

# **History**

Advanced GCE **2587**

Historical Investigations 768-1216

## **Mark Scheme for June 2010**

---

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## GENERIC MARK BANDS

## Units 2587-2589: 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
- are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5].

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.**

## PASSAGES QUESTION

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.
- Glosses in [ ] have been added to aid “a well-founded and common understanding of the requirements of the mark scheme.” (*Code of Practice*, #4.17).

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

- I (36-45) The response **focuses very sharply on the key issue** in the question, using good and very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. Contextual knowledge is used **very appropriately and effectively** in relation to the question. (This contextual knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.). The answer **contains a very good balance** between Passage and contextual evaluation in **reaching a judgement** about the issue. There is **clear and substantial evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved by comments on the validity of the arguments in the Passages using the other Passages or own knowledge (**not** all the Passages need to be evaluated). The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[‘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 (31-35)** The response **focuses on the key issue** in the question, using very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. The quality of the contextual comments and some aspects of the internal analysis of the Passages, whilst sound, will be **less rigorous** than in Band I. There is a **fairly clear and fairly full evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved and a **judgement is reached**. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[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 (27-30)** The response **considers the interpretations** in the Passages and deploys some contextual knowledge. The argument is clear, but comments will be **thinner** and overall **judgements less effective** than in Band II. The organisation of the answer is **uneven**. There is a **reasonable degree of evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing is generally fluent and historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

*[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 (22-26)** The response shows **considerable imbalance between** Passage evaluation and contextual knowledge. A **basic argument** is provided. The Passages may be largely used to **illustrate the argument** put forward and not as the focus of the answer. There is **some attempt at evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

*[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 (18-21)** The response shows **some evidence of knowledge** of the key issue, but may make **little use** of the Passages. The answer **lacks coherent structure** but the direction of the attempted argument is **mostly relevant**. There is **little evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer contains frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[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 (10-17)** The response shows **serious weaknesses in knowledge** and ability to handle contextual questions. The argument may be **fragmentary**. There may be **serious irrelevance**. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

*[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 (0-9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding. There is no attempt to answer the question. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## ESSAY

### NB

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

## BANDS I-VII/45

- I (36–45)** *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions.* The response is **focused clearly** on the demands of the question, even if there is **some unevenness**. The approach is clearly **analytical rather than descriptive** or narrative and, in particular, there is a **clear and evident** (but not necessarily totally full) **evaluation** of the historical debate bearing upon the topic which is **carefully integrated** into the overall approach. The answer is fully relevant. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material - the degree of that support will help to distinguish between answers higher and lower in the Band. The impression is that a **good solid answer** has been provided. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (31–35)** The response is **focused clearly** on the question but there is **some unevenness in content**. The approach is **mostly analytical and relevant**. The answer is generally structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. However, the answer will **not be equally thorough throughout**, for example evaluating the relevant debate less well. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

## III (27–30)

The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt** to provide an appropriate argument and factual knowledge. The approach contains **analysis or explanation but it may be inadequately supported**. There is a reasonable grasp of the elements of the debate which bears upon the topic, and this is to a degree integrated into the overall approach. The answer is mostly relevant. The answer may **lack balance and depth** in factual knowledge. Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

IV (22–26) The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly**. The approach may depend more on **some heavily descriptive or narrative sections** than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. There **is some knowledge of the historical debate** which bears upon the topic, but this may be **'bolted-on'** to the other material. Alternatively, the answer may consist largely of **description of schools of thought** that is not well directed at the specific question and is not well supported factually. Factual material may be used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly** the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.

V (18–21) The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer** but there is little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of a question. The approach **lacks analysis and explanation** and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, **is not linked effectively to the answer**. There may be **some hints of the historical debate** which bear upon the topic, but it will probably be poorly understood. Alternatively, there may be **extensive description of schools of thought** that is only slightly directed at the specific question. The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.

VI (10–17) The response is not **properly focused on the requirements** of the question. There may be many **unsupported assertions**. The argument may be of very **limited relevance** and there may be **confusion about the implications** of the question. There will be **no sense of the historical debate** on the topic. The answer may be largely **fragmentary and incoherent**, perhaps only in brief note form. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

VII (0–9) The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding of the general topic and of the historical debate on it. There is **no attempt to answer** the question. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Charlemagne**

- 1 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that the cultural revival under Charlemagne did not constitute a true Renaissance. [45]**

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.

Candidates may define the term Renaissance in order to have a basis for their judgement. Passage **A**, without using the term, does suggest that something close to a renaissance was taking place and is the most enthusiastic of the Passages. Passage **C** refers to a kind of Renaissance and to dazzling achievements. Even Passage **B** acknowledges that the court scholars had real significance as preservers of a cultural heritage. Passage **D** suggests that education, vital for the understanding of new ideas, was much improved. But Passage **B** is not convinced that the activity was for the sake of learning but for more practical reasons, which detracts from the claim to be a Renaissance and Passage **D** upholds this view, although the two Passages refer to different purposes. Passage **C** considers that the revival was based on some earlier developments which were of vital importance.

Candidates can use examples of the cultural achievements to evaluate their answers.

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**.

- 2 Assess the extent to which Charlemagne's wars of conquest exhausted or benefited his Empire. [45]**

Debate: How badly was the Empire affected by the long years of warfare.

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 whether the wars led to a decline in government and law and order or whether the wars were beneficial to the Empire. Evidence for the first view comes from the internal discontent and the grave difficulties in raising armies in the latter part of the reign. Local officials of the government were plundering the countryside. The other view is that the wars led to the acquisition of wealth and kept the upper classes satisfied with plunder and administrative positions and this made possible the cultural achievements of the reign.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**3 Assess the view that Charlemagne was surprised to receive the Imperial Coronation at Christmas 800. [45]**

Debate: Was the Coronation really a surprise or was Charlemagne expecting it?

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.

Candidates could argue that Einhard's famous description suggests that the imperial coronation on Christmas Day 800 came as a total, and perhaps unwelcome, surprise to Charlemagne and may comment on the strengths and weaknesses of this source. They could refer to the benefits which the creation of a Western emperor offered to the Papacy, which might then have conceived the idea without the knowledge of Charlemagne. Alternatively, evidence such as the Annals of Lorsch, has led to the view that Charlemagne and his court had been preparing for the coronation and his protection of the Papacy earlier made it a likely outcome.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**



**King John**

- 4 Using these four Passages and your own knowledge, assess the view that King John failed to regain his continental lands in the period 1204-1214 due to the lack of support from the English barons. [45]**

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 is centred on the varying importance of the different reasons put forward for the failure of John. Passage **A** makes clear the extent of the undertaking and the power of Philip. Passage **B** supports this with the suggestion that some believed Philip might invade England. Passage **A** also indicates that John had support from the barons, but not from his advisors, while Passage **B** implies that some barons were in a conspiracy against John and so were not supportive. Parts of Passage **C** support this view as John promised to avoid rancour with some barons if they would send him aid. Passage **C** further argues that John was well prepared and had built up his finances, a policy which could have lost him support. Passage **D**, on the other hand, is of the opinion that John's finances were under pressure due to increasing costs. **C** mentions the Poitevin campaign and John's appeals for help. The reasons why this failed could be linked to the question. There is debate about the extent to which John's resources matched those of Philip and this could be cited in evaluation.

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**.

- 5 Assess the view that Innocent III was to blame for the protracted quarrel with King John. [45]**

Debate: how far it was the obstinacy of Innocent or the determination of John which kept the quarrel going.

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.

Innocent can be blamed for provoking John by disregarding his rights in the Canterbury election and appointing Langton, who had been living in France. Innocent had also seemed quite eager to allow bishops in France to swear loyalty to Philip after 1204, which annoyed John. His imposition of the Interdict and the Excommunication were further provocations which prolonged the quarrel. Innocent can be partly defended by the argument that he behaved similarly to other rulers and genuinely saw Langton as a compromise candidate. Faced with John's continued defiance he had no choice but to escalate the quarrel. He did offer several times to negotiate.

John's blame can be seen in his overruling of the first election and insistence on his candidate. He saw Langton as an enemy and was determined to uphold his political rights as his predecessors had done. He benefited from the Interdict financially and, despite the outcry from monastic sources, had the general support of the laity. Hence he had little motivation to end the struggle until the threat of invasion from Philip.

Candidates could argue that both were culpable in prolonging the quarrel in that both were determined and obstinate in defence of their respective positions.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

**6 To what extent were the barons satisfied with Magna Carta?****[45]**

Debate: Did Magna Carta meet the needs of the barons.

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.

As the barons were disunited their needs were different but none of them were likely to be entirely satisfied. The ultras, who had largely withdrawn from the discussions, were left resentful and unsatisfied in the north and in Essex. William Marshal and Stephen Langton who had brought the two sides together had some satisfaction in the negotiation of a peace. Many barons had hoped that the imposition of terms on John and provisions for ensuring that he kept them was useful. Other barons had held aloof from the discussions at Runnymede.

Candidates could go on to consider how far some of the terms of the Charter met baronial needs or to evaluate the reaction of John and how this impacted on the hopes of the barons. Once John defied the Charter with the backing of the Pope, the barons were bound to be disappointed and the outbreak of Civil War was a denial of the hope that a peaceful settlement had been negotiated in 1215.

**Alternative explanations are possible and examiners must be open to alternative approaches. If in doubt, consult your Team Leader.**

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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**