916 and the reprisals of the Black and Tans. Only Gladstone (post 1882) and Asquith are possible exceptions to this trend. No British government accepted that Irish politicians and leaders knew what was best for them. Regarding **religion** British governments were prepared to be generous but had to be wary about public opinion on the mainland which was hostile. (Pitt had wanted emancipation in 1800, Peel reluctantly conceded it in 1829, but his Maynooth Grant was more to do with the control of the Catholic hierarchy than encouraging it). Disestablishment solved a grievance but governments did little to stop the sectarianism that spilled out from Ulster. Regarding **economics** governments did little (but it was a Laissez Faire Age) in the first half of the century and indeed could be condemned on a 'relief' front during the famine. Legal problems arising from land were tackled successfully (Land Acts) and from the 1880s the land itself was dealt with 'generously' from the tenants point of view (Wyndham's Act 1903). By the end of the period large sums were spent on Agrarian improvement. **Politically** governments were very reluctant to concede reform within the Union before the 1880s. Repeal was vigorously resisted, as was the appointment of Catholics to office after 1829. After 1886 governments were prepared to grant either Home Rule (1886) or extensive local government (1898). After 1918 Home Rule was conceded by both parties to both parts of Ireland. Better candidates might argue that Ireland as a whole stood to gain more from British and local government than from Home Rule Parliaments in Dublin. The Home Rule Bills kept most power at Westminster and in that sense were not 'generous' to Ireland. The pattern of 'generosity' is thus a mixed one.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 How far was the Third Home Rule Bill of 1912 the most important turning point in the relationship between Ireland and the British government in the period 1789 to 1921?

Focus: assessment of the relative importance of the Third Home Rule Bill over the period.

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 compare the Third Home Rule Bill of 1912 with other key points in the relationship between the UK and Ireland. Other possibilities might include the Act of Union in 1800, Emancipation in 1829, the Famine in the 1840s, the Home Rule Bill of 1886, the 1916 Easter Rising and the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921. **Not** all need to be considered. It depends on the candidates arguments, but a full consideration of 1912 is required. The case for the Act of Union is that it set the agenda for the entire period, a Protestant dominated Ireland fully integrated politically into the UK. One either defended this or sought to chip away at it. The argument for Emancipation is that it opened the door to a Catholic Ireland. Home Rule in 1886 could be seen as the key turning point as it provided a restored Dublin Parliament but its powers were limited and, unlike 1800 and 1829, it failed. The Famine created bitterness and an American migratory dimension whilst the Easter Rising proved to be a mistake for the British Government. Clearly the 1921 Treaty closed the agenda raised by the Union and as such repays close examination. The case for the most important event being the 1912 Bill is not that it was radical (a very moderate Bill in the post 1886 context) but its impact on both Ireland and Britain. The First Home Rule Bill saw less impact on Ireland itself, although it split the Liberals and thus its chances of enactment. The Third Bill transformed Ulster with their own schemes for self government and quasi military training. It also saw the Conservative Party firmly hitched to Unionism and, unlike the 19th century, prepared to be irresponsible, and in the south provoked a similarly military response. Such developments prevented compromise and pointed to war later in the decade. No other previous event had threatened this. It completed the sectarian divide and would quickly lead to Partition, not effectively an issue before 1900 (although it would have been if 1886 had succeeded). It confirmed that Home Rule was the way forward, albeit two separate Home Rule Parliaments in 1920. It ended the 'all' Ireland solution of the 19th century. Unlike 1888 it also confirmed that the now supreme elected House of the British Parliament accepted Home Rule. Better candidates might also point to the weakness of Asquith's government at this point (failure to consider Ulster, accusations of a 'corrupt bargain' with Redmond, the handling of the Curragh Mutiny), unlike 19th century leaders and governments who dealt with Ireland and were anything but weak (Pitt, Peel, Russell, Gladstone, Salisbury, Balfour etc). 1912 was also crucial for constitutional nationalism. A failure to deliver this time would lead to the collapse of the late 19th century Home Rule Party.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 Assess the view that opposition to war was confined to an educated minority in the period from 1793 to 1918.**

Focus: assessment of the opposition to war.

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 agree that opposition was confined to an educated minority during this period, especially the expression of such opposition. As Britain only conscripted in the final two years of the period there was no chance of popular opposition manifesting itself in that manner. Press-ganging for the Navy was too low profile to figure. Nonetheless better candidates may be able to argue a case. In the 1790s the Radicals threatened a wider success in portraying participation in the Revolutionary Wars as against the interests of the people and Pitt's response focused on preventing their communication of such ideas to a more popular ill-educated following. There was more widespread opposition to any suggestion of helping the South in the American Civil War whilst in Gladstone's period educated Nonconformity led opposition to Disraeli's Imperial Wars. After the Boer War there was some popular dislike of the 'methods' used (Chinese labour) but the key test was the First World War. The evidence here can point in different directions. Soldiers' diaries reveal a mixed pattern with some very obvious anti-war perspectives. Some communities, especially Nonconformist and Irish, opposed conscription. Yet, even in the Great War, much opposition was voiced by educated individuals (Sassoon) and most 'opposition' was less about the War per se than about how it was being run. The same was true about the Crimean War and the aftermath of the Boer War. Radicals like Tom Paine in the 1790s, Cobden and Bright in the mid 19th century and the 'pro-Boers' in 1900 were from an educated minority. When Cobden, Bright and Gladstone got a censure motion on the Second Opium War, Palmerston called a snap election in 1857, the result of which confirmed popular support for his China War. All colonial wars were portrayed as successful and 'Mafeking' continued to confirm popular support for war. 'Little Englanders' were ridiculed whether they be pro French Revolutionary Radicals, Nonconformists or Conscientious Objectors. The Socialist end of the Labour Party (ILP) opposed entry to war in 1914 but the majority (Trade Unions) supported it, as Henderson's career showed.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 successfully did British governments manage the nation's resources to meet the demands of war in the period from 1793 to 1918?

Focus: evaluation of the relative success of resource management in the prosecution of war.
No set conclusions are to be expected but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Much will depend on how candidates define the nation's resources and their applicability to war. These can include manpower issues, finance, technology and weaponry, raw materials, transport and communication and the evolution of a Home Front. Some may be more successfully harnessed than others and at particular times. Naval resources had always preoccupied governments, hence the provision of dockyards and the cultivation of timber and naval supplies (prison and workhouse). Although not always in the forefront of naval technology, governments responded quickly to any perceived naval threat (1859 and 1906). Private companies were used (Armstrong Vickers) as well. Nonetheless there were many instances of economies undermining the successful use of resources, notably at Jutland in 1916 and during the Gladstone period. Governments were effective in managing finance. All Britain's wars in the period were 'paid for', Pitt's 'gold' keeping foreign armies in the field against Napoleon but in times of peace economies wrecked reform. Manpower was a problem in the 19th century and without the poverty of Ireland would have been worse. Government attempts to improve this (Enlistment 1847 and Cardwell's Army Reforms in the 1870s) largely failed. Britain was lucky that her wars were mainly imperial and overseas. Her army could remain relatively small. In 1914, Kitchener's Volunteer Army was a resounding success and conscription was accepted post 1916, partly as a more efficient way of managing manpower in key industries on the Home Front. The Empire also proved crucial for manpower, especially in the First World War and in running India. Governments were less open to new technology in the 19th century, especially the first half, perhaps because the landowning aristocratic governments failed to see the opportunities or they were less clear. The potential for the use of railways was missed in the Crimean War until the contractor, Thomas Brassey, plugged the gap at his own expense. Most troop movements went by sea, although rail was well used in the Great War. Communications remained traditional well after the invention of the electric telegraph, with phone and radio only being well used after 1914 (What would British governments have done without Marconi?) The record with weaponry was better (machine guns were used after 1888) although this application was often not properly thought through given traditional command structures. As for food, governments worried throughout the period, aware of Napoleon's Continental Blockade and of Germany's unrestricted submarine warfare. Dependence on the Atlantic was there from the 1870s and government took swift action after 1914 to encourage self sufficiency with some considerable success.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 How far would you agree that the navy was always more important than the army in British military strategy in the period from 1793 to 1918?

Focus: Assessment of the relative importance of the navy and army in military strategy during the period.

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 agree with the question's assertion of the primacy of naval strategy, not least because of the importance of Home and Imperial defence and of securing trade routes. A 'Bluewater Strategy' remained the key. Governments were very reluctant to commit troops to Europe, doing so only three times in the period (and one of these was to the Crimea, arguably not 'mainland' intervention). In the Napoleonic Wars it was not until 1807, fourteen years into the war, that a larger, non expeditionary army was committed to Spain (and then not to Italy, the Low Countries, or the battlegrounds of Central Europe). Even in 1914 the intention was only to give assistance to the French on a supposed secondary front (BEF in Belgium), not to take the full strain in key areas of what became the Western Front. The late arrival of a General Staff (1904) in Britain denotes that army planning of this type was not a priority in the 19th century. After 1815 the enlarged continental army was rapidly scaled down to play a law and order role (Ireland and the Radicals and Chartists) and an imperial one (China, Africa). Only in the 1807-15 and 1914-18 periods did the army assume, perhaps, greater importance in terms of resources, focus, strategy (wars of attrition) and ultimately victory. However, even then the navy continued to play a crucial role. In both cases a Continental Blockade had to be maintained and in both cases was done successfully. Discontent in Napoleon's Europe and the failure of conscription presaged Napoleon's military defeat, whilst by 1917 Germany was nearing malnutrition and starvation. German collapse was triggered by naval mutiny in Kiel. Britain had retained surface supremacy and contained the U boat threat. For the period in between these two great wars the army was dependent on the navy for manoeuvre and for its 'expeditionary-like' nature. This was how the Crimean War and China Wars were fought. The Walcheren expedition and later Gallipoli were classic examples of this strategy in action during larger scale wars. Most of Britain's enemies defended themselves from naval rather than military attack. Until the arrival of huge continental wars British strategic thinking kept the army in an expeditionary 'box'.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 'There was far more continuity than change in the way governments dealt with the problem of poverty during the period 1834 to 1948'. How far do you agree?

Focus: an assessment of government policies to tackle poverty.

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 challenge the statement by pointing out what appear to be significant changes in policy. They are likely to discuss the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 and how this was modified with the introduction of the Poor Law Board (1847) and the Local Government Board (1871). Further change was mooted in 1905 with establishment of the Royal Commission on the Poor Law and Unemployed which seemed to have some influence on the framing of the Liberal social reforms (1906-14). A major change followed in 1929 with the abolition of the Poor Law Guardians and in 1948 the very last vestiges of the Poor Law were removed when Attlee's Labour Government introduced the Welfare State. However, for candidates to be awarded Band III or above there should be an attempt to offer balanced analysis and evaluation. It could be argued there was much continuity in government attitudes towards the poor regardless of the party in power. Many continued to have faith in individualism and a belief that relief should be granted based on the principle of the 'deserving poor' as illustrated by the eligibility rules for receiving Old Age Pensions (1908) and National Insurance (1911). This was also linked to the continued use of means testing and the workhouse as a way of controlling aid to the 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 will be well organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 changes in housing policies influenced mainly by political factors during the period 1834 to 1948?

Focus: an assessment of the influences on housing policies.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should be able to argue a case for political factors influencing housing policies. They are likely to point to the rise of the labour movement (including General Unionism) and an extension to the franchise (1867, 1888, and 1918) as political pressures which influenced government policies particularly in the later part of the period. Better candidates may attempt to show how the question of housing was used as an electioneering tool as in 1918 and 1945. For Band III or above other issues should be addressed. These might include the power and influence of local governments, the strength of vested interests, financial constraints, developments in science and technology, rising living standards (and, hence, aspirations), the role of individuals (eg the Lever brothers, Chamberlain, the Cadbury family) and the effects of wars. Generally, more sophisticated answers are likely to consider how government policies ebbed and flowed with changes in the economy, society and politics.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 Assess the reasons for greater government intervention in education during the period 1834 to 1948.

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for governmental intervention in education.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Governments intervened for a variety of economic, social and political reasons. Finance was continually an issue; there is likely to be discussion of grants to education (1830s onwards), the monitoring of expenditure (Privy Council), payment by results, the funding of scholarships and cuts in spending as a result of economic depressions and/or wars. Intervention also seemed to go hand in hand with social change especially with the emergence of more distinct middle and working classes and the emancipation of women. Generally, as living standards increased so did aspirations and the demand for more and better education. Political pressures included the extension to the franchise, pressure from the Labour movement, and the use of education as an electioneering tool. Better candidates are also likely to link the above with the effects of wars (Crimean, Second Boer War, World Wars) and religious issues (conformity, non-conformity). Overall for Bands 1 and 2 a range of factors should be evaluated with a clear attempt to make a judgement about relative importance.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 Assess the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Conservative party during the period 1868 to 1992.**

Focus: an assessment of the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Conservative party.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

To achieve marks in the higher Bands it is important for candidates to avoid listing factors. They should evaluate a range of issues by considering their relative importance. These might include the strength of leadership, the effectiveness of party organisation, particular events, trends in the economy, changing social structure and the ability of other parties to provide strong opposition. One line of argument might be that the Conservatives continued to be the major force in British politics throughout the whole period mainly as a result of charismatic leadership and policies that had popular appeal. An alternative view would be that weak opposition allowed the Conservatives to retain power along with a fair amount of luck. More able candidates should provide balance to their answers by considering a range of internal and external influences on the progress of the party.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 To what extent were changes to both the House of Commons and the House of Lords essential to the development of democracy during the period 1868 to 1992?

Focus: the significance of changes to the Houses of Parliament.

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 changes to the Houses of Parliament were essential but have to be considered alongside other developments. Reforms to the Lords were more significant than those of the Commons. In particular, there is likely to be much discussion about the 1911 constitutional crisis and the reduction in the power of the Lords reinforced by the reform of 1948. However, there were important changes in the Commons as electoral reform (extensions to the franchise, redistribution of seats, 'secret voting') changed its composition. These seemed to have a positive impact on the development of democracy although other changes, such as the televising of parliament were more contentious. Better candidates should be able to measure the importance of these changes against other developments such as the widening of the electorate, the emergence of new political parties, the changing role of the prime minister, educational reforms, the role of the mass media and the growth of pressure group activity. Merit should be given to those who challenge the idea of changes to parliament being essential insofar as it could be argued that other developments were far more important.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 'The change in the political role of women was very limited during the period 1868 to 1992.' How far do you agree?

Focus: the changing political role of women.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

A number of candidates are likely to adopt the rather simplistic line of argument that when women eventually received the vote (1918 and 1928) then their political status improved considerably. This was added to by the rise in the number of female MPs starting with Nancy Astor (1919), the appointment of the first female cabinet minister (Margaret Bondfield, 1929), the first female peers being accepted in the House of Lords (1958), and the election of the first female prime minister (Thatcher, 1979). There were a significant number of other women who achieved significant political status throughout the period including Ellen Wilkinson (1946-47), Florence Horsburgh (1951-55), Barbara Castle (1964-70), Judith Hart (1968-70), and Shirley Williams (1970-74). This approach is rather tokenistic and more able candidates should be able to provide more balanced analysis and evaluation. This might acknowledge the advances made by women but is likely to indicate that in relative terms changes to the political status of women have been slow, arduous and quite limited. By the end of the period women were still underrepresented in parliament and in other areas of political activity such as trade union leadership, the organisation and management of pressure groups, the political press and local government. In general, the quality of responses is likely to hinge on how 'political role' is defined and the breadth of knowledge and understanding candidates have about the historical role of women in British politics.

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 organized, 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 have synthesized 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 (eg 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 may 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 responses 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 organized 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 the Mass Media 1896-1996**13 How far do you agree that, during the century from 1896, American influence has been the most significant factor in the development of the mass media in Britain?**

Focus: the growing influence on the mass media of techniques and programmes from the USA.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

From the industrialisation of the press in the last part of the 19th century to the way in which television has developed in the second half of the 20th century, the convention has been to accord to the USA a predominant influence. This question encourages candidates to subject that assumption to careful scrutiny, and especially to focus on the extent to which the actual roles of the media have been affected by American techniques and programmes. Counter-arguments which candidates may put forward could include the much stronger educational role and programming assumed by the BBC and popular press especially, the resistance to commercialism, the strong commitment to public information. Other significant factors (such as government pressure, changes in society unique to Britain) may also be argued as equally or more important in influencing the media, and they may spend quite a large part of the essay on this, but equally candidates could just weigh up the American influence and still achieve the highest marks. Good candidates may well make a useful distinction between ‘techniques’ from the USA (generally adopted keenly) and ‘programmes’ or content which were relatively limited.

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 (eg 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 To what extent did periods of national crisis affect the relationship between British governments and the mass media during the century from 1896?

Focus: the way in which governments have influenced and been influenced by the media, especially in times of national crisis.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Periods of national crisis offered a real opportunity to governments to make use of the media and new forms of communication, to rally support and appeal for unity, to maintain morale and shape public perception. But the media during crises also posed a huge challenge and potential threat to their authority and reputations. Before the emergence of the new mass media, governments had found it comparatively easy to manage the information available to the public. Yet now the challenge was made all the greater because of the coincidental extension of the franchise and improvements in mass education and literacy. The relationship between governments and the media is one of the most controversial aspects of this Theme paper: considerable debate has raged about the degree to which governments have managed to manipulate the press in times of crisis and whether 'the truth is the first casualty of war' for example. In both World Wars the government imposed and the media accepted considerable control, yet newspapers and especially magazines such as Hutchinson's Pictorial History of the War in the Second World War were remarkably frank about defeat and disaster. Baldwin during the General Strike and Mrs Thatcher during the Falklands War were arguably very successful in bringing the press on side, but the latter was not so successful during the Miners' Strike, and Eden failed dismally during the Suez Crisis. From the point of view of the media, the influence of the great press barons of the inter-war period and more recently the Murdoch empire is likely to be examined here. Candidates may also consider whether the relationships established during crises then went on to have a longer-term impact.

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 (eg 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 Assess the view that the emergence of radio in the 1920s was the main turning-point in the influence of the mass media on popular culture in Britain during the century from 1896.

Focus: the nature of broadcasting in Britain and its 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.

The real challenge for candidates here is to see that this is a 'comparison' question requiring the establishment of radio broadcasting to be set against other possible turning-points in the influence of the mass media on popular culture. While a strong case may be made for the emergence of radio changing popular culture in very significant ways (instant, in the home, shared by family or larger gatherings, little choice and therefore shaping culture into a degree of uniformity, appealing to all classes, open to a wider public) there are good arguments to be found in support of contrary views (clearly television and the freeing of the media in the 1980s and 1990s for example can be argued to have more importance, not all of it beneficial; American influence was more apparent once television came in etc.) Some students may wish to discuss the meaning of 'influence' too.

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 (eg 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 To what extent were the quality and training of ordinary soldiers the main factors in the success of armies in the period from 1792 to 1918?

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of specific factors in warfare.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

There are plenty of armies in the period that had high levels of 'quality & training of ordinary soldiers'. Examples might include the French *Grande Armée* in the period 1805-07, the British army at any time in the period – even the Crimean War – but especially the BEF of 1914. Discussion supported by such examples might address quality such as élan, junior leadership or motivation, training in battlefield tactics, drill and doctrine. Placed in the right context quality and training of soldiers could be used as an argument for success by armies when in difficult situations – outnumbered, fighting on disadvantageous battlefields, etc. On the other hand candidates might point to armies being successful without high levels of quality and training. Candidates might point to 'national characteristics' such as the stoic resistance of Russian troops virtually throughout the period. Another line of enquiry would be the use of masses of poorly trained, low quality troops of the battlefield, a factor that became ever more common with the introduction of mass conscription as the period went on. Candidates might discuss the effectiveness of methods by which armies prepared a conscript army for war, a good example would be the Prussian and, subsequently, German armies. Candidates who wish to discuss the American Civil War might point to the poor training but high levels of élan of some of the fighting units, mostly Confederate but also some Union – such as the Iron Brigade. This war is also a good example of the successful use of mass lower quality conscripts.

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 (eg 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 impact of developments in communications and transport on the conduct of war in the period from 1792 to 1918.

Focus: Evaluation of the impact of specific technologies on warfare.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Both communications and transport must be addressed to move above band III.

Transport will probably concentrate on the application of steam power in the form of railways (and steam ships where their use applies to land warfare – the Crimean War springs to mind). The response must use this knowledge in an analytical fashion with focus on the specific demands of the question set. Examples might be rapid strategic movement, the ability to mobilize large numbers of soldiers, its impact on concentration of force. The obvious examples are the 1866 Austro-Prussian War & the opening months of WW1. Better candidates might argue that the railway only took armies so far and once separated from rail networks soldiers moved as fast as their 18th century forebears had done. We might also expect discussion of the impact of the internal combustion engine in WW1 (lorries, tanks and aircraft). Here many of the comments for rail apply for motorized troops. For tanks and aircraft we might expect some discussion of use in battle. For pre-steam technologies use of waterways to transport troops or mass use of horse drawn carts were important. The former was a common feature of war in the later 18th and early 19th centuries, the latter was used on occasion by Napoleon, for example to move part of his army in 1805.

Communications will probably concentrate on the developments of the second half of the period, telegraph, telephone and early radio. Telegraph first starts to make an impact with the Crimean War, with the telephone we move to the Boer War and Russo-Japanese War, radio is a feature of WWI. There are obvious applications of evidence from the American Civil War to both parts of the question.

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 (eg 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 Assess how effectively states responded to the changing demands of warfare in the period from 1792 to 1918.

Focus: Evaluation of state support for war.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

The question asks candidates to discuss the changing demands of warfare on the state and by implication discuss the changing nature of warfare. The expansion of the size of war both chronologically and geographically at the start of the period with the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, and the subsequent need for larger armies, in turn prompted the use of conscription and the need to provide the means to wage war- munitions, weapons and food. The same issues apply to the last war of the period-WW1- and also to the American Civil War. The wars of the middle period of the century were less far reaching, often lasting for short periods of time and being confined to relatively small theatres of operation. Candidates might argue some states found the new challenges of war difficult to meet and discuss why this was the case and the impact on effective war fighting. Austria in 1859 and 1866 and especially the combatant powers of the Crimean War are examples. Some states found difficulties meeting the demands posed in the question. Examples might be the *ancien regime* states opposing the French until perhaps 1890 or the allied war effort in the Crimean War.

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 (eg 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 To what extent was German nationalism consistently a popular cause throughout the period from 1815 to 1919?**

Focus: Evaluation of the popular appeal of nationalism in the period 1815 to 1919.

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 'to what extent', 'German nationalism', 'consistently' and 'popular cause' in their answers in an attempt to evaluate the popular appeal of nationalism in this period. Candidates should evaluate the extent to which nationalism had popular appeal and demonstrate awareness that such appeal was not uniform but fluctuated. Candidates may demonstrate that concepts of romantic nationalism had a limited intellectual appeal. Candidates could consider the extent to which nationalism appealed to the people at various points, for example 1848 and 1871 and 1914. Candidates may choose to demonstrate that the mass appeal of nationalism may be compared to the mass appeal of other philosophies such as socialism or liberalism. For example the growing industrialization of Prussia and the German Empire was mirrored by the growing mass appeal of socialism, an appeal that proved relatively immune to either appeasement, in the form of state socialism, or repression. Candidates may well demonstrate that they understand that Wilhelmine Germany increasingly looked to harness nationalist yearnings through a populist foreign policy in order to distract the masses from social discontent. Distress from the winter of 1916/1917 onwards, and defeat in 1918, led to the socialist uprisings of late 1918 and early 1919 and the establishment of Ebert's republic. However, even in 1919 the appeal of unrequited nationalism was never far from the surface, as evidenced by the Freikorps and the emerging 'stab-in-the-back' theory.

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 (eg 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 How far do you agree with the view that Kaiser William II managed German nationalism more effectively than Metternich and Bismarck?

Focus: Evaluation of the management of German nationalism in this period by Metternich, Bismarck and Kaiser William II.

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 how effectively Metternich, Bismarck and William II managed German nationalism. Candidates will undoubtedly be more successful if they define 'managed' in their answer. Candidates might define the ways in which the three were (or were not) effective: for example in controlling, harnessing or using nationalism. Clearly all three had different aims and different circumstances, which could enable candidates to make convincing cases for all of them. By 1848/49 no leader of the nationalist movement with mass appeal emerged. From 1815 to 1848 the nationalist movement was too weak to effectively challenge the Metternich System: arguably this demonstrates Metternich's effective control over German nationalists. Equally Metternich fled Vienna in 1848, though his downfall was hardly dominated by German nationalism. Many candidates may argue in favour of Bismarck because of his critical role in the 1860s in the creation of the Second Reich; candidates may argue that he managed German nationalism by hijacking the nationalist cause for Prussia's ends. This too could be considered effective management of German nationalism. William II's search for world power was undoubtedly populist, mirroring the development of radical nationalism, but it placed Germany in a vulnerable, dangerous position. The ultimate outcome of his policies was defeat in the Great War and humiliation at Versailles.

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 (eg 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 reasons for Prussia's changing relationship with the other German states in the period from 1815 to 1919.

Focus: An evaluation of the reasons for Prussia's changing relationship with the other German states in this period.

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 the reasons why Prussia was less successful in dominating the German states because of Austria's dominance of Germany in the first half of the period 1815 to 1865. They may also demonstrate understanding of the reasons for Austria's replacement by Prussia as the dominant German power from 1866. In terms of the earlier period, the impact of decisions taken at Vienna and Austria's role within the Diet might be usefully discussed. The role and influence of Metternich through to 1848 could be usefully explored. Candidates may well wish to discuss how Austria was able to regain control, imposing the 'humiliation' of Olmütz of 1850 after the revolutions of 1848/49 and the attempted establishment by Prussia of the Erfurt Union. Candidates should be able to explain why the balance of power within Germany was actually changing and how Olmütz probably represents Austria's last assertion of dominance. The importance of economic factors on developments, for example the impact of the Zollverein after 1834 in developing Prussia's economic strength and Prussia's eventual dominance over the German states and gaining of the leadership of Germany, might usefully be explained. Candidates should understand how developments in the economy in the 1850s paved the way for the military victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870/71. Military strength depended upon economic strength. The role played by Bismarck will almost certainly be highlighted by many candidates in terms of explaining the reasons for Prussia's dominance over the creation and development of the Empire. How the Constitution enabled Prussia's domination of the other German states after 1871 could usefully be explored as could the leadership of Kaiser William 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 (eg 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 fall of the Provisional Government in October 1917 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 the fall of the Provisional Government as a turning point in the development of Russian government in the period 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 phrase 'most important turning-point' and 'the development of Russian government' in their answers. Candidates may argue either for or against the fall of the Provisional Government 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 consideration could be given to 1855, 1866, 1881, 1905/1906, February 1917, 1924 or 1928/1929. Candidates may argue that the end of over 300 years of Romanov rule in February 1917 was the most significant turning-point, but may 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 the most important turning-point as it crushed all possibility that a liberal democracy might emerge in Russia. Candidates may consider that the replacement of Lenin by Stalin, after Lenin's death in 1924, was 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. 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.

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 (eg 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 How far do you agree that a study of Russia in the period from 1855 to 1956 suggests that change was always imposed from above?

Focus: Assessment of causes of change in Russia in the period from 1855 to 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 what caused change to happen in Russia in this period: was it always imposed from above? Candidates will probably find much to argue about in support of this assertion: Alexander II (his reforms eg Emancipation) and Alexander III (re-imposition of reactionary autocracy) and Witte's 'Great Spurt' are good examples from the Tsarist period; in the communist period there are large numbers of examples, from Lenin's original decrees, to War Communism, through to Stalin and collectivization and the Five Year Plans. Candidates should be able to argue that change also came because of pressure from below. The most obvious examples stem from the revolutions themselves, but candidates could argue that there are other significant examples. Some changes are open to interpretation by candidates. Did Lenin change to the NEP in 1921 because he wanted to or did famine, economic collapse and the Kronstadt Revolt leave him with little option? Were the famines of 1891, 1921 and the early 1930s imposed from above? Did the impact of the First World War produce an unstoppable pressure for change from below or was this imposed from above by decisions such as going to war in August 1914?

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 (eg 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 the working class of Russia suffered more under communist rule than they did under the Tsars in the period from 1855 to 1956?

Focus: Comparative assessment of the condition of the working class peoples of Russia in the period 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 an understanding of the experience and impact of communism on the living and working conditions of Russia's working class. Some candidates may compare and contrast Marxist ideology with the actual experience of life in the USSR. Candidates should compare the experience of the working class under the tsars with their experience under the communists. Candidates may treat Russia's peasants as **part** of their discussions, but the main focus should involve a consideration of the experience of Russia's industrial working class or proletariat and candidates who fail to discuss the urban workers may **not** be put into bands (I) or (II). Candidates are likely to compare the impact of industrialization on the lives of the people, both before and after 1917. Similarities could include the grim experience of industrialization experienced by the proletariat, both as a consequence of Witte's 'Great Spurt' and Stalin's Five Year Plans. Candidates may wish to compare the scale of the suffering under Lenin and Stalin with that experienced before 1917. Candidates may argue that the working peoples gained benefits from Bolshevik rule, for example in the sphere of education.

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 (eg 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 Assess the view that political groups and parties played the central role in the development of the Constitution during the period from 1787 to 1877.

Focus: Evaluation of the role of political groups and parties in the development of the US Constitution.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should address the role of both groups and parties. Groups could include those who advocated different positions during the constitutional convention of 1787. It may also include the divisions between supporters of strong federal government and those who supported states' rights. However, for the later period candidates may mention the important role of the Republican Party in the lead up to and course of the Civil War which resulted in the three amendments of 1865 to 1870 (13th-15th).

Candidates may also offer alternative factors which may be regarded as more central such as social change or the role of the president, Congress and/or 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 (eg 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 To what extent was sectional conflict between North and South unavoidable in the period from 1787 to 1877?

Focus: Evaluation of the reasons for sectional conflict.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates should decide whether or not conflict was inevitable. Factors which may be considered are the nature and functioning of the US Constitution created in 1787. It created the tension between State and Federal Government. Candidates may mention examples of this such as the Second Bank of the US crisis of the early 1830s. It could be argued that, at some stage, conflict would break out. The Missouri Compromise of 1820 and the Great Compromise of 1850 merely put off something which inevitably would occur. Alternatively, they may state that the US political system was based on the concept of compromise and the events of 1860-61 were an aberration.

They may also mention the issue of slavery and how it caused great tension between North and South as the country moved westward in the 19th century. They may state that slavery was so crucial to Southern society and the southern economy that the South was bound to go to war to defend it.

Even after the Civil War tension still existed between North and South during Reconstruction. The end of Reconstruction in 1877 temporarily brought to an end this conflict.

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 (eg 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 Supreme Court the most important institution in the development of federal power from 1790 to 1877?

Focus: Comparative analysis of the role of the US Supreme Court against other parts of federal government in the development of federal power.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates are expected to compare the role of the US Supreme Court with other factors in the development of federal power. The Marbury v Madison case and the Court under Chief Justice Marshall played a central role in supporting the Federal Government against State power. This pattern continued through the 1820s to the 1850s. However, the Dred Scott Case of 1857 under Chief Justice Roger Taney suggested that the Supreme Court did not always support the Federal as against State interests.

Candidates could mention other factors such as the role of the presidency or the actions of Congress. The most important part of the latter's role was the Civil war and Reconstruction period (1861-1877)

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 (eg 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 How far did US presidents hinder rather than help the development of African American civil rights in the period from 1865 to 1980?**

Focus: Assessment of the role of US presidents in the development of civil rights.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates have the opportunity to discuss the role of US presidents in the development of African American civil rights.

They can mention the role of Andrew Johnson (1865-1869) who impeded the development of Radical Reconstruction which planned to offer full rights to AAs; under Grant (1869-1877) Reconstruction saw the implementation of the 14th and 15th amendments and the suppression of White Supremacist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan. Hayes (1877-1881) saw the end of Reconstruction and the imposition of white supremacist rule in the South. Under presidents Cleveland through to Wilson (1889-1921) the development of segregation took place in the South without presidential interference. Changes occur under FDR (1933-1945) with AAs receiving better rights under New Deal agencies and in WWII; Truman (1945-1953) desegregated the armed forces and made AA civil rights a government propriety. Eisenhower (1953-1961) tried to avoid supporting AA rights unless forced to do so. JFK/LBJ (1961-1969) openly aided AA rights and were very important in supporting the civil rights movement. Nixon (1969-74) upheld 1960s legislation and court ruling which aided AA rights. Nixon's role continued by Ford (1974-1977) and Carter (1977-1981).

Clearly those candidates who offer a balanced, analytical view encompassing the whole period will receive mark in the top band.

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 (eg 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 To what extent were the 1890s the main turning-point in the development of trade union and labour rights in the period from 1865 to 1980?

Focus: Evaluation of the 1890s compared to other moments of change.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates will be expected to explain the importance of the 1890s in the development of trade union rights. Majority of candidates may refer to the Homestead and Pullman strikes of the 1890s. These quite rightly can be regarded as watershed events. Homestead Strike, in particular, ended trade union claim for concept of workers rights within US companies. Both strikes stand out as examples of the use and support of Federal and State power against trade unions.

The 1890s also saw the mass arrival of New Immigrants from Europe. This helped split the US trade union movement between Old and New Immigrants. It also saw the growing division between skilled and unskilled labour. Finally, the 1890s saw the growth of trade union militancy which resulted in the creation of the International Workers of the World (IWW).

Candidates could counter the assertion in the question with reference to other potential main turning points such as:-

The 1920s when Big Business, with Federal Government support introduced no strike (yellow dog) contracts on unions. Unions also faced Supreme Court and Federal courts judgements against collective bargaining.

The New Deal era (1933-1941):- the Wagner Act of 1935 gave unions recognition and collective bargaining rights. The National Labor Standards Act 1938 gave unions arbitration rights. The COI was created in 1936.

The Second World War when full employment and the war effort gave unions a major role in war industries under Federal protection. Union membership increased to its highest proportionate level in US history.

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 (eg 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 'Asian and Hispanic Americans faced far greater discrimination in social and economic matters than in political rights.' How far do you agree with this view for the period from 1865 to 1980?

Focus: Comparative study of the development of civil rights for two ethnic groups.

No set conclusions are to be expected, but candidates must answer the question and address the theme over the full period.

Candidates can mention that throughout much of the period both ethnic groups faced social and economic discrimination. This involved segregated housing areas; separate educational facilities and discrimination in employment. Chinese in 19th century were forced to live in China towns and took poor paid work such as labouring on the Trans-continental railroad or in the food industry. Hispanics were similarly forced to accept poorly paid migrant labour primarily in agriculture. They were forced to live in barrios.

This pattern of social and economic discrimination continued up to the post 1945 era when both ethnic groups benefited from changes associated with the AA civil rights movement.

In political terms Asians suffered more discrimination than Hispanics. The Asian or Chinese Exclusion Act 1882 and the Root/Takahira Agreement greatly limited Asian immigration in a way not experienced by Hispanics. The incarceration of Japanese Americans in WWII epitomised this issue. By 1960s, along with AAs both ethnic groups were granted full political rights. Asians advanced socially and economically. This included Korean Americans by 1970s. However, the Hispanic population faced continued social and economic discrimination, partly caused by high influx of illegal immigrants (Wetbacks) from Mexico.

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 (eg 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.

**Advanced GCE History (3835/7835)
January 2007 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2580	Raw	60	45	40	35	30	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2581	Raw	60	45	40	35	30	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2582	Raw	60	44	39	34	29	25	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2583	Raw	45	36	31	26	22	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2584	Raw	45	36	31	26	22	18	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2585	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2586	Raw	45	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2587	Raw	90	66	59	52	45	39	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2588	Raw	90	66	59	52	45	39	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2589	Raw	90	66	59	52	45	39	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2590	Raw	120	89	80	71	63	55	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2591	Raw	120	89	80	71	63	55	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3835	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7835	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3835	16.39	45.67	73.30	89.13	99.08	100.00	543
7835	12.36	48.32	82.02	95.51	100.00	100.00	89

632 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(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 2007

