

History A

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1935**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **GCSE 1035**

Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Components

June 2005

1935/1035/MS/R/05

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 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education History A (1935)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) History A (1035)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE COMPONENTS

Component	Content	Page
1035/01	Paper 1(Short Course)	1
1935/11-15	Paper 1	37
1935/21	Paper 2 – Medicine Through Time	105
1935/22	Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment Through Time	113

REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS

Component	Content	Page
1935 11-15	Paper 1	124
1035/01	Paper 1 (Short Course)	134
1935/21	Paper 2 – Medicine Through Time	136
1935/22	Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment Through Time	140
1035/02, 1935/03	Coursework	147
*	Grade Thresholds	149

**Mark Scheme 1035/01
June 2005**

INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS**GENERAL POINTS**

- 1 This mark scheme has been designed to assess candidates' understanding of the key concepts in this course and their ability to use source material, as well as their contextual knowledge.
- 2 Candidates' contextual knowledge is important but it is usually only rewarded if it is used to support the demonstration of conceptual understanding or the interpretation and evaluation of source material.
- 3 This mark scheme is constructed to reward attainment in relation to the Assessment Objectives. Examiners should remember that in this paper these are: AO 1 - 60%; AO 2/3 - 40%.
- 4 The mark scheme identifies the levels of skill or understanding that candidates are expected to reach. If a candidate reaches a particular level, s/he must be rewarded from the mark band for that level. A response which corresponds with a level description but which is a weak example of that level must not be placed in a lower level.
- 5 When you first read a response your first task is to match it to the appropriate level in the mark scheme. Only when you have done this should you start to think about the mark to be awarded.

If you are undecided between two levels always place the answer in the higher of these levels.

- 6 There are different ways of reaching a high level. Good candidates will often go straight to a high level. Other candidates will gradually climb their way there by working their way through lower levels first. However, to be awarded a high level, candidates do not have to have reached all of the lower levels.
- 7 Exhaustive examples of factual support are not given. There will usually be a wide choice of factual support which a candidate may choose to deploy. Examiners should use their knowledge and discretion as to whether this is valid. Examiners who are in doubt should contact their Team Leader immediately.
- 8 Examples of responses given in the mark scheme are only examples. There will be many alternative ways of reaching each level. Do not try to match the words of a candidate's answer to those of the examples. Rather, match the level of understanding/skill in the answer with that indicated in the level description.

If you come across an answer that does not appear to match any of the level descriptions try and make a 'best match' with one of the level descriptions or identify a level description that indicates an equivalent level of skill/understanding. If you are not sure, contact your Team Leader.

- 9 It is important to remember that we are rewarding candidates' attempts at grappling with challenging concepts and skills. Do not be punitive if candidates show a lack of understanding. Reward candidates for what they understand, know and can do. Be positive. Concentrate on what they can do, not on what they cannot do. Never deduct marks for mistakes.

SPECIFIC POINTS

- 1 Always mark in red.
- 2 Half marks are never used.
- 3 Do not transfer marks from one part of a question to another. All questions, and sub-questions, are marked separately.
- 4 Where a band of marks is allocated to a level specific instructions are sometimes provided about using these marks. When there are no such instructions you should:
 - in a 2 mark band - award the higher mark unless the answer is so weak that you had doubts whether it should be in that level at all;
 - in a 3 mark band - award the middle mark unless the answer is particularly strong or weak.

NB See comments below about the assessment of written communication.

- 5 Please note on the script (in the right hand margin at the end of the answer) the level and the mark awarded for each part of the question. (e.g 3/4 indicated Level 3, 4 marks). It will help your Team Leader if you indicate which part of the answer led to that level and mark being awarded. At the end of a complete question write down the total mark for that question and ring it. On the front of each script write the marks the candidate has scored for the two questions, and then the grand total (e.g. 10 =10 =20).
- 6 At first, your marking will proceed slowly because it takes time to learn the mark scheme. One way to hasten this process is to first mark question by question, or even sub-question by sub question. Marking about twenty Q1(a)s together is an excellent way of getting to learn the mark scheme for that question.
- 7 Remember that we are trying to achieve two things in the marking of the scripts:
 - (i) to place all the candidates in the correct rank order. This means that it is essential you mark to the agreed standard. Once you have mastered the mark scheme;
 - (ii) to use the full range of marks. When they are merited do not worry about awarding top marks in levels, in sub-questions or even complete questions. You should also, where appropriate, not hesitate to award bottom marks or even no marks at all.
Avoidance of awarding high marks in particular will lead to a bunching of the marks or to an unnatural depression of marks. This will lead to your marks having to be adjusted. It might even lead to your scripts having to be remarked.
- 8 Remember - YOUR TEAM LEADER IS AT THE OTHER END OF THE PHONE (OR INTERNET). IF THERE IS A QUESTION, OR AN ANSWER, YOU ARE NOT SURE ABOUT, CONTACT THEM.

ASSESSMENT OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

Written communication covers: clarity of expression, structure of arguments, presentation of ideas, grammar, vocabulary, punctuation and spelling.

The quality of candidates' written communication will be assessed in part (c) of the structured essay question.

In the marking of this question, the quality of the candidate's written communication will be one factor (other factors include the relevance and amount of supporting detail) that influences whether an answer is placed at the bottom, the middle, or the top, of a level.

The following points should be remembered:

- answers are placed in the appropriate level using the normal criteria, ie no reference is made at this stage to the quality of the written communication
- the quality of written communication must never be used to move an answer from the mark band of one level to another
- candidates already placed at the top of a level cannot receive any credit for the quality of their written communication; candidates already placed at the bottom of the level cannot receive any penalty for the quality of their written communication
- assessing the quality of written communication should be approached in a positive manner. It should be remembered that candidates whose written communication skills are poor have probably already been penalised in the sense that they will have been unable to show in writing their true understanding.

MEDICINE THROUGH TIME

1(a) Study Source A. What can you learn from this source about Greek medicine? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

BBL	Answers that make no reference to the source	(0)
Level 1	Surface comprehension These answers will simply repeat information in the source. No inferences will be made. <i>E.g. 'I can learn from this source that they went into a temple where they gave offerings to the gods. Then gods and snakes were involved and the patient was cured.'</i>	(1)
Level 2	Knowledge used to explain surface information in the source (2-3) These answers use knowledge of e.g. Asclepius or temple medicine to explain parts of Source A but no inferences are made about Greek medicine or beliefs about illness. <i>E.g. 'This source tells me that the Greeks went to the temple of Asclepius when they were ill. Here Asclepius would appear and would cure the people who were ill.'</i>	(2-3)
or		
Level 2	Inference made about Greek medicine/Greek beliefs about illness <i>E.g. 'This source tells me that Greek medicine was supernatural.'</i>	(2-3)
Level 3	Inference about Greek medicine/Greek beliefs supported from the source or from contextual knowledge. <i>E.g. 'This source tells me that the Greeks believed that illness was caused by the gods. This was why they went to the god Asclepius to be cured. If illness was caused supernaturally then only the gods could cure it.'</i>	(4)
Level 4	Inference about Greek medicine/Greek beliefs supported from the source and from contextual knowledge	(5)

- 1(b) Study Sources A and B. How far do these sources prove that medicine had made no progress between 400BC and AD1060? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.**

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1 Answers based on surface information of the sources (1-2)**
 These answers will compare the surface details in the sources and then claim there was/was not improvement.
E.g. 'These sources show there was improvement because in Source A gods were being used to cure people but in Source B the king is curing people.'
- or**
- Level 1 Answers that ignore the sources and make general claims that improvement did/did not take place (1-2)**
E.g. 'There was lots of improvement between these dates because people gradually knew much more about the causes of disease. They stopped just using gods to cure people.'
- Level 2 Answers that identify that fact that they are both supernatural methods/based on supernatural beliefs – no explanation (3)**
- Level 3 Answers that ignore the sources or gets the sources wrong and uses specific contextual knowledge to argue for improvement/no improvement (3-5)**
E.g. 'These sources do prove this. There was not much improvement in medicine in this period because of the fall of the Roman Empire. This meant that the knowledge of Hippocrates and Galen was lost for a long time and advances were not made. All their books were destroyed and so people went back to primitive methods.'
- Level 4 Identifies both sources as supernatural and uses knowledge to explain improvement or other examples of no improvement (4-6)**
- or**
- Level 4 Answers that use the sources and knowledge to explain that both are based on supernatural methods/beliefs – so no improvement (Source B must be explained). If writes about gods for Source B - max 4 marks (4-6)**
E.g. 'These sources do prove that there was not much improvement in medicine. Source A is based on supernatural beliefs about medicine but Source B is the same. King Edward is touching people to make them better because people then believed that kings were chosen by God and that they had supernatural powers. They thought that one of these powers was to cure people of scrofula. This was why it was called the King's Evil.'
- Level 5 Both types of Level 4 (7)**

- 1(c) Study Sources C and D. Are you surprised that people behaved in these ways during the plague of the fourteenth century? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1 Expresses surprise because they are peculiar (1)**
E.g. *'Yes I am surprised by what they are doing. To go round whipping yourself is an odd thing to do and it certainly is not going to help get rid of the plague.'*
- or**
- Level 1 Answers based on everyday empathy and expressing no surprise (1-2)**
These answers will not display any understanding of Sources C and D but will be based on the severity of the Black Death or the fact that nobody understood it.
E.g. *'I am not surprised by their behaviour. The Black Death was so terrible and killed so many people that they would have been prepared to try anything – even whipping themselves.'*
- Level 2 Identifies valid reason(s) why people were behaving in these ways (2-3)**
- Level 3 Answers based on an explanation of one of the sources (4-5)**
E.g. *'I am not surprised by what they are doing in Source C. The doctor is wearing a beak that is stuffed with strong smelling flowers and herbs. They did this because they thought the plague was spread by bad air. The smell from the herbs kept the bad air away from the doctor and made him safe from catching it.'*
- Level 4 Answers based on an explanation of both sources (6)**

- 1(d) Study Source E. Why was this cartoon published in the 1860s? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers based on the surface information of the source** **(1)**
E.g. *'It was published to show people what water pumps were like.'*
- Level 2** **Answers that assert but do not explain that it was to show people how poor drinking water/public health was – or to try and get things improved** **(2-3)**
E.g. *'This cartoon was published to show everyone how unhealthy the drinking water was.'* *'This cartoon was published to try and persuade people that the quality of the drinking water should be improved.'*
- Level 3** **As for Level 2 but explained through use of details in the cartoon or contextual knowledge** **(3-4)**
E.g. *'This cartoon was published to warn people about the dirty drinking water. You can tell this because it says under the cartoon 'Death's Dispensary', which means the dirty water is handing out death to people.'*
- Level 4** **As for Level 2 but explained through the use of details in the cartoon and contextual knowledge** **(5)**
- Level 5** **As for Level 2 but contextual knowledge used to explain why the 1860s** **(6)**
E.g. *'This cartoon was published in the 1860s because it is warning people about the dangers of dirty water. It is saying that diseases like cholera were spread by infected water. A few years before John Snow had proved that cholera was spread by dirty water so this is why it was published in the 1860s.'*

- 1(e) Study Source F. Can this source be trusted as evidence about Pasteur's germ theory? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 3

Level 1 **Answers based on misunderstanding of Source F** **(1-2)**
E.g. *'Yes this source is all about Pasteur's germ theory and so it must have been important.'*

or

Level 1 **Answers that ignore the source and write about germ theory or reject source through knee jerk evaluation** **(1-2)**

Level 2 **Answers based on an uncritical acceptance of Source F** **(2-3)**
E.g. *'Yes this source is useful It shows that people did not accept Pasteur's germ theory. It is making fun of it. This shows that Pasteur's theory was not important because people made fun of it.'*

Level 3 **Answers based on the tone of Source F** **(4-5)**
E.g. *'No this source cannot be trusted as it is clearly biased against Pasteur. You can tell this by the way it is written. When it says 'The worship of microbes is the fashion' it is being sarcastic about Pasteur and this shows it is not reliable.'*

Level 4 **Contextual knowledge used to evaluate Source F (challenges claims made in source)** **(6-7)**
E.g. *'No this source cannot be trusted. It was written by someone who did not accept Pasteur's germ theory and so is biased. Many people still believed in the spontaneous generation theory and would not accept the germ theory. However they were wrong. Pasteur's theory was proved to be right and medicine only progressed because of it e.g. the development of drugs to kill germs that cause disease.'*

- 1(f) Study all the sources. 'Ideas about disease have always been based on religious beliefs.' How far do the sources support this interpretation? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use.**

Target: AO 1, 2 and 3

Level 1 Answers that fail to use the sources (1-3)

Level 2 Answers that use the sources to provide a one-sided answer (4-6)

Level 3 Answers that use the sources to explain both sides (6-8)

In Levels 2 and 3 award 1-2 extra marks for any evaluation of sources.
Maximum mark to be awarded is 9.

2(a) Briefly describe the medical advances of the Ancient Greeks.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid advance identified, 2-3 marks for any advances that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Advances might include: natural explanations, Hippocratic Oath, the Four Humours, clinical observation, natural treatments, surgery, knowledge of the body.

N.B. Don't allow Galen

E.g. 'One advance the Greeks made was the Theory of the Four Humours. This was a natural belief and it said that people became ill when the humours in the body were out of balance. This was an improvement on blaming illness on the gods. This led to natural treatments like blood-letting which was meant to get the humours back into balance.' = 5 marks (3 for the section on the Four Humours and 2 for blood-letting).

2(b) Explain why it was possible for advances to be made in medicine during the Medical Renaissance.

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'It was possible for advances to be made because at that time they were beginning to understand a lot more about the world and this let them make advances in medicine.'</i> | (1-2) |
| | or | |
| Level 1 | Describes the advances | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: observed nature/the body carefully – work of artists like da Vinci, new interest in Greek ideas and writings, the printing press, mechanical pumps, human dissection, the work of great men like Vesalius, the work of earlier men like Columbo and Fabricius. | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'It was possible to make advances in medicine during the Renaissance because people began to study the human body properly. Before artists had not tried to draw bodies realistically because all the drawings were religious. During the Renaissance people like Leonardo da Vinci studied and dissected bodies before they drew them. The realistic drawings helped doctors have a better idea of what the body was really like. This led to an improvement in medical knowledge.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

- 2(c) Were the medical advances made by the Greeks more important than those made during the Medical Renaissance? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Greeks were much more important because they started everything off. It wasn't for them the advances in the Renaissance could not have been made.'</i> | |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific advances made by the Greeks or by the Medical Renaissance. | (2-3) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. (Maximum of 2 marks for Greeks)
Advances might include: Greeks – natural explanations of illness, the Four Humours, clinical observation; Medical Renaissance – knowledge of the structure of the body, proving Galen wrong, circulation of blood, ligatures, artificial limbs. | |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific advances made by the Greeks and by the Medical Renaissance | (4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. | |
| Level 4 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of either the advances of the Greeks or of the Medical Renaissance | (5-6) |
| | Award 6 marks for explanation of long-term impact.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Greeks were much more important because they made the first steps that made everything else possible. They started to investigate the world around them and began the study of the human body and of illness. This led them to show that illness had natural causes. Before the Greeks people thought that disease had supernatural causes. No progress would be made in medicine until people realised that there were natural causes that you could do something about. The Theory of the Four Humours was still believed in the Middle Ages and much later and so it was the basis for all the work in medicine for thousands of years. Without it people would have believed in supernatural causes for much longer.'</i> | |
| Level 5 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of the advances of both the Greeks and the Medical Renaissance. | (6-7) |
| | Award 7 marks for explanation of long-term impact of one period. | |

Level 6**Compares the importance of the advances of the Greeks and the Medical Renaissance (7-8)**

E.g. 'The Greeks were much more important than the Medical Renaissance because their advances had a much greater effect on the development of medicine. They discovered that illness has natural causes and they developed lots of natural treatments. Their ideas about the Four Humours and treatments like blood-letting and their clinical observation influenced medicine for thousands of years, These ideas were still the basis of medicine in the Middle Ages and even well past the Renaissance. The advances in the Renaissance although they gave people more knowledge about the body like the circulation of the blood, did not lead to better medical treatment. You can see this by the fact that the treatments, based on Greek ideas like blood-letting, stayed the same after the Renaissance. For this reason I think the Greek advances were more important.'

3(a) Briefly describe the advances the Romans made in public health.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid advance identified, 2-3 marks for any advances that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Advances might include: water supply, lavatories, sewage systems, siting of towns, public baths.

E.g. *'The Romans built aqueducts to bring clean water into their towns. This was because they knew how important fresh clean water was to staying healthy.'* = 3 marks.

3(b) Explain why was it possible to make advances in public health in nineteenth-century Britain.

Target: AO 1

Level 1	General assertions Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge. E.g. <i>'It was possible for advances to be made because at the time they knew a lot more about disease and this meant they had a good reason to do more about public health. More people supported it.'</i>	(1-2)
	or	
Level 1	Describes the advances or describes the lack of public health in the nineteenth century.	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies specific reasons Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: the work of Edwin Chadwick – dirt led to disease, the work of John Snow showing dirty water spread cholera, Pasteur's germ theory, repeated visitations of cholera, the Great Stink of 1858, working classes get the vote in 1867.	(2-4)
Level 3	Explains one specific reason E.g. <i>'It was possible to make advances in public health because of Pasteur's germ theory. He proved that germs cause disease. This proved to the people that dirty living conditions, dirty food and water, made people ill. This strengthened the argument of those who wanted to spend money on improving the public health facilities in Britain's towns.'</i>	(3-5)
Level 4	Explains more than one specific reason Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified. Award 7 marks for two reasons explained.	(6-7)

- 3(c) Were the advances in public health made by the Romans more important than those made in nineteenth-century Britain? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Romans were much more important because they were the first people to build public health systems. This makes them more important because other people could copy them.'</i> | |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific advances of the Romans or the nineteenth century | (2-3) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. (Maximum two marks for Romans)
Advances might include: Romans – clean water supply, sewers, public baths; nineteenth century – building of sewers, drains and public toilets, provision of clean water, slum clearance, flushing lavatories, rubbish was collected, regulations controlled standard of house building. | |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific advances of the Romans and the nineteenth century | (4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. | |
| Level 4 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of either the advances of the Romans or of the nineteenth century | (5-6) |
| | Award 6 marks for explanation of long-term impact.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Romans in public health were not all that important. They did provide healthy towns for the Romans to live in with clean water and sewers but when the Roman Empire was destroyed it was all lost. The conditions in medieval towns were dreadful and this shows that the public health systems of the Romans had no long-term importance because it was all destroyed and hundreds of years later people had to start all over again. The people of the nineteenth century did not learn from the Romans they had to find out the importance of good public health for themselves.'</i> | |
| Level 5 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of the advances of both the Romans and the nineteenth century. | (6-7) |
| | Award 7 marks for explanation of long-term impact of one period. | |

Level 6

Compares the importance of the advances of the Romans and the nineteenth century. (7-8)

E.g. 'The advances made by the nineteenth century were much more important because they were based on proper scientific understanding. When the Romans built their public health system they did it from common sense – they knew it was healthy to keep clean. But they did not have any scientific understanding of germs. This was why when the Roman systems were destroyed nobody in the Middle Ages bothered to replace them – because they did not understand why they were so important. In the nineteenth century public health systems were provided because of Pasteur's germ theory proving that dirty conditions led to disease. This is why the public health reforms of the nineteenth century have lasted and have spread to other parts of the world like Africa.'

4(a) Briefly describe the problems faced by surgeons at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid problem identified, 2-3 marks for any problems that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Problems might include: infection, bleeding, pain, lack of knowledge of the body, lack of knowledge of germs, failure of attempts at blood transfusions.

E.g. 'Surgeons had the problem of patients bleeding when they cut them open. The patient could die through this loss of blood because they had know way of replacing it. Attempts at blood transfusions had failed because of their lack of knowledge of the different blood groups.' = 3 marks.

4(b) Explain why there was opposition to advances in surgery in the nineteenth century.

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'There was opposition because people did not like the advances. Sometimes the new ideas led to more people dying. People were always suspicious of new ideas.'</i> | (1-2) |
| | or | |
| Level 1 | Describes the advances | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: opposition to anaesthetics - because of religious reasons, doctors sometimes got the dosage wrong and patients died, they had side effects, led to increase in the death rate; opposition to antiseptics – rejection of the germ theory, nurses did not like working with carbolic acid, made operating slower which could be dangerous. | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'There was opposition to Simpson's use of chloroform as an anaesthetic for religious reasons. Some people said that the Bible said that childbirth was meant to be painful. They said that chloroform should not be used for childbirth for this reason. If God had wanted it to be painless he would had made it so. Surgeons were going against God's will.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

- 4(c) Was Lister more important than Simpson in the development of surgery?
Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'Lister was more important because his work saved more lives and led to great improvements in surgery that can be seen today. Without him modern surgery would not be possible.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific contributions of Lister or Simpson.
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance.
Answers might include: Lister – antiseptic surgery, use of carbolic acid, fewer deaths, carbolic spray, made complicated internal operations possible; Simpson – replaces ether with chloroform, makes longer operations possible, surgeons do not have to rush so safer. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific contributions of Lister and Simpson.
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of either Lister or Simpson
Award 6 marks for explanation of long-term impact.
E.g. <i>'Lister was much more important. Until he came along many patients who were operated on died because of infections that set in during the operation. This made many operations unsuccessful. Lister introduced antiseptic medicine by using carbolic acid to kill the germs on and around the patient. The death rate of patients in operations fell quickly. This also led to longer and more complicated operations taking place because there was less danger that patients would die. Without antiseptics surgery would not have been able to develop like it did.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of both Lister and Simpson.
Award 7 marks for explanation of long-term impact of one period. | (6-7) |

Level 6 **Compares the importance of Lister and Simpson** **(7-8)**
Allow answers that explain how they were both needed before surgery could progress.

E.g. 'Lister was much more important than Simpson. Before Simpson there were other anaesthetics laughing gas and ether used by people like Humphrey Davy. So Simpson did not invent anaesthetics. Lister, on the other hand, invented antiseptic surgery. Before him nobody had any idea how to save patients from dying from infection from operations. Also Simpson's chloroform made it possible to attempt longer and more ambitious operations because the patient was no longer in any pain. But this led to the death rate going up because these patients still died from infection – until Lister came along and found a way of stopping these deaths. So Lister was much more important.'

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT THROUGH TIME

- 1(a) Study Source A. What impressions of medieval justice do these two cases give? Use the source to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 3

Level 1 **Repeats, paraphrases surface information – no inferences** **(1-2)**
E.g. *‘These two cases show that people were hanged as a punishment for stealing and that Margaret was punished for not looking after her children properly.’*

Level 2 **Valid but unsupported inferences about medieval justice** **(2-3)**
Inferences might include that it was harsh or cruel, that it treated women harshly, that it was humane.

Level 3 **Valid inferences about medieval justice supported from the source** **(4-5)**
E.g. *‘This source shows that medieval justice was fair. In Case 1 Catherine, despite being found guilty, was not hanged because she was pregnant. In Case 2 Margaret was mad and because of this she also has not been executed. This shows that they were looking at the circumstances carefully and were trying to be fair.’*

1(b) Study Source B. Why do you think this woman was being treated in this way? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | Surface comprehension or description
E.g. <i>'It was so she could learn to swim.'</i> <i>'It gave everybody something to watch.'</i> | (1) |
| or | | |
| Level 1 | Describes/explains trial by ordeal | (1) |
| Level 2 | Claims she is being punished
E.g. <i>'This is being done to punish her. This is how they punished women in those days for talking too much.'</i> | (2) |
| Level 3 | Claims it is to test if she is a witch – not explained
E.g. <i>'She was being made to do this to see if she was a witch. It was a kind of ordeal.'</i> | (3) |
| Level 4 | Uses contextual knowledge to explain how/why it was used to test if someone was a witch
These answers might use knowledge to explain how the test worked or might place the answer in the context of the seventeenth century to explain that there was a great fear of witches then.
E.g. <i>'She is being made to do this to test if she is a witch. Her hands were tied. If she sank she was innocent and if she did not sink she was proved to be a witch.'</i> | (4-5) |
| Level 5 | Uses contextual knowledge to explain how and why it was used to test of someone was a witch
These answers explain how the test worked and are placed in the context of the seventeenth century. | (6) |

1(c) Study Source C. Why were women punished so harshly during this period? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1 General answers (1)**
 These answers will not use details from the source and will not demonstrate specific contextual knowledge.
 E.g. *'Women were treated harshly because they were discriminated against. They were second class citizens.'*
- Level 2 Answers that simply repeat reasons from Source C (2-3)**
 E.g. *'They were punished harshly because people did not want to pay for their illegitimate children.'*
- Level 3 Answers that use contextual knowledge to explain reasons in Source C (4-5)**
 E.g. *'They were punished harshly because they were regarded as inferior to men. The husband was in charge of the family and the wife had to obey him at all times. So if a woman murdered her husband it was regarded as the worst kind of murder because she had gone against the natural order of things by going against her husband, her lord and master.'*
- or**
- Answers that use contextual knowledge to explain other reasons (4-5)**
 E.g. *'They were punished harshly because they were expected to be gentle and respectable like the Virgin Mary. If they had committed a crime they were going against this idea of what women should be like and so had to be punished harshly.'*
- Level 4 Combines both types of Level 3 (6-7)**

- 1(d) Study Source D. Would most people at the time have approved of how these women prisoners were being treated? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers based on everyday empathy** **(1)**
 These will not demonstrate specific contextual knowledge and will claim either that people would think they were not being punished harshly enough because they were criminals or they would feel sorry for them because they were women/mothers.
- Level 2** **Describes/explains what is happening in Source B** **(1-2)**
- Level 3** **Identifies a contextual reason(s) for a response – not explained** **(2-3)**
 Reasons might include: approval that they are doing useful work, approval that they are silent, approval because it is orderly; disapproval because they are together and not in isolation, disapproval because are not doing pointless work, approval or disapproval because they are women who were meant to be gentle, good and virtuous.
- Level 4** **Explains why some people would have approved/not approved** **(4-5)**
E. g. 'I think they would have approved because they are behaving themselves and everything is organised. They are also working hard and are obviously under control. This is a big improvement with what Elizabeth Fry found in women's prisons earlier in the nineteenth century. She found a screaming mass of women who were fighting and often drunk. They were freezing cold and their children were with them in these terrible conditions. So people would have approved that conditions had improved.'
 NB Other answers might explain the arguments for or against isolation, and silence, or the attitudes at the time towards women and how they should behave.
- Level 5** **Explains why some people would have approved and why others would not have approved** **(5-6)**

- 1(e) Study Source E. Are you surprised by this poster? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers based on everyday empathy** **(1)**
 These answers will not demonstrate specific contextual knowledge.
 E.g. *'I am surprised that this women is being treated in this terrible way. The people around her are being very nasty. They are forcing something down her nose.'*
- or**
- Level 1** **Describes/explains what is happening in the picture** **(1)**
- Level 2** **Identifies a contextual reason(s) for not being surprised by what is happening to the woman – not explained** **(2-3)**
 Reasons might include: she is a suffragette, she was on hunger strike, the suffragettes used violence.
- or**
- Level 2** **Identifies the fact that it is suffragette propaganda – so not surprised** **(2-3)**
- Level 3** **Uses contextual knowledge to explains one reason for not being surprised** **(4-5)**
 E.g. *'No I am not surprised by what is happening because the woman is a suffragette and she would have been on hunger strike. The authorities could not let her die because this would make them unpopular and so they are having her force fed.'*
- Level 4** **Uses contextual knowledge to explain that this is suffragette propoganda and why they would be publishing posters like this at that time** **(6-7)**
 E.g. *'No I am not surprised. This is a suffragette poster issued when there were campaigning to win the vote for women. They used violence like and were put in prison. To try to get released they would go on hunger strike. The authorities then had them force fed. This poster is making it look as bad as possible to win peoples' sympathy and turn them against the government. This is what you expect the suffragettes to and so I am not surprised.'*

- 1(f) Study all the sources. 'Women have always been punished more harshly than men.' How far do the sources support this interpretation? Use the sources and your own knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use.**

Target: AO 1, 2 and 3

Level 1	Answers that fail to use the sources	(1-3)
Level 2	Answers that use the sources to provide a one-sided answer	(4-6)
Level 3	Answers that use the sources to explain both sides	(6-8)

In Levels 2 and 3 award 1-2 extra marks for any evaluation of sources.
Maximum mark to be awarded is 9.

2(a) Briefly describe the main features of the Anglo-Saxon system of law and order.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid feature identified, 2-3 marks for any features that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Features might include: the hue and cry, tithings, blood-feud, wergild (or compensation to victims), execution, physical punishments like mutilation, trial by ordeal, juries of local people, compurgators, manorial courts, royal courts.

E.g. *'The main features were putting all men into tithings were they had to be responsible for the actions of anyone on their tithing and the hue and cry.'* = 3 marks (2 for the tithings, 1 for the hue and cry).

2(b) Explain why the Normans changed some aspects of the Anglo-Saxon system of law and order but left other aspects unchanged.

Target: AO 1

- Level 1 General assertions (1-2)**
 Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
 E.g. *'They changed some aspects because they needed to be improved but they left other aspects because there was no need to change more than was necessary.'*
 or
- Level 1 Describes the changes and/or the things left unchanged (1-2)**
- Level 2 Identifies specific reasons for making or not making changes (2-3)**
 Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
 Reasons include: changes – to establish control, to deal with over-mighty subjects, to extend royal power, were war-like so introduced trial by battle, William's love of hunting, to make money; not changing – avoid upsetting the Saxons, needed cooperation of Saxons, William wanted to be seen as true heir, William was religious so trial by ordeal kept.
- Level 3 Identifies specific reasons for making changes and for leaving some things alone. (4)**
 Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
- Level 4 Explains one or more specific reasons for making or for not making changes (3-5)**
 E.g. *'When William defeated Harold he still had a lot of work to do. He had to consolidate his power. He had argued with Harold over who was the rightful heir of Edward. One way William tried to convince the English people that he should be king was to keep many of Edward's old laws and to govern like Edward. If he had changed too much he would have upset people. He also needed the help of local people in courts, on juries and in tithings to catch and try criminals – he could not do it all himself. So he left all these things unchanged to make sure the system of local law and order continued to work.'*
- Level 5 Explains one reason why changes were made and one reason why they were not made (6-7)**
 Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
 Award 7 marks for both reasons explained.

2(c) How far did the system of law and order change between 1066 and the end of the Middle Ages? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The system of law and order changed a lot over this period. There were lots of improvements needed to bring things up-to-date.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific changes or aspects that were not changed (2-3)
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of change/no change. Answers might include: changes – extension of royal justice, the King's Peace, the Grand Jury, travelling justices, royal courts, wergild ended, Forest Laws, Church courts, coroners courts, trials by ordeal ended, juries used more to decide guilt, borough courts, county gaols, J Ps, sanctuary; aspects that stayed the same – manorial courts, sheriffs, tithings, hue and cry. | |
| Level 3 | Identifies specific changes and aspects that were not changed (4)
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of change/no change. | |
| Level 4 | Explains change or no change
E.g. <i>'Things did change a lot over this period. One of the main changes was the fact that king's wanted to increase their own power. To do this they introduced the idea of the King's Peace and got rid of wergilds. Kings wanted any crime to be seen as an insult to them and so punishments changed from being compensation to the victim and became punishments like execution carried out by the king's officials.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains change and no change | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 5 but in addition makes informed assessment about 'how far' | (7-8) |

3(a) Briefly describe the system of transportation.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid feature identified, 2-3 marks for any features that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Features might include: used to send criminals to America and Australia, mostly men, assigned to settlers, had to work for them, could win a ticket of leave, some did very well.

E.g. *'The system of transportation involved sending criminals to Australia as a punishment. There they had to work for a settler until their sentence was finished. Most of them stayed in Australia afterwards.'* = 4 marks (4 points made).

3(b) Explain why the Bloody Code was introduced in the eighteenth century.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was introduced to make law and order better. Things were getting out of hand and had to be improved.'</i> | |
| | or | |
| Level 1 | Describes the Bloody Code | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons | (2-4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: the landed classes thought the crime rate was increasing, to defend property, to scare people into obeying the law, the landed classes were worried about riots and rebellion. | |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason | (3-5) |
| | E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was introduced to defend the property of the landed classes. They believed that the job of the government was to protect property. This was why harsh punishments were introduced for things like poaching because this was stealing from the landed classes.'</i> | |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason | (6-7) |
| | Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | |

3(c) How far was transportation more successful than the Bloody Code?
Explain your answer.

Target: 1 and 2

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was not really successful because it did not achieve what it was meant to achieve. Transportation was far too soft.'</i> | |
| Level 2 | Identifies successes or failures of transportation or of the Bloody Code | (2-3) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Answers might include: transportation – it was used a lot, courts were prepared to use it, it did not bring about a fall in the crime rate, people transported did reform, it settled Australia for Britain, it was expensive, it was a soft option – many convicts ended up doing very well; The Bloody Code - property is defended, does make interests of properties classes important, landowners were happy with it, death penalty used less, harsh punishments led to people being found not guilty, no police force so little fear of being caught, crime actually increases later in eighteenth century. | |
| Level 3 | Identifies successes or failures of transportation and of the Bloody Code | (4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. | |
| Level 4 | Explains successes or failures of transportation or of the Bloody Code | (5-6) |
| | E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was a failure because it was meant to scare people into obeying the law by introducing harsh punishments like execution but in fact the number of people being executed actually went down. This was because many people including juries and judges thought that it was not fair to be executed for stealing something like a piece of cloth. As a result they would find people not guilty because the punishment was not fair. Often guilty people would be let off – this was not the aim of the Bloody Code so it was failing.'</i> | |
| Level 5 | Explains success or failures of transportation and of the Bloody Code | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 5 but in addition makes informed assessment about 'how far' | (7-8) |

4(a) Briefly describe the main events of the Rebecca Riots.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid feature identified, 2-3 marks for any features that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Maximum of 1 mark for causes of riots.

Features might include: took place in Wales, protests against high tolls on turnpike roads, roads had to be used by the farmers, farmers dressed as women destroyed tollgates, other grievances included tithes and new workhouses, barns and hayricks and a workhouses were destroyed, soldiers and London policemen were sent, some of the leaders were transported, a woman tollgate keeper was killed, the government set up an enquiry.

E.g. *'Some farmers in Wales dressed up as women and attacked and destroyed tollgates because the tolls were too high and were increasing.'* = 3 marks.

4(b) Explain why people took part in the Rebecca Riots.**Target: AO 1 and 2**

Level 1	General assertions Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge. E.g. <i>'People took part in the Rebecca Riots because they were poor and had lots of other problems. Nothing ever seemed to be done to help them so they went on riots.'</i>	(1-2)
	or	
Level 1	Describes the Riots	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies specific reasons Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: turnpike tolls, new tollgates, high rents for farmers, tithes (now paid in cash), poor harvests, farmers who had more than one farm, the poor law, English landowners buying up land.	(2-4)
Level 3	Explains one specific reason E.g. <i>'They took part in the Rebecca Riots because of the high tolls on the roads in west Wales. Most of the people who took part were farmers. They had to use the roads a lot for moving lime to put on their land. They had to pay the toll for every journey they made. Things were made worse when the new turnpike trust put up extra gates and made them pay new tolls. The farmers were poor and could not afford this.'</i>	(3-5)
Level 4	Explains more than one specific reason Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified. Award 7 marks for two reasons explained.	(6-7)

4(c) How successfully did the authorities deal with the Rebecca Riots? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The authorities did not deal with the Rebecca Riots because they went on and on and did not stop for a long time.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies successes or failures or the methods of the authorities
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Answers might include: failures – local magistrates were powerless, sending in soldiers made the situation worse, juries would not convict, took government a long time to make reforms – afraid of looking soft or of encouraging revolution; successes - soldiers captured some of the leaders, government set up an enquiry, reforms were introduced, leaders were transported, the troubles ended. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies successes and failures of the methods of the authorities
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains the successes or failures of the authorities
E.g. <i>'The authorities did not deal with the Rebecca Riots very well. This was because many of the local JPs were English and did not understand the problems faced by the farmers. They were not respected by the local people and so were not able to restore law and order. When the government sent in soldiers this just made the situation worse. It was after the soldiers were sent in that a tollgate keeper was killed and the presence of English soldiers just made the people support the rioters even more.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains the successes and failures of the authorities | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 5 but in addition makes informed assessment about 'how successfully' | (7-8) |

Mark Scheme 1935/11-15
June 2005

INSTRUCTIONS TO EXAMINERS**GENERAL POINTS**

- 1 This mark scheme has been designed to assess candidates' understanding of the key concepts in this course and their ability to use source material, as well and their contextual knowledge.
- 2 Candidates' contextual knowledge is important but it is usually only rewarded if it is used to support the demonstration of conceptual understanding or the interpretation and evaluation of source material.
- 3 This mark scheme is constructed to reward attainment in relation to the Assessment Objectives. Examiners should remember that in this paper these are: AO 1 - 89%; AO2/3 - 11%.
- 4 The mark scheme identifies the levels of skill or understanding that candidates are expected to reach. If a candidate reaches a particular level, s/he must be rewarded from the mark band for that level. A response which corresponds with a level description but which is a weak example of that level must not be placed in a lower level.
- 5 When you first read a response your first task is to match it to the appropriate level in the mark scheme. Only when you have done this should you start to think about the mark to be awarded.

If you are undecided between two levels always place the answer in the higher of these levels.

- 6 There are different ways of reaching a high level. Good candidates will often go straight to a high level. Other candidates will gradually climb their way there by working their way through lower levels first. However, to be awarded a high level candidates do not have to have reached all of the lower levels.
- 7 Exhaustive examples of factual support are not given. There will usually be a wide choice of factual support which a candidate may choose to deploy. Examiners should use their knowledge and discretion as to whether this is valid. Examiners who are in doubt should contact their Team Leader immediately.
- 8 Examples of responses given in the mark scheme are only examples. There will be many alternative ways of reaching each level. Do not try to match the words of a candidate's answer to those of the examples. Rather, match the level of understanding/skill in the answer with that indicated in the level description.

If you come across an answer that does not appear to match any of the level descriptions try and make a 'best match' with one of the level descriptions or identify a level description that indicates an equivalent level of skill/understanding. If you are not sure, contact your Team Leader.

- 9 It is important to remember that we are rewarding candidates' attempts at grappling with challenging concepts and skills. Do not be punitive if candidates show a lack of understanding. Reward candidates for what they understand, know and can do. Be positive. Concentrate on what they can do, not on what they cannot do. Never deduct marks for mistakes.

SPECIFIC POINTS

- 1 Always mark in red.
- 2 Half marks are never used.
- 3 Do not transfer marks from one part of a question to another. All questions, and sub-questions, are marked separately.
- 4 Where a band of marks is allocated to a level specific instructions are sometimes provided about using these marks. When there are no such instructions you should:
 - in a 2 mark band - award the higher mark unless the answer is so weak that you had doubts whether it should be in that level at all;
 - in a 3 mark band - award the middle mark unless the answer is particularly strong or weak.

NB See comments below about the assessment of written communication.

- 5 Please note on the script (in the right hand margin at the end of the answer) the level and the mark awarded for each part of the question. (e.g 3/4 indicated Level 3, 4 marks). It will help your Team Leader if you indicate which part of the answer led to that level and mark being awarded. At the end of a complete question write down the total mark for that question and ring it. On the front of each script write the marks the candidate has scored for the four questions, and then the grand total (e.g. 10=10=12=9 = 41).
- 6 At first, your marking will proceed slowly because it takes time to learn the mark scheme. One way to hasten this process is to first mark question by question, or even sub-question by sub question. Marking about twenty Q1(a)s together is an excellent way of getting to learn the mark scheme for that question. Eventually you will be able to mark the entire Section A in one go.
- 7 Remember that we are trying to achieve two things in the marking of the scripts:
 - (i) to place all the candidates in the correct rank order. This means that it is essential you mark to the agreed standard. Once you have mastered the mark scheme;

- (ii) to use the full range of marks. When they are merited do not worry about awarding top marks in levels, in sub-questions or even complete questions. You should also, where appropriate, not hesitate to award bottom marks or even no marks at all. Avoidance of awarding high marks in particular will lead to a bunching of the marks or to an unnatural depression of marks. This will lead to your marks having to be adjusted. It might even lead to your scripts having to be remarked.

- 8 Remember - YOUR TEAM LEADER IS AT THE OTHER END OF THE PHONE (OR INTERNET). IF THERE IS A QUESTION, OR AN ANSWER, YOU ARE NOT SURE ABOUT, CONTACT THEM.

ASSESSMENT OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

Written communication covers: clarity of expression, structure of arguments, presentation of ideas, grammar, vocabulary, punctuation and spelling.

The quality of candidates' written communication will be assessed in part (c) of the structured essay questions (ie once in the Development Study and once in the Depth Study).

In the marking of these questions the quality of the candidate's written communication will be one factor (other factors include the relevance and amount of supporting detail) that influences whether an answer is placed at the bottom, the middle, or the top, of a level.

The following points should be remembered:

- answers are placed in the appropriate level using the normal criteria, ie no reference is made at this stage to the quality of the written communication
- the quality of written communication must never be used to move an answer from the mark band of one level to another
- candidates already placed at the top of a level cannot receive any credit for the quality of their written communication; candidates already placed at the bottom of the level cannot receive any penalty for the quality of their written communication
- assessing the quality of written communication should be approached in a positive manner. It should be remembered that candidates whose written communication skills are poor have probably already been penalised in the sense that they will have been unable to show in writing their true understanding.

MEDICINE THROUGH TIME

1(a) Study Source A. What can you learn from this source about Greek medicine? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- BBL** **Answers that make no reference to the source** **(0)**
- Level 1** **Surface comprehension** **(1)**
 These answers will simply repeat information in the source. No inferences will be made.
E.g. 'I can learn from this source that they went into a temple where they gave offerings to the gods. Then gods and snakes were involved and the patient was cured.'
- Level 2** **Knowledge used to explain surface information in the source** **(2)**
 These answers use knowledge of e.g. Asclepius or temple medicine to explain parts of Source A but no inferences are made about Greek medicine or beliefs about illness.
E.g. 'This source tells me that the Greeks went to the temple of Asclepius when they were ill. Here Asclepius would appear and would cure the people who were ill.'
 or
- Level 2** **Inference made about Greek medicine/Greek beliefs about illness** **(2)**
E.g. 'This source tells me that Greek medicine was supernatural.'
- Level 3** **Inference about Greek medicine/Greek beliefs supported from the source or from contextual knowledge.** **(3)**
E.g. 'This source tells me that the Greeks believed that illness was caused by the gods. This was why they went to the god Asclepius to be cured. If illness was caused supernaturally then only the gods could cure it.'
- Level 4** **Inference about Greek medicine/Greek beliefs supported from the source and from contextual knowledge.** **(4)**

- 1(b) Study Sources A and B. How far do these sources prove that medicine had made no progress between 400BC and 1060AD? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers based on surface information of the sources** (1)
 These answers will compare the surface details in the sources and then claim there was/was not improvement.
E.g. 'These sources show there was improvement because in Source A gods were being used to cure people but in Source B the king is curing people.'
- or**
- Level 1** **Answers that ignore the sources and make general claims that improvement did/did not take place** (1)
E.g. 'There was lots of improvement between these dates because people gradually knew much more about the causes of disease. They stopped just using gods to cure people.'
- Level 2** **Answers that identify that fact that they are both supernatural methods/based on supernatural beliefs – no explanation** (2)
- Level 3** **Answers that ignore the sources or get the sources wrong and use specific contextual knowledge to argue for improvement/no improvement** (3-4)
E.g. 'These sources do prove this. There was not much improvement in medicine in this period because of the fall of the Roman Empire. This meant that the knowledge of Hippocrates and Galen was lost for a long time and advances were not made. All their books were destroyed and so people went back to primitive methods.'
- Level 4** **Identifies both sources as supernatural and uses knowledge to explain improvement or other examples of no improvement.** (4-5)
- or**
- Level 4** **Answers that use the sources and knowledge to explain that both are based on supernatural methods/beliefs – so no improvement (Source B must be explained) If writes about gods for Source B – max 4 marks.** (4-5)
E.g. 'These sources do prove that there was not much improvement in medicine. Source A is based on supernatural beliefs about medicine but Source B is the same. King Edward is touching people to make them better because people then believed that kings were chosen by God and that they had supernatural powers. They thought that one of these powers was to cure people of scrofula. This was why it was called the King's Evil.'
- Level 5** **Both types of level 4.** (6)

- 1(c) Study Sources C and D. Are you surprised that people behaved in these ways during the plague of the fourteenth century? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** Expresses surprise because they are peculiar (1)
 E.g. *'Yes I am surprised by what they are doing. To go round whipping yourself is an odd thing to do and it certainly is not going to help get rid of the plague.'*
- or
- Level 1** Answers based on everyday empathy and expressing no surprise (1)
 These answers will not display any understanding of Sources C and D but will be based on the severity of the Black Death or the fact that nobody understood it.
 E.g. *'I am not surprised by their behaviour. The Black Death was so terrible and killed so many people that they would have been prepared to try anything – even whipping themselves.'*
- Level 2** Identifies valid reason(s) why people were behaving in those ways. (2)
- Level 3** Answers based on an explanation of one of the sources (3-4)
 E.g. *'I am not surprised by what they are doing in Source C. The doctor is wearing a beak that is stuffed with strong smelling flowers and herbs. They did this because they thought the plague was spread by bad air. The smell from the herbs kept the bad air away from the doctor and made him safe from catching it.'*
- Level 4** Answers based on explanation of both sources (5)

2(a) Briefly describe the medical advances of the Ancient Greeks.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid advance identified, 2-3 marks for any advances that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Advances might include: natural explanations, Hippocratic Oath, the Four Humours, clinical observation, natural treatments, surgery, knowledge of the body.

N.B. Don't allow Galen

E.g. *'One advance the Greeks made was the Theory of the Four Humours. This was a natural belief and it said that people became ill when the humours in the body were out of balance. This was an improvement on blaming illness on the gods. This led to natural treatments like blood-letting which was meant to get the humours back into balance.'* = 5 marks (3 for the section on the Four Humours and 2 for blood-letting).

2(b) Explain why it was possible for advances to be made in medicine during the Medical Renaissance.

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'It was possible for advances to be made because at that time they were beginning to understand a lot more about the world and this let them make advances in medicine.'</i> | (1-2) |
| or | | |
| Level 1 | Describes the advances | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: observed nature/the body carefully – work of artists like da Vinci, new interest in Greek ideas and writings, the printing press, mechanical pumps, human dissection, the work of great men like Vesalius, the work of earlier men like Columbo and Fabricius. | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'It was possible to make advances in medicine during the Renaissance because people began to study the human body properly. Before artists had not tried to draw bodies realistically because all the drawings were religious. During the Renaissance people like Leonardo da Vinci studied and dissected bodies before they drew them. The realistic drawings helped doctors have a better idea of what the body was really like. This led to an improvement in medical knowledge.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

2(c) Were the medical advances made by the Greeks more important than those made during the Medical Renaissance? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Greeks were much more important because they started everything off. It wasn't for them the advances in the Renaissance could not have been made.'</i> | |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific advances made by the Greeks or by the Medical Renaissance. | (2-3) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. (Maximum of 2 marks for Greeks)
Advances might include: Greeks – natural explanations of illness, the Four Humours, clinical observation; Medical Renaissance – knowledge of the structure of the body, proving Galen wrong, circulation of blood, ligatures, artificial limbs. | |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific advances made by the Greeks and by the Medical Renaissance | (4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. | |
| Level 4 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of either the advances of the Greeks or of the Medical Renaissance | (5-6) |
| | Award 6 marks for explanation of long-term impact.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Greeks were much more important because they made the first steps that made everything else possible. They started to investigate the world around them and began the study of the human body and of illness. This led them to show that illness had natural causes. Before the Greeks people thought that disease had supernatural causes. No progress would be made in medicine until people realised that there were natural causes that you could do something about. The Theory of the Four Humours was still believed in the Middle Ages and much later and so it was the basis for all the work in medicine for thousands of years. Without it people would have believed in supernatural causes for much longer.'</i> | |

Level 5 Explains the importance/lack of importance of the advances of both the Greeks and the Medical Renaissance. (6-7)
Award 7 marks for explanation of long-term impact of one period.

Level 6 Compares the importance of the advances of the Greeks and the Medical Renaissance (7-8)
E.g. *'The Greeks were much more important than the Medical Renaissance because their advances had a much greater effect on the development of medicine. They discovered that illness has natural causes and they developed lots of natural treatments. Their ideas about the Four Humours and treatments like blood-letting and their clinical observation influenced medicine for thousands of years, These ideas were still the basis of medicine in the Middle Ages and even well past the Renaissance. The advances in the Renaissance although they gave people more knowledge about the body like the circulation of the blood, did not lead to better medical treatment. You can see this by the fact that the treatments, based on Greek ideas like blood-letting, stayed the same after the Renaissance. For this reason I think the Greek advances were more important.'*

3(a) Briefly describe the advances the Romans made in public health.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid advance identified, 2-3 marks for any advances that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Advances might include: water supply, lavatories, sewage systems, siting of towns, public baths.

E.g. *'The Romans built aqueducts to bring clean water into their towns. This was because they knew how important fresh clean water was to staying healthy.'* = 3 marks.

3(b) Explain why was it possible to make advances in public health in nineteenth-century Britain.

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'It was possible for advances to be made because at the time they knew a lot more about disease and this meant they had a good reason to do more about public health. More people supported it.'</i> | |
| | or | |
| Level 1 | Describes the advances or describes the lack of public health in the nineteenth century. | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons | (2-4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: the work of Edwin Chadwick – dirt led to disease, the work of John Snow showing dirty water spread cholera, Pasteur's germ theory, repeated visitations of cholera, the Great Stink of 1858, working classes get the vote in 1867. | |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason | (3-5) |
| | E.g. <i>'It was possible to make advances in public health because of Pasteur's germ theory. He proved that germs cause disease. This proved to the people that dirty living conditions, dirty food and water, made people ill. This strengthened the argument of those who wanted to spend money on improving the public health facilities in Britain's towns.'</i> | |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason | (6-7) |
| | Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | |

3(c) Were the advances in public health made by the Romans more important than those made in nineteenth-century Britain? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Romans were much more important because they were the first people to build public health systems. This makes them more important because other people could copy them.'</i> | |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific advances of the Romans or the nineteenth century | (2-3) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. (Maximum two marks for Romans)
Advances might include: Romans – clean water supply, sewers, public baths; nineteenth century – building of sewers, drains and public toilets, provision of clean water, slum clearance, flushing lavatories, rubbish was collected, regulations controlled standard of house building. | |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific advances of the Romans and the nineteenth century | (4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. | |
| Level 4 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of either the advances of the Romans or of the nineteenth century | (5-6) |
| | Award 6 marks for explanation of long-term impact.
E.g. <i>'The advances made by the Romans in public health were not all that important. They did provide healthy towns for the Romans to live in with clean water and sewers but when the Roman Empire was destroyed it was all lost. The conditions in medieval towns were dreadful and this shows that the public health systems of the Romans had no long-term importance because it was all destroyed and hundreds of years later people had to start all over again. The people of the nineteenth century did not learn from the Romans they had to find out the importance of good public health for themselves.'</i> | |

cont. on next page

- Level 5** Explains the importance/lack of importance of the advances of both the Romans and the nineteenth century. (6-7)
Award 7 marks for explanation of long-term impact of one period.
- Level 6** Compares the importance of the advances of the Romans and the nineteenth century. (7-8)
E.g. *'The advances made by the nineteenth century were much more important because they were based on proper scientific understanding. When the Romans built their public health system they did it from common sense – they knew it was healthy to keep clean. But they did not have any scientific understanding of germs. This was why when the Roman systems were destroyed nobody in the Middle Ages bothered to replace them – because they did not understand why they were so important. In the nineteenth century public health systems were provided because of Pasteur's germ theory proving that dirty conditions led to disease. This is why the public health reforms of the nineteenth century have lasted and have spreads to other parts of the world like Africa.'*

- 4(a) Briefly describe the problems faced by surgeons at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid problem identified, 2-3 marks for any problems that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Problems might include: infection, bleeding, pain, lack of knowledge of the body, lack of knowledge of germs, failure of attempts at blood transfusions.

E.g. 'Surgeons had the problem of patients bleeding when they cut them open. The patient could die through this loss of blood because they had know way of replacing it. Attempts at blood transfusions had failed because of their lack of knowledge of the different blood groups.' = 3 marks.

4(b) Explain why there was opposition to advances in surgery in the nineteenth century.

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'There was opposition because people did not like the advances. Sometimes the new ideas led to more people dying. People were always suspicious of new ideas.'</i> | (1-2) |
| | or | |
| Level 1 | Describes the advances | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: opposition to anaesthetics - because of religious reasons, doctors sometimes got the dosage wrong and patients died, they had side effects, led to increase in the death rate; opposition to antiseptics – rejection of the germ theory, nurses did not like working with carbolic acid, made operating slower which could be dangerous. | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'There was opposition to Simpson's use of chloroform as an anaesthetic for religious reasons. Some people said that the Bible said that childbirth was meant to be painful. They said that chloroform should not be used for childbirth for this reason. If God had wanted it to be painless he would had made it so. Surgeons were going against God's will.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

- 4(c) Was Lister more important than Simpson in the development of surgery?
Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'Lister was more important because his work saved more lives and led to great improvements in surgery that can be seen today. Without him modern surgery would not be possible.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific contributions of Lister or Simpson.
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance.
Answers might include: Lister – antiseptic surgery, use of carbolic acid, fewer deaths, carbolic spray, made complicated internal operations possible; Simpson – replaces ether with chloroform, makes longer operations possible, surgeons do not have to rush so safer. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific contributions of Lister and Simpson.
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of importance. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains the importance/lack of importance of either Lister or Simpson
Award 6 marks for explanation of long-term impact.
E.g. <i>'Lister was much more important. Until he came along many patients who were operated on died because of infections that set in during the operation. This made many operations unsuccessful. Lister introduced antiseptic medicine by using carbolic acid to kill the germs on and around the patient. The death rate of patients in operations fell quickly. This also led to longer and more complicated operations taking place because there was less danger that patients would die. Without antiseptics surgery would not have been able to develop like it did.'</i> | (5-6) |

cont. on next page

- Level 5** Explains the importance/lack of importance of both Lister and Simpson. (6-7)
Award 7 marks for explanation of long-term impact of one period.
- Level 6** Compares the importance of Lister and Simpson (7-8)
Allow answers that explain how they were both needed before surgery could progress.
E.g. *'Lister was much more important than Simpson. Before Simpson there were other anaesthetics laughing gas and ether used by people like Humphrey Davy. So Simpson did not invent anaesthetics. Lister, on the other hand, invented antiseptic surgery. Before him nobody had any idea how to save patients from dying from infection from operations. Also Simpson's chloroform made it possible to attempt longer and more ambitious operations because the patient was no longer in any pain. But this led to the death rate going up because these patients still died from infection – until Lister came along and found a way of stopping these deaths. So Lister was much more important.'*

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT THROUGH TIME

1(a) Study Source A. Why do you think this woman was being treated in this way? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|---|------------|
| Level 1 | Surface comprehension or description
E.g. <i>'It was so she could learn to swim.'</i> <i>'It gave everybody something to watch.'</i> | (1) |
| or | | |
| Level 1 | Describes/explains trial by ordeal | (1) |
| Level 2 | Claims she is being punished
E.g. <i>'This is being done to punish her. This is how they punished women in those days for talking too much.'</i> | (2) |
| Level 3 | Claims it is to test if she is a witch – not explained
E.g. <i>'She was being made to do this to see if she was a witch. It was a kind of ordeal.'</i> | (3) |
| Level 4 | Uses contextual knowledge to explain how/why it was used to test if someone was a witch
These answers might use knowledge to explain how the test worked or might place the answer in the context of the seventeenth century to explain that there was a great fear of witches then.
E.g. <i>'She is being made to do this to test if she is a witch. Her hands were tied. If she sank she was innocent and if she did not sink she was proved to be a witch.'</i> | (4) |
| Level 5 | Uses contextual knowledge to explain how and why it was used to test of someone was a witch
These answers explain how the test worked and are placed in the context of the seventeenth century. | (5) |

- 1(b) **Study Source B. Would most people at the time have approved of how these women prisoners were being treated? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.**

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1 Answers based on everyday empathy (1)**
 These will not demonstrate specific contextual knowledge and will claim either that people would think they were not being punished harshly enough because they were criminals or they would feel sorry for them because they were women/mothers.
- Level 2 Describes/explains what is happening in Source B (1-2)**
- Level 3 Identifies a contextual reason(s) for a response – not explained (2-3)**
 Reasons might include: approval that they are doing useful work, approval that they are silent, approval because it is orderly; disapproval because they are together and not in isolation, disapproval because are not doing pointless work, approval or disapproval because they are women who were meant to be gentle, good and virtuous.
- Level 4 Explains why some people would have approved/not approved (3-4)**
E. g. 'I think they would have approved because they are behaving themselves and everything is organised. They are also working hard and are obviously under control. This is a big improvement with what Elizabeth Fry found in women's prisons earlier in the nineteenth century. She found a screaming mass of women who were fighting and often drunk. They were freezing cold and their children were with them in these terrible conditions. So people would have approved that conditions had improved.'
 NB Other answers might explain the arguments for or against isolation, and silence, or the attitudes at the time towards women and how they should behave.
- Level 5 Explains why some people would have approved and why others would not have approved (5)**

1(c) Study Source C. Are you surprised by this poster? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers based on everyday empathy** **(1)**
 These answers will not demonstrate specific contextual knowledge.
 E.g. *'I am surprised that this women is being treated in this terrible way. The people around her are being very nasty. They are forcing something down her nose.'*
- or**
- Level 1** **Describes/explains what is happening in the picture** **(1)**
- Level 2** **Identifies a contextual reason for not being surprised by what is happening to the woman – not explained** **(2)**
 Reasons might include: she is a suffragette, she was on hunger strike, the suffragettes used violence.
- or**
- Level 2** **Identifies the fact that it is suffragette propaganda – so not surprised** **(2)**
- Level 3** **Uses contextual knowledge to explains one reason for not being surprised** **(3-4)**
 E.g. *'No I am not surprised by what is happening because the woman is a suffragette and she would have been on hunger strike. The authorities could not let her die because this would make them unpopular and so they are having her force fed.'*
- Level 4** **Uses contextual knowledge to explain that this is suffragette propaganda and why they would be publishing posters like this at that time** **(5)**
 E.g. *'No I am not surprised. This is a suffragette poster issued when there were campaigning to win the vote for women. They used violence like and were put in prison. To try to get released they would go on hunger strike. The authorities then had them force fed. This poster is making it look as bad as possible to win peoples' sympathy and turn them against the government. This is what you expect the suffragettes to and so I am not surprised.'*

- 2(a) Briefly describe the main features of the Anglo-Saxon system of law and order.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid feature identified, 2-3 marks for any features that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Features might include: the hue and cry, tithings, blood-feud, wergild (or compensation to victims), execution, physical punishments like mutilation, trial by ordeal, juries of local people, compurgators, manorial courts, royal courts

E.g. *'The main features were putting all men into tithings were they had to be responsible for the actions of anyone on their tithing and the hue and cry.'* = 3 marks (2 for the tithings, 1 for the hue and cry).

2(b) Explain why the Normans changed some aspects of the Anglo-Saxon system of law and order but left other aspects unchanged.

Target: AO 1

- Level 1 General assertions (1-2)**
 Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
 E.g. *'They changed some aspects because they needed to be improved but they left other aspects because there was no need to change more than was necessary.'*
 or
- Level 1 Describes the changes and/or the things left unchanged (1-2)**
- Level 2 Identifies specific reasons for making or not making changes (2-3)**
 Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Reasons include: changes – to establish control, to deal with over-mighty subjects, to extend royal power, were war-like so introduced trial by battle, William's love of hunting, to make money; not changing – avoid upsetting the Saxons, needed cooperation of Saxons, William wanted to be seen as true heir, William was religious so trial by ordeal kept.
- Level 3 Identifies specific reasons for making changes and for leaving some things alone. (4)**
 Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
- Level 4 Explains one or more specific reasons for making or for not making changes (3-5)**
 E.g. *'When William defeated Harold he still had a lot of work to do. He had to consolidate his power. He had argued with Harold over who was the rightful heir of Edward. One way William tried to convince the English people that he should be king was to keep many of Edward's old laws and to govern like Edward. If he had changed too much he would have upset people. He also needed the help of local people in courts, on juries and in tithings to catch and try criminals – he could not do it all himself. So he left all these things unchanged to make sure the system of local law and order continued to work.'*
- Level 5 Explains one reason why changes were made and one reason why they were not made (6-7)**
 Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
 Award 7 marks for both reasons explained.

2(c) How far did the system of law and order change between 1066 and the end of the Middle Ages? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

Level 1	General assertions Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge. E.g. <i>'The system of law and order changed a lot over this period. There were lots of improvements needed to bring things up-to-date.'</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies specific changes or aspects that were not changed Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of change/no change. Answers might include: changes – extension of royal justice, the King's Peace, the Grand Jury, travelling justices, royal courts, wergild ended, Forest Laws, Church courts, coroners courts, trials by ordeal ended, juries used more to decide guilt, borough courts, county gaols, J Ps, sanctuary; aspects that stayed the same – manorial courts, sheriffs, tithings, hue and cry.	(2-3)
Level 3	Identifies specific changes and aspects that were not changed Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of change/no change.	(4)
Level 4	Explains change or no change E.g. <i>'Things did change a lot over this period. One of the main changes was the fact that king's wanted to increase their own power. To do this they introduced the idea of the King's Peace and got rid of wergilds. Kings wanted any crime to be seen as an insult to them and so punishments changed from being compensation to the victim and became punishments like execution carried out by the king's officials.'</i>	(5-6)
Level 5	Explains change and no change	(6-7)
Level 6	As for Level 5 but in addition makes informed assessment about 'how far'	(7-8)

3(a) Briefly describe the system of transportation.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid feature identified, 2-3 marks for any features that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Features might include: used to send criminals to America and Australia, mostly men, assigned to settlers, had to work for them, could win a ticket of leave, some did very well.

E.g. *'The system of transportation involved sending criminals to Australia as a punishment. There they had to work for a settler until their sentence was finished. Most of them stayed in Australia afterwards.'* = 4 marks (4 points made).

3(b) Explain why the Bloody Code was introduced in the eighteenth century.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions | (1-2) |
| | Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was introduced to make law and order better. Things were getting out of hand and had to be improved.'</i> | |
| | or | |
| Level 1 | Describes the Bloody Code | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons | (2-4) |
| | Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: the landed classes thought the crime rate was increasing, to defend property, to scare people into obeying the law, the landed classes were worried about riots and rebellion. | |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason | (3-5) |
| | E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was introduced to defend the property of the landed classes. They believed that the job of the government was to protect property. This was why harsh punishments were introduced for things like poaching because this was stealing from the landed classes.'</i> | |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason | (6-7) |
| | Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | |

- 3(c) How far was transportation more successful than the Bloody Code?
Explain your answer.

Target: 1 and 2

* Written communication assessed in this question

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was not really successful because it did not achieve what it was meant to achieve. Transportation was far too soft.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies successes or failures of transportation or of the Bloody Code
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Answers might include: transportation – it was used a lot, courts were prepared to use it, it did not bring about a fall in the crime rate, people transported did reform, it settled Australia for Britain, it was expensive, it was a soft option – many convicts ended up doing very well; The Bloody Code - property is defended, does make interests of properties classes important, landowners were happy with it, death penalty used less, harsh punishments led to people being found not guilty, no police force so little fear of being caught, crime actually increases later in eighteenth century. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies successes or failures of transportation and of the Bloody Code
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains successes or failures of transportation or of the Bloody Code
E.g. <i>'The Bloody Code was a failure because it was meant to scare people into obeying the law by introducing harsh punishments like execution but in fact the number of people being executed actually went down. This was because many people including juries and judges thought that it was not fair to be executed for stealing something like a piece of cloth. As a result they would find people not guilty because the punishment was not fair. Often guilty people would be let off – this was not the aim of the Bloody Code so it was failing.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains success or failures of transportation and of the Bloody Code | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 5 but in addition makes informed assessment about 'how far' | (7-8) |

4(a) Briefly describe the main events of the Rebecca Riots.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid feature identified, 2-3 marks for any features that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Maximum of 1 mark for causes of riots.

Features might include: took place in Wales, protests against high tolls on turnpike roads, roads had to be used by the farmers, farmers dressed as women destroyed tollgates, other grievances included tithes and new workhouses, barns and hayricks and a workhouses were destroyed, soldiers and London policemen were sent, some of the leaders were transported, a woman tollgate keeper was killed, the government set up an enquiry.

E.g. *'Some farmers in Wales dressed up as women and attacked and destroyed tollgates because the tolls were too high and were increasing.'* = 3 marks.

4(b) Explain why people took part in the Rebecca Riots.**Target: AO 1 and 2**

Level 1	General assertions Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge. E.g. <i>'People took part in the Rebecca Riots because they were poor and had lots of other problems. Nothing ever seemed to be done to help them so they went on riots.'</i>	(1-2)
	or	
Level 1	Describes the Riots	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies specific reasons Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: turnpike tolls, new tollgates, high rents for farmers, tithes (now paid in cash), poor harvests, farmers who had more than one farm, the poor law, English landowners buying up land.	(2-4)
Level 3	Explains one specific reason E.g. <i>'They took part in the Rebecca Riots because of the high tolls on the roads in west Wales. Most of the people who took part were farmers. They had to use the roads a lot for moving lime to put on their land. They had to pay the toll for every journey they made. Things were made worse when the new turnpike trust put up extra gates and made them pay new tolls. The farmers were poor and could not afford this.'</i>	(3-5)
Level 4	Explains more than one specific reason Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified. Award 7 marks for two reasons explained.	(6-7)

4(c) How successfully did the authorities deal with the Rebecca Riots? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question

Level 1	General assertions Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge. E.g. <i>'The authorities did not deal with the Rebecca Riots because they went on and on and did not stop for a long time.'</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies successes or failures or the methods of the authorities Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Answers might include: failures – local magistrates were powerless, sending in soldiers made the situation worse, juries would not convict, took government a long time to make reforms – afraid of looking soft or of encouraging revolution; successes - soldiers captured some of the leaders, government set up an enquiry, reforms were introduced, leaders were transported, the troubles ended.	(2-3)
Level 3	Identifies successes and failures of the methods of the authorities Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.	(4)
Level 4	Explains the successes or failures of the authorities E.g. <i>'The authorities did not deal with the Rebecca Riots very well. This was because many of the local J.P.s were English and did not understand the problems faced by the farmers. They were not respected by the local people and so were not able to restore law and order. When the government sent in soldiers this just made the situation worse. It was after the soldiers were sent in that a tollgate keeper was killed and the presence of English soldiers just made the people support the rioters even more.'</i>	(5-6)
Level 5	Explains the successes and failures of the authorities	(6-7)
Level 6	As for Level 5 but in addition makes informed assessment about 'how successfully'	(7-8)

ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND

- 1(a) Study Source A. What does this source tell you about the problems facing actors and playwrights in the Elizabethan theatre? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.**

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1 Describes relevant parts of the theatre without explaining how they caused problems (1-2)**
E.g. 'This source shows that the stage stuck out into the audience. There were no curtains. The better-off sat around the stage in rows that got higher and higher.'
- Level 2 Identifies/explains problems from the source (2-6)**
NB only allow problems that can be reasonably inferred from the source.
Starting at 2 marks award 1-3 marks for each problem depending on how well explained and well related to the source. These will include: no curtain therefore no signal for end of scene and actors needed chance to change clothes, no scenery or change of scenery so words had to paint the picture, open to sky and no lighting so had to indicate if night or day, catching the attention of the audience at the beginning, keeping it – especially groundlings, appealing to both groundlings and the more educated.

- 1(b) Study Source B. Does Source B prove that the authorities in Elizabethan England supported theatres? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

Level 1 **Answers based on the fact that Elizabeth enjoyed plays** (1-2)
 These answers might be restricted to what is in Source B or might include contextual knowledge about Elizabeth's love of plays e.g. ways in which she supported it –invited actors to perform at Court, allowed one company to call itself 'The Queen's Men'

or

Level 1 **General claims of bias** (1)

Level 2 **Contextual knowledge used to identify reasons why the authorities did not approve of the theatre** (2-4)
 NB Do not allow reasons that apply to Puritans.
 Reasons might include: fear of - spread of disease, disorder because of the large crowds, gathering place of criminals and prostitutes, political messages in the plays, roaming troops of actors.

Level 3 **Contextual knowledge used to explain reasons why the authorities did not approve of the theatre** (4-6)
 NB Do not allow answers that apply to Puritans.

Level 4 **Explains difference between Elizabeth's personal likes and the responsibilities of the authorities** (7)
 NB Do not allow answers that apply to Puritans. Contextual knowledge used to explain why the authorities did not approve of the theatre and to explain how Elizabeth supported it.
E.g. 'Elizabeth did love the theatre. She often had actors to Court to perform before her. But she also had to keep law and order in the country and her governments were very suspicious of theatres and often closed them. This was because of the large numbers of people that gathered at them. This could spread disease and could also be used by her opponents to stir up trouble. The government was also worried when large numbers of people gathered together.'

- 1(c) Study Source C. What type of person do you think held opinions of the theatre like those in Source C? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers using information in Source C to infer he was an opponent of the theatre – no contextual knowledge** **(1-2)**
 NB Award only 1 mark to unsupported assertions that he was an opponent of the theatre.
 E.g. *'This was a person who did not like the theatre because he calls plays filthy and complains that it was stopping people from going to Church.'*
- Level 2** **Asserts that he was a Puritan – no support** **(3)**
- Level 3** **Identifies person as a Puritan and explains Puritan ideas/beliefs about the theatre** **(4-6)**
 E.g. *'He must have been a Puritan because he is complaining that the theatre was stopping people from going to church – a Puritan would complain about this.'*
- Level 4** **Contextual knowledge of the attitudes of Puritans used to explain why the evidence in Source C suggests he was a Puritan** **(6-7)**
 E.g. *'He was a Puritan. The Puritans were strict religious people who thought that the theatre was a place of sin. They thought it was immoral. This is why he calls plays 'filthy'. They thought that some of the plots encouraged people to act in an immoral way and they did not like boys dressing up as women. They were also against things like bear baiting that went on at the theatres.'*

2(a) Briefly describe the activities of vagrants and vagabonds in Elizabethan England.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid aspect identified, 2-3 marks for any aspects that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Activities might include: begging, wandered from place to place, wandered in large groups, robbed and stole and broke into peoples' houses, pretended to be disabled or ill.

E.g. *'The vagrants were people who had no job and were homeless. They wandered around the country in large groups begging and frightening people.'* = 3 marks.

2(b) Explain why vagrants and vagabonds were punished so harshly.

Target: AO 1

Level 1	<p>General assertions</p> <p>Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge. E.g. <i>'They were punished harshly because people thought they were bad and they were afraid of them.'</i> General deterrent = level 1</p>	(1)
Level 2	<p>Identifies specific reasons</p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: fear of disorder or rebellion, because there numbers were increasing, were a nuisance in cities like Norwich, they were regarded as idle, regarded as pretending to be ill or disabled, spread disease, involved in crime, difficult to keep tabs on, seen as rejecting the social order where everything had its place.</p>	(2-4)
Level 3	<p>Explains one specific reason</p> <p>E.g. <i>'They were punished harshly because governments at this time were worried about rebellions breaking out. Elizabeth had many enemies like Catholics. This made the government nervous about large numbers of vagrants wandering around the country because they could be used by Catholics or people like Mary, Queen of Scots, in a rebellion against the government. They punished harshly to try and stop them from being vagrants'</i></p>	(3-5)
Level 4	<p>Explains more than one specific reason</p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified. Award 7 marks for two reasons explained.</p>	(6-7)

2(c) How successfully did the authorities in Elizabethan England deal with the problem of vagrants, vagabonds and the poor? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
E.g. <i>'They were not very successful. By the end of the reign it was clear that they had failed to deal with this problem.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific reasons for success or failure

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of success or failure.
Examples of, or reasons for success include: recognising some people were genuinely poor while others were not, surveys showed extent of problem, recognition that it was a national, not a local problem, initiatives in towns – Bridewells and hospitals, beggars licensed, rate levied, poor made to work, Elizabethan Poor Law 1601 – poor relief, poor rates and almshouses; examples of, and reasons for failure include: viewing it as only a local problem, numbers continued to rise, did, not understand the reasons for the rise, relied on punishment only – not dealing with causes, saw the poor as one group. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific reasons for success and failure

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of success or failure. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains specific reasons for success or failure
E.g. <i>'Elizabeth's government was successful in dealing with the problem of poverty. In some towns they recognised that some people were poor through no fault of their own and they helped them but they also punished those who were being deliberately lazy. They understood the poor belonged to these two different groups who needed different treatment. They provided them with work or gave them licenses to beg. Hospitals were set up for old people and for children. At the same time workhouses were set up for those who refused to work. These policies were so successful that they were copied at the end of the reign for the whole country in the Elizabethan Poor Law.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains specific reasons for success and failure | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 6 but in addition makes an informed judgement about 'how successful' | (8) |

3(a) Briefly describe the main feature of Elizabeth's Church Settlement in 1559.**Target: AO 1**

1 mark for each valid feature identified, 2-3 marks for any features that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Features might include: Protestant, Elizabeth head of the Church, bishops, people had to attend Church – fined if did not, services in English, vestments and ornaments, clergy had to use the new Prayer Book, and had to take oath of loyalty, mixture of Protestant and Catholic – a compromise.

E.g. *'It was a mixture of Catholic things and Protestant things because Elizabeth wanted to win the support of as many people as possible. The Church was Protestant and Elizabeth was in charge not the Pope, but it had bishops.'* = 5 marks (2 for mixture of Catholic and Protestant, 3 for other features).

3(b) Explain why Mary, Queen of Scots, was a threat to Elizabeth.**Target: AO 1****Level 1 General assertions**

Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.

E.g. *'She was a threat to Elizabeth because she wanted to replace Elizabeth as queen of England. This made her very dangerous.'*

Level 2 Identifies specific reasons**(2-4)**

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: claim to the throne, support of Pope, Catholics abroad and in England, Elizabeth's illegitimacy and excommunication, plotting and rebellions.

Level 3 Explains one specific reason**(3-5)**

E.g. *'Mary was a threat to Elizabeth because she had a claim to the throne which many Catholics supported. Catholics did not regard Elizabeth as the rightful queen and might support Mary in a rebellion. Some of the Catholics were powerful noblemen and there were many Catholics in England who did not like what Elizabeth was doing like her religious policies and the persecution of Catholics.'*

Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason**(6-7)**

Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified. Award 7 marks for two reasons explained.

3(c) Who posed the greater threat to Elizabeth, Catholics or Puritans? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
E.g. <i>'I think it was the Puritans because they did not agree with many things that Elizabeth did and they wanted to change her policies.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific reasons for Catholics or Puritans being, or not being a threat
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of the problems or the solutions.
Reasons include: Catholics – a threat: excommunication of Elizabeth, did not recognise her as rightful queen, support from countries like Spain and France, Elizabeth's persecution of them, the plots and rebellions, powerful Catholics like Norfolk;; not a threat: majority gave Church and Elizabeth outward acceptance, few involved in active rebellion, majority just wanted to get on with their lives as long as not bothered by government, little support for rebellions like Northern Rebellion; Puritans – a threat: opposition to Elizabeth's Church, wanted less government control of Church – no bishops, campaigns and pamphlets, strong in London and south-east, some opposed to idea of Elizabeth as head of Church; not a threat: accepted Elizabeth as rightful queen, both Elizabeth and Puritans were Protestant, never rebelled against her, weak in second half of the reign, | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific reasons for Catholics and Puritans being, or not being, a threat
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of the problems or the solutions. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains specific reasons why Catholics or Puritans were/were not a threat
E.g. <i>'The Puritans were a real threat to Elizabeth. This was because they disagreed with the fact that Elizabeth controlled the Church. This was important to Elizabeth because it helped her keep control of the country as a whole. But the Puritans wanted a Church that was run by its members. This would have been a real threat to Elizabeth's power and authority.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains specific reasons why Catholics and Puritans were/were not a threat | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 6 but in addition compares the threat posed by the two groups and makes an informed judgement | (8) |

BRITAIN 1815–1851

1(a) Study Source A. Why was this drawing published in 1831? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers restricted to surface information in the source** **(1)**
 E.g. *'This drawing was published to show people what a borough was like. It does not look very big.'*
- Level 2** **Answers that identify a valid purpose or identify the fact that there was a campaign for reform at the time** **(2-3)**
 Award 3 marks if both points identified.
 E.g. *'It was published to show people that Parliament should be reformed.'* *'It was published because of the campaign for parliamentary reform at the time.'*
- or**
- Level 2** **Describes the electoral system pre 1832 – no purpose** **(2-4)**
- Level 3** **Answers that use contextual knowledge to explain the purpose of the drawing not set in context of the campaign of the early 1830s** **(4-6)**
 Answers will concentrate on what was wrong with the electoral system.
 E.g. *'This drawing was published to show people what was wrong with the electoral system. It shows a borough that elected two MPs and yet nobody lived there. This kind of borough was called a pocket borough because the landowner would control who the two MPs were. Places like this had two MPs while big towns like Manchester had no MPs of their own. This was why people wanted reform.'*
- Level 4** **Uses contextual knowledge to explain purpose in context of the the campaign of the early 1830s** **(6-7)**
 Contextual knowledge must be used to explain purpose (as for Level 3) but in addition there must be some account of the campaign of the early 1830s.

1(b) Study Source B. Explain what the author of Source B meant. Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers that simply repeat or paraphrase the information in the source** (1)
E.g. 'He meant that Reform was dangerous and it would be even more dangerous not to pass it.'
- Level 2** **Answers that identify this is about the danger of reform or the danger of no reform – no explanation** (2)
E.g. 'He meant that it would be more dangerous not to reform Parliament.'
- Level 3** **Both parts of level 2** (3)
- Level 4** **Contextual knowledge used to explain either why the Reform Bill was dangerous or why not passing it was more dangerous** (4-5)
E.g. 'The author is trying to say that it would be dangerous to reform Parliament. He thought that if the middle classes were given the vote it would lead to chaos because they were not the right people to rule the country. He would think that the landed classes who were already in Parliament were born to rule and should be allowed to carry on.'
- Level 5** **Answers that complete both parts of Level 4** (6)

1(c) Study Source C. Do you think that the impression this painting gives of the Chartists was fair? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Descriptions of the painting or assertions that this was what the Chartists were like** (1)
- Level 2** **Assertions that this is only what happened in one place at one time so not a general picture of the Chartists – not explained** (2)
E.g. 'This view of the Chartists was not a fair one. It only shows what happened in Newport.'

- Level 3** **Assertions that many other Chartists were peaceful – not explained or assertions that this may have been painted by an opponent of the Chartists** (3)
 E.g. *'This view of the Chartists is not fair because the Chartists usually protested peacefully.'*
- Level 4** **Assertions that Chartists used peaceful means and violence – not explained** (4)
- Level 5** **Contextual knowledge to support the impression of the painting** (5)
 These answers might be based on the Newport Riots or on other examples of physical force.
 E.g. *'This is what the Chartists were like. In Newport an armed mob attacked a hotel where some prisoners were being kept. This developed into a battle with the soldiers with the Chartists firing at the soldiers. In the end the Chartist were defeated and about 20 of them were killed.'*
- Level 6** **Contextual knowledge used to explain how most of the Chartists and most of their activities were peaceful** (5-6)
 E.g. *'This painting gives a completely wrong impression of the Chartists. Most of the time they were peaceful. They consisted of educated skilled workmen not revolutionaries and their most popular tactic was to draw up petitions to send to Parliament and to have peaceful demonstrations.'*
- or**
- Level 6** **Contextual knowledge used to explain that this painting might be by an opponent of the Chartists and how it is not representative or answers that use contextual knowledge to explain there are other interpretations of what happened at Newport** (5-6)
- Level 7** **Contextual knowledge used to explain the two sides of Chartism – moral and physical force** (7)

- 2(a) Briefly describe working conditions in textile factories before improvements were introduced.**

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid aspect identified, 2-3 marks for any aspects that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Aspects might include: long hours, child labour, the heat and dust, damp leading to diseases like bronchitis, repetitive work led to physical deformities, dangerous machines, cleaning the machines while working, cruel overseers,

E.g. *'The working conditions were awful. Very young children aged seven used to work long hours and if they did not work hard enough they would be whipped by an overseer.'* = 3 marks.

- 2(b) Explain why some people disagreed with government attempts to reform working conditions in factories and mines.**

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'Some people disagreed because they thought it was the wrong thing to do. They did not think that the conditions needed reforming.'</i> | |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: laissez faire, nothing to do with the government, put costs up, make British industry less competitive, take money away from poor families, reduce right of women to work, interfere with people's freedom – workers and owners | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'Some people disagreed with the reforms because they said the government should not interfere. They said that the factories belonged to the owners and they should have the freedom to do what they liked there. They thought that government interference was an attack of people's freedom. It was not the job of the government to interfere with private businesses.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

2(c) 'Between the 1830s and 1851 working conditions in factories and mines were steadily improved.' How far do you agree? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Level 1 | <p>General assertions (1-2)</p> <p>E.g. <i>'They had not been improved much because conditions in the mines were still terrible.'</i></p> |
| Level 2 | <p>Identifies or describes specific examples of improvement or of lack of improvement (2-3)</p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of Improvement/lack of improvement.</p> <p>Examples of improvement include: young children not allowed to work in factories and mines, no women or girls in mines, Inspectors of Mines appointed to enforce this in mines, factories – hours of older children limited, and they had to attend school for two hours a day, Inspectors appointed to enforce this in factories, 10 hour day introduced in 1850, 1844 - dangerous machinery had to be fenced off; examples of lack of improvement include: earlier legislation brought little improvement because no enforcement, factory schools were very poor, the 1850 Act actually increased the hours worked by women and children, women continued to work underground in mines, women and children forced to work a shift system in factories, opposition in Parliament watered down and held up many reforms, factories and mines still very dangerous and unhealthy – employers not liable for injury caused by accidents.</p> |
| Level 3 | <p>Identifies or describes specific examples of improvement and of lack of improvement (4)</p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of Improvement/lack of improvement.</p> |
| Level 4 | <p>Explains specific examples of improvement or of lack of improvement (5-6)</p> <p>E.g. <i>'There was improvement in the working conditions but it was very slow. When young children were banned from working in textile mills it took a long time for this to be enforced because there were few Inspectors and so many factory owners could ignore the law. The families were also to blame for this because they wanted their children to be earning money. So the picture was not as good as the legislation suggests. Improvements were very slowly to happen in the factories. There were even women working underground in mines when they should not have been.'</i></p> |
| Level 5 | <p>Explains specific examples of improvement and of lack of improvement (6-7)</p> |
| Level 6 | <p>As for Level 6 but in addition makes an informed judgement about how 'steady' the improvements were. (8)</p> |

3(a) Briefly describe what happened at Peterloo in 1819.**Target: AO 1**

1 mark for each valid aspect identified, 2-3 marks for any aspects that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Aspects might include: In Manchester at St Peter's Field, large peaceful crowd gathered to hear Henry Hunt talk, magistrates worried by size of crowd sent Yeomany (cavalry) in, not trained soldiers, charged the crowd and killed some, more killed in the crush.

E.g. *'What happened was that the cavalry attacked a crowd including women and children and killed some of them'* = 3 marks.

3(b) Explain why rural labourers in the south of England took part in the Swing Riots of the early 1830s.**Target: AO 1****Level 1 General assertions**

Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.

E.g. *'They did this because they were poor and hungry and fed up.'*

Level 2 Identifies specific reasons**(2-4)**

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: threshing machines, loss of jobs, economic slump led to wage cuts and unemployment, demanded – higher wages, reduction in rents, reduction in tithes; reacting to reduction in allowances paid by parish – ignoring the price of bread, bad harvests 1829 and 30, starvation.

Level 3 Explains one specific reason**(3-5)**

E.g. *'They did this because the farmers they worked for began to introduce threshing machines. These machines were cheaper for the farmer because they could do the work of several men. This meant that the labourers lost their jobs and in the south of England there was no chance of other jobs. With no job they and their families were in danger of starving.'*

Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason**(6-7)**

Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.

Award 7 marks for two reasons explained.

3(c) How successful were governments in dealing with popular disturbances such as Peterloo and the Swing Riots? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
E.g. <i>'They were not very successful, they simply made things worse by over-reacting.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific examples of success or of failure

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of success or failure.
Examples include: success - the Six Acts suppress meetings, Swing rioters dealt with effectively – many transported, imprisoned, movement dies out, failure – actions at Peterloo led to public outcry, the Six Acts did nothing to deal with underlying causes of trouble, same with Swing Riots – rioters suppressed but problems still there, partly dealt with in reform of Poor Law, trouble often ended by economic improvement not by government action, disturbances return later in the period. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes examples of success and failure

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of success or failure. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains specific examples of success or failure
E.g. <i>'The government was very successful. After Peterloo took place they decided that meetings like this would never take place again. They passed the Six Acts which stopped such meetings and gave magistrates powers to search people's houses. It also made newspapers much more expensive so radicals could not sell their newspapers so easily. There were few riots or disturbances for about the next ten years so the government kept things under control very well.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains specific examples of success and failure | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 6 but in addition makes an informed judgement about 'how successful' | (8) |

THE AMERICAN WEST, 1840-1895

1(a) Study Source A. Is this a useful source of evidence about the American West? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1 Answers restricted to surface information in the source (1)**
E.g. 'Yes this source is very useful as it tells me all about how the Indians lived. It says they were lazy and sat around all day.'
- or**
- Level 1 Source dismissed because Greeley doesn't know / understand Indians – asserted. (1)**
- Level 2 Source dismissed as useful because it is biased (1-2)**
E.g. 'This source has no useful information because it is written by a white man and he would be biased against the Indians. He makes them out to be lazy and to be no good.'
 Answers that show knowledge of attitudes of whites towards Plains Indians award 2 marks.
- Level 3 Answers that just assert it is useful because it tells you about white attitudes towards the Indians – no explanation (2)**
- Level 4 Contextual knowledge of Plains Indians used to reject the information in the source (2-3)**
E.g. 'This source does not contain any useful information because it is wrong. The Plains Indians were not lazy and they had good reasons for not being farmers. They regarded the earth as part of nature and their mother. It was sacred. They would not cut it up to farm. Anyway they did not need to farm because they lived off the buffalo and they were nomadic. They lived a different way of life.'
- Level 5 Answers that demonstrate knowledge of white attitudes and of the life style/beliefs of Plains Indians (combine Levels 3 and 4) (4)**
- Level 6 Answers that explain that the source is useful as evidence of white attitudes towards the Plains Indians (5-6)**
 Reserve 6 marks for candidates who go beyond white attitudes and explain the importance to American history of this lack of understanding.
E.g. 'This source is useful evidence because it tells you about the attitudes of whitemen like Greeley towards the Plains Indians. They thought the Indians were lazy and were wasting the land because they were not farming it. They did not understand the Indians had a completely different style of life that depended on hunting the buffalo. They adapted to their environment whereas the whiteman used and destroyed it. It is important to know about these attitudes because this lack of understanding eventually led to the whitemen running the Indians off their land and destroying them.'

- 1(b) Study Source B. Does this source prove that the Plains Indians were cruel?
Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | Answers based on the word 'cruel' in the source – no explanation
E.g. <i>'Yes it does because it says they were cruel to their old people.'</i> | (1) |
| Level 2 | Everyday empathy used to explain that what they were doing was cruel
E.g. <i>'Yes it does show they were cruel. They were going to leave the old man behind to die by himself on the Plains. This was very cruel they should look after their old people.'</i> | (2) |
| Level 3 | Asserts valid reason why Indians did this | (2) |
| or | | |
| Level 3 | Uses details in the source to explain they were not cruel
E.g. <i>'No they were not cruel. The old man said he wanted to die. He told them to leave him because he would be burden to them.'</i> | (2-3) |
| Level 4 | Uses contextual knowledge of other aspects of the Plains Indians to show they were/were not cruel | (3-4) |
| Level 5 | Answers that demonstrate knowledge of the practice of 'exposure' and explain why the Indians practised it
E.g. <i>'This source does not prove that they were cruel. They depended on the buffalo for all their food, shelter and clothing. The buffalo herds moved around the Plains and the Indians had to follow them. Some of the oldest members of the tribe who found too difficult to move would hold them up and they might get stranded out on the Plains in the worst weather with no protection. They might even lose the buffalo. So it was for the good of the rest of the tribe that they left the oldest people behind. As the source shows the old people did not resent this.'</i> | (4-6) |

- 1(c) Study Sources C and D. Do these two sources show that the Plains Indians and white Americans shared the same attitude towards the buffalo? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | Answers based on surface information in the source – to agree
<i>E.g. 'Yes they had the same attitude. They both thought the buffalo should be killed.'</i> | (1) |
| Level 2 | Answers based on surface information in the source – to disagree
<i>E.g. 'No the Indians are having to work hard to kill the buffalo while the whitemen are just sitting on a train shooting them.'</i> | (2) |
| Level 3 | Answers that use contextual knowledge to identify / explain the different reasons for killing the buffalo

<i>Answers might mention – Indians depended on the buffalo or needed it for food or only killed a few; whitemen killing for sport or to damage the Indians or slaughtered them wholesale.</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Contextual knowledge used to explain Indian or whiteman's attitudes towards buffalo
<i>E.g. 'No they did not have the same attitude towards the buffalo. The whiteman did not think the buffalo were anything special. They killed them for their skins and fur which was very fashionable and they also killed them because they thought that if they killed all the buffalo this would help to wipe out the Indians because the Indians depended on them for their food and clothing. So killing the buffalo was a way of getting at the Indians.'</i> | (6-7) |
| Level 5 | Contextual knowledge used to explain both Indian and whiteman's attitudes towards the buffalo | (8) |

- 2(a) Briefly describe the problems that settlers faced during their journey westwards.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid problem identified, 2-3 marks for any problems that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Max of 2 marks for different types of weather.

Max of 1 mark for lists of savage beasts.

Problems might include: the weather – the heat, snow drifts, blizzards, lack of water, Plains Indians, crossing the Rockies and the Sierra Nevada, wagons overturning, sickness, crossing rivers, running out of food.

E.g. *'They faced many problems. The weather would either be baking hot or there would be storms with enormous hailstorms. Often the biggest problem was a lack of water as there was little to be found on the Plains.'* = 3 marks.

- 2(b) Explain why the American Government passed the Homestead Act of 1862.

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'They passed the Homestead Act because they thought that a lot of changes were needed on the Plains and they would not happen if they did not pass the Act. It was to get things going.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: to give free land to settlers, to encourage people to settle and work the land in the West, to spread civilisation and law and order, to push the Indians off the land, manifest destiny, to increase the size of the Union, to stop speculators buying the land. | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'The Government passed this Act because they wanted the West populated. They knew that if they had lots of people settling in the West this would have the effect of gradually pushing the Indians back. The Act gave people 160 acres of land free provided they lived on it and worked it for five years. This was to ensure they stayed there and the area was populated and settled.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

2(c) How successful were homesteaders in overcoming the problems of living and working on a homestead? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
E.g. <i>'The Homesteaders had a very tough time on the Plains. It was too tough for many of them.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific examples of success or failure

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of the problems or the solutions.
Problems include: building a house, the conditions in sod houses, loneliness for women, the hard soil, lack of equipment, the climate and weather, little timber for fencing, lack of water, grasshoppers; solutions include: dry farming, the Timber and Culture Act, new inventions like mechanical threshers, barbed wire, new crops like Turkey Red, wind pumps. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies specific examples of success and failure

Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of the problems or the solutions. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains specific examples of success or failure
E.g. <i>'Most were successful because they were able to overcome the problems. The first wheat they tried to grow could not survive the extreme climate of the Plains and so they started to use a new type called Turkey Red which immigrants from Russia brought with them, This was very successful and saved a lot of homesteaders from ruin. They overcame the problem of lack of rain by dry farming. This meant keeping the moisture in the soil by ploughing it every time it rained. This was a great help and the moisture helped the crops grow.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains specific examples of success and failure | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 6 but in addition makes an informed judgement about 'how successful' | (8) |

3(a) Briefly describe the dangers faced by cowboys in their work.

Target; AO 1

1 mark for each valid danger identified, 2-3 marks for any dangers that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Dangers might include: on the long drive - attacked by farmers or by Indians, stampedes, crossing rivers, thrown from horse, thorny vegetation, the cold on the line camps. rustlers,

E.g. *'The cowboys had to take the cattle on long drives. If the cattle stampeded the cowboy could be trampled and killed. There was also a threat from homesteaders who might think the cattle would spread diseases to their animals.'*
= 4 marks (2 described).

3(b) Explain why cattle ranching spread to the Plains?

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'It spread across the Plains because the Plains was a good place for it and it did very well there.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: the roles of Goodnight and Loving, McCoy and Abilene, the demand from the northern industrial towns, the coming of the railroads, the difficulties of the long drive – homesteads blocking them and Indians charging to go through their land, range rights on the Plains. | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'At first cattle were reared in Texas and taken north by long drives but as homesteads grew up all over the Plains the homesteaders started to block the routs of the drives. Also many of the animals were not in very good condition after the long drive. It was better to rear the cattle on the Plains themselves nearer the cities that bought the beef. This meant the long drive could be avoided.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

- 3(c) Three reasons for the decline of the cowboys' traditional way of life were: the invention of barbed wire, the harsh weather of 1886-1887, the Johnson County War of 1892.
Was one of these reasons more important than the others? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

Level 1	General assertions E.g. <i>'Yes I think the harsh weather was the most important reason because this is what really finished cattle ranching off.'</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies or describes specific reasons why one factor important Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Reasons include: barbed wire – homesteaders fenced off their land, cattlemen fenced their land; the weather – hot and dry summer of 86, winter blizzards and cold of 86-87; the Johnson County War – the homesteaders stayed, cattlemen fenced their ranges, end of cattlemens' dominance .	(2-3)
Level 3	Identifies or describes specific reasons why more than one factor important Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanations.	(4)
Level 4	Explains specific reasons why one factor important E.g. <i>'I think the invention of barbed wire was the most important. The homesteaders used this to fence off their land and stop cattle trampling all over it. This made it more difficult for the cattle to freely roam and got in the way of long drives. Also the cattlemen decided to fence their land off as well and this meant that cowboys were no longer needed for some of their jobs like riding the line because the cattle could no longer wander off.'</i>	(5-6)
Level 5	Explains specific reasons why at least two factors important	(6-7)
Level 6	Compares importance of at least two factors or explains connections between factors.	(8)

GERMANY 1919-1945

1(a) Study Source A. Why was this cartoon published in July 1919? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | Answers restricted to surface information in the source
E.g. <i>To show that Clemenceau was a vampire.'</i> | (1) |
| Level 2 | Answers that identify a valid reason – not explained
E.g. <i>'It was published to criticise the French.'</i> <i>'It was published to show people that Germany had been destroyed.'</i> <i>'It was published then because that was when the Treaty of Versailles was signed.'</i> | (2) |
| Level 3 | Answers that support Level 2 answers with references to details in the cartoon
E.g. <i>'It was published to criticise the French. You can see this because France is shown as a vampire sucking the blood from Germany which has been made weak.'</i> | (3) |
| Level 4 | Uses contextual knowledge of the terms of the Treaty or the role of France in the peace talks to explain purpose in context
E.g. <i>'This cartoon was published to show everyone that the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were far too harsh. Germany had been weakened by having territory taken away from her and she had to pay massive reparations to the Allies. The Germans thought this would leave them very weak.'</i> | (4) |
| Level 5 | Answers that use details in the source and contextual knowledge of the Treaty or the role of France to explain purpose | (5-6) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 5 but in addition explains why then - explains that the Treaty had just been agreed by the Allies or signed by Germany | (7) |

1(b) Study Source B. Are you surprised by this cartoon? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

Level 1 **Answers express surprise because of surface details** **(1)**
E.g. 'Yes I am surprised because the French soldier looks mad.'

Level 2 **Not surprised that Germans are producing an anti-French cartoon** **(2)**

Level 3 **Not surprised because French invaded the Ruhr and this is what the cartoon shows** **(3)**

or

Level 3 **Not surprised because the Ruhr was economically important** **(3)**

Level 4 **Not surprised because the Germans would be annoyed at the French invading the Ruhr – no further explanation** **(4)**

Level 5 **Contextual knowledge used to explain surprise because the French had a right to be there** **(5)**
E.g. 'These answers use contextual knowledge to explain why the French invaded the Ruhr – so the Germans should not be complaining.'

or

Level 5 **Contextual knowledge used to confirm surface information in Source B** **(5)**

Level 6 **Contextual knowledge used to explain why not surprised by message of cartoon.** **(6)**
E.g. 'No I am not surprised by the message of this cartoon. The message of this cartoon is that the French should get out of the Ruhr which was part of Germany and contained a lot of its industry. In 1923 the French invaded the Ruhr because Germany was not keeping up with its reparation payments. They took the coal which further weakened Germany. This cartoon is criticising the actions of France and I am not surprised by it.'

- 1(c) Study Source C. How far did the Weimar Republic solve economic problems like that described in Source C? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- | | | |
|----------------|---|----------------------------|
| Level 1 | Unsupported assertions
E.g. <i>'They solved the problem of inflation completely.'</i> It did not.
<i>The Weimar Republic always had economic problems.'</i> | (1) |
| Level 2 | Describes economic problems early 1920s | (1-2) |
| or | | |
| Level 2 | Answers based on the fact that there is an economic depression in the early 1930s
Claims that economic problems returned late 20s / early 30s
E.g. <i>'The Weimar Republic did not solve its economic problems because there was an economic depression at the beginning of the 1930s and this weakened the Weimar Republic and let Hitler get into power.'</i> | (1-2)
(2) |
| Level 3 | Identifies factors that helped or examples of success or failure – no explanation
These might include: Stresemann, Rentenmark introduced, government cut expenditure, the Dawes Plan, by 1924 inflation had been defeated. | (3-4) |
| Level 4 | Contextual knowledge used to explain how inflation was defeated / not defeated
E.g. <i>'The Weimar Republic was totally successful. When the Rentenmark was introduced the old currency was replaced by this new one. This restored confidence and prices went down to normal very quickly.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains both sides of level 4. | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 4/5 but in addition explains that economic problems returned late 20s /early 30s. | (7) |

2(a) What did the Nazis promise the German people in the election campaigns of 1930-1933?

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid promise identified, 2-3 marks for any promises that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Promises might include: employment, strong leadership, make Germany great again, deal with the Communists, higher profits for businesses, bread, hope.

E.g. *'The Nazis promised people jobs. This was very important as there was a lot of unemployment at that time.'* = 2 marks.

2(b) Explain why the Reichstag Fire of 1933 was useful to Hitler.

Target: AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'It was useful to Hitler because it caused lots of fears and it let him blame his enemies for it.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: blames Communists, Communists imprisoned, excuse for emergency powers, helps in March elections, | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'Hitler's most dangerous opponents at this time were the Communists. Hitler was able to blame the Fire on van der Lubbe a Communist. He presented it was a Communist plot. This gave him an excuse to arrest and imprison thousands of Communists. The story made the Communists unpopular and Hitler could look as if he was saving the country by locking up the Communists.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

- 2(c) Which was the more important in allowing Hitler to strengthen his power in 1933-4, the Enabling Act or the Night of the Long Knives? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
E.g. <i>'I think it was the Enabling Act because this gave Hitler great power. After this there was no going back.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons for Night of the Long Knives or the Enabling Act being important/not important
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Reasons include: Night of the Long Knives – destroys power of the SA, wins the support of the army, win support of big business; the Enabling Act – did not have overall majority in the Reichstag, let Hitler make laws by himself, made Hitler dictator, made possible the Nazi revolution – destruction of TUs, opponents arrested, political parties banned. | (2-3) |
| or | | |
| Level 2 | Describes the Night of the Long Knives or the Enabling Act | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies specific reasons for Night of the Long Knives and the Enabling Act being important/not important
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. | (4) |
| or | | |
| Level 3 | Describes the Night of the Long Knives and the Enabling Act | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains specific reasons why the Night of the Long Knives or the Enabling Act were/were not important
E.g. <i>'The Night of the Long Knives was more important to Hitler. This was because Rohm, the leader of the Nazis private army the SA, was becoming too powerful. He wanted to follow more radical policies and Hitler thought that Rohm was plotting to replace him. The SA was powerful, Hitler could not have got to power without it, but no it was a danger. Rohm could have used it to take over and so Hitler had him and the other leaders executed. That got rid of the threat.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains specific reasons why the Night of the Long Knives and the Enabling Act were/were not important | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 6 but in addition compares the importance of the two events in an informed way | (8) |

3(a) Briefly describe the different methods of propaganda used by the Nazis.**Target: AO 1**

1 mark for each valid method identified, 2-3 marks for any methods that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Methods might include: radio, films, newspapers, marches and rallies, culture – art and architecture, school books and lessons, work of Goebbels, poster, presentation of Hitler

E.g. *'The Nazis used the radio a lot. They took control of the radio company and made millions of very cheap radios so they could all hear the propaganda'* = 3 marks.

3(b) Explain why the Nazi regime persecuted Jews and other minorities.**Target: AO 1**

Level 1	General assertions Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge. E.g. <i>'They did this because they did not like them and wanted to get rid of them.'</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies specific reasons Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: Aryan superiority, Jews and other inferior, wanted pure Aryans to be produced, did not want Aryan race to be contaminated, wanted to make Germany strong again, Jews subhuman, resentment of wealth of Jews, Jews responsible for Germany's troubles (defeat in WW1). Other groups covered might include: homosexuals, gypsies, the mentally ill.	(2-4)
Level 3	Explains one specific reason E.g. <i>'The Nazis persecuted the Jews because they regarded the Jews as subhuman. Hitler wanted to produce perfect Aryans because he thought they were the master race and would make Germany great again. He was worried that Jews would marry German girls and that this would contaminate the pure German blood. This was why he persecuted them.'</i>	(3-5)
Level 4	Explains more than one specific reason Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified. Award 7 marks for two reasons explained.	(6-7)

3(c) How successful was the Nazi regime in winning the loyalty and support of young Germans? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
E.g. <i>'They were very successful. The brainwashed them and for most of the time they supported the Nazis.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies or describes specific examples of success or lack of success
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of examples of success or failure. Examples include: success – Hitler Youth and the League of German Girls – millions belong, use of education, other youth organisations banned; failure – many left Hitler Youth when they left school at 14, Hitler Youth less popular later when stress put on military preparation and when less committed youngsters forced to join, opposition groups mainly in war years – Edelweiss Pirates, Swing, White Rose. | (2-3) |
| Level 3 | Identifies or describes specific examples of success and lack of success
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of examples of success or failure. | (4) |
| Level 4 | Explains specific reasons for success or failure
E.g. <i>'The Nazis were not totally successful. The longer they were in power the harder they found it to keep up young people's enthusiasm. During the war years things got worse. Membership of the Hitler Youth dropped and groups like the Edelweiss Pirates appeared. Their numbers grew rapidly in the war years. They beat up Hitler Youth patrols and helped escaped prisoners of war. They also gave out Communist leaflets. The authorities were worried about them and had the leaders arrested. In 1944 some of them were executed.'</i> | (5-6) |
| Level 5 | Explains specific reasons for success and failure | (6-7) |
| Level 6 | As for Level 6 but in addition makes an informed judgement about 'how successful' | (8) |

SOUTH AFRICA 1948–c.1995

1(a) Study Source A. Why was this cartoon published at that time? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers restricted to surface information in the source** (1)
 E.g. *It was published to show Vorster was a strong man.*
- Level 2** **Answers that identify a valid reason – no contextual knowledge** (2)
 Reasons might include: to criticise Vorster or Verwoerd, to show they are a danger to democracy, to show they are misusing the justice system.
- Level 3** **Answers that support Level 2 answers with references to details in the cartoon** (3)
 E.g. *It was published to criticise the policies of Vorster. It shows him attacking South African democracy by destroying the justice system. Democracy is shown as on the floor under attack.*
- Level 4** **Uses contextual knowledge to identify purpose re. 1961** (4)
 These answers will use knowledge of the late 1950s and early 1960s to identify a purpose. These might include: to criticise policies of separate development or the Bantustans, to criticise government actions over Sharpeville, government increases repression – ANC and PAC banned, thousands of campaigners against pass laws arrested the Treason Trials
- Level 5** **Answers that uses contextual knowledge to explain purpose re. 1961** (5-6)
 E.g. *This cartoon was published in 1961 to attack the new stage of apartheid that Verwoerd's government had started to introduce in the late 1950s. Part of this was a policy of repression of any opposition. At a protest meeting in Sharpeville in 1960 the police shot dead over sixty people, many of them in the back. The government then tried to cover-up what they had done. They then declared a state of emergency which gave them powers to do almost anything. They then went further and banned the ANC. The cartoon is criticising the government doing all this.*
- Level 6** **As for Level 5 but in addition refer to details in the cartoon** (7)

1(b) Study Source B. Was this cartoon supporting or criticising apartheid? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

Level 1	Describes surface features of the source – no interpretation	(1)
	or	
Level 1	Unsupported assertions	(1)
Level 2	Misinterprets the source and explains that it is supporting apartheid	(2-3)
	<i>E.g. 'It supports apartheid because it shows how the whites could have a nice quiet place of their own where they can get away from the blacks. The white children can play by themselves and do not have to mix with black children.'</i>	
	or	
Level 2	Claims that it is simply illustrating apartheid – it is not commenting on it	(3)
Level 3	Argues that it is criticising apartheid simply because the nanny is not allowed in the same area	(4)
Level 4	Explains how the cartoon is poking fun at the ridiculous nature of apartheid	(4-6)

- 1(c) Study Source C. Does this source prove that most Black South Africans benefited from Bantustans? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Target: AO 1 and 2

- Level 1** **Answers based on the information in Source C** **(1)**
E.g. *'Yes they did. The source says that they were able to get jobs there so they would support it.'*
- Level 2** **Answers that evaluate the nature of Source C** **(2-4)**
These answers will either reject Source C because it is from an American singer who would not know what was happening, or because he appears to be a friend of Sol so is biased in favour, or Sun City was completely unrepresentative of Bantustans. Only award 4 marks if two of these arguments are used.
- Level 3** **Contextual knowledge of Bantustans used to explain why most black South Africans rejected them** **(4-6)**
These answers might concentrate on the quality of life in the Bantustans or the forcible removals or the aim of separate Development.
- Level 4** **Answers that combine Levels 2 and 3.** **(7)**

- 2(a) Briefly describe how apartheid affected the lives of black South Africans in the 1950s.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid aspect identified, 2-3 marks for any aspects that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Aspects might include: could not marry a white, had to carry a pass book, could not use same amenities as whites, received sub-standard 'African' education, forced to move out of areas designated 'whites only'.

E.g. *'The lives of Black South Africans were affected a lot. Some of them who lived in areas that were suddenly designated as white areas had to move home to much worse areas where blacks only were to live. They were also not allowed to use the same buses or toilets as whites.'* = 4 marks.

- 2(b) Explain why many white South Africans supported apartheid in the 1950s.

Target; AO 1

- | | | |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| Level 1 | General assertions
Valid, but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.
E.g. <i>'They supported it because they thought it was the best thing for South Africa and it would help to make South Africa strong.'</i> | (1-2) |
| Level 2 | Identifies specific reasons
Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.
Examples include: believed whites were superior, to maintain the supremacy of the whites, that races should be separated because they could not live together peacefully, belief in separate development, fear of blacks taking jobs, fear of blacks dominating in towns, God supports it, to preserve what they had achieved in South Africa. | (2-4) |
| Level 3 | Explains one specific reason
E.g. <i>'They supported it because they believed that it would be better if the different races developed separately. They said the history showed that the different races could not live and work together peacefully. They argued that black South Africans would be better off to develop by their own in their homelands.'</i> | (3-5) |
| Level 4 | Explains more than one specific reason
Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.
Award 7 marks for two reasons explained. | (6-7) |

2(c) How successful was the South African government in dealing with opposition to apartheid in the period 1948 to 1976? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

Level 1	General assertions E.g. <i>They were very successful because apartheid survived and there was nothing anybody could do about it. All opposition was crushed.</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies or describes specific examples of success or lack of success Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of examples of success or failure. Examples include: success – the Rivonia Trial and imprisonment of Mandela and other leaders, the MK and the ANC were broken inside South Africa, apartheid was enforced during this period, examples of failure – rise in membership of the ANC, the Defiance Campaign of 1952, the Freedom Charter, anti-pass law demonstrations, bus boycotts, ineffectiveness of banning orders, the failure of the Treason Trial, Sharpeville and reaction to it, armed struggle begins, strikes of 1973	(2-3)
Level 3	Identifies or describes specific examples of success and lack of Success Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation of examples of success or failure.	(4)
Level 4	Explains specific examples of success or failure	(5-6)
Level 5	Explains specific examples of success and failure	(6-7)
Level 6	As for Level 6 but in addition makes an informed judgement about 'how successful'	(8)

- 3(a) Briefly describe the main events leading to, and during, the Soweto Riots of 1976.

Target: AO 1

1 mark for each valid event identified, 2-3 marks for any event that are described or explained.

Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking in specific contextual knowledge.

Events might include: subjects to be taught in Afrikaans, Black Consciousness, fears of being moved to a homeland, students march against Afrikaans, demonstrators shot by police, lessons boycotted, schools burnt down, migrant workers used to beat up students, Soweto not under government control, demonstrations spread to other townships

E.g. *'The riots started when the government said that some subjects in Black schools would be taught in Afrikaans. This was very unpopular because the students saw it as the language of the oppressors and it was not as useful as English because it was not used anywhere outside South Africa. It was seen as a way of keeping the blacks in inferior jobs.'* = 3 marks.

- 3(c) Which was the more important in bringing about the end of apartheid in South Africa, pressure from within the country or pressure from outside? Explain your answer.

Target: AO 1

* Written communication assessed in this question.

Level 1	General assertions E.g. <i>'I think it was pressure from outside the country. South Africa had to listen to what other countries said because it needed them for all kinds of things.'</i>	(1-2)
Level 2	Identifies specific reasons for either pressure from outside or inside being important/not important Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Reasons include: outside - collapse of white regimes in Africa, Macmillan's speech, international sanctions- trade, sport and cultural, opposition to sanctions in South Africa and outside; inside – begins to crumble with Botha's reforms, increase in violence and protests in South Africa in the 80s, State of Emergency, de Klerk forced to begin changes because of the lack of law and order.	(2-3)
or		
Level 2	Describes the pressure from inside or outside	(2-3)
Level 3	Identifies specific reasons for pressure from outside and from inside being important/not important Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.	(4)
or		
Level 3	Describes the pressure from outside and inside	(4)
Level 4	Explains specific reasons why pressure from outside or from inside was/was not important	(5-6)
Level 5	Explains specific reasons why pressure from outside and inside was/was not important	(6-7)
Level 6	As for Level 6 but in addition compares the importance of the two in an informed way	(8)

Mark Scheme 1935/21
June 2005

MEDICINE THROUGH TIME

NOTES TO EXAMINERS

1. The mark scheme is graded in order from the lowest level of response to the highest. It is not cumulative and answers should be rewarded at the highest level reached. They do not have to reach the lower levels before they can be rewarded at the higher.
2. The examiner's first task is to establish the appropriate level at which the candidate is to be rewarded. Then the number of marks is allocated according to the quality (not quantity, unless specifically indicated) of response. Examiners should also take note of where marks within a band are determined by the quality of the candidate's supporting historical detail.

Marks are to be shown in the right hand margin with level followed by mark, e.g. L2/6. Examiners should underline or annotate an answer to indicate which part is considered worthy of the mark allocated. Where a question has several parts, the total for the complete question should be shown and ringed.

3. The mark scheme is intended as a guide to marking and there will almost certainly be answers which do not fit exactly into the levels. In such circumstances please allocate a mark in keeping with the level of understanding shown in the answer (show as = L2/6). If in doubt consult your team leader.
4. Please take care not to over-reward learned responses that are not directly linked to the sources. Unless answers such as 'It depends what you want to know' are supported by reference to the sources they should be rewarded at a low level. Equally, care should be taken not to over-reward candidates for their skills in literacy. Flowing prose does not necessarily produce a better historical answer than a more deliberate style.
5. You will note that some questions have gaps between the mark levels (e.g. Level 2 = 4 marks, Level 3 = 6 marks). This is not a mistake by the Principal Examiner, but a deliberate policy based on the belief that there is a 'qualitative leap' between the levels. Please make sure that you don't award the non-existent mark.

- 1** Study Source A.
What can an historian learn about medical care in monasteries from this source?
Use the source to explain your answer. [6]

Level 1 **Answers which lift or paraphrase information in the source** [1-2]

I can learn that monasteries were beginning to train their own physicians (1)

1 mark for copying. 2 marks for paraphrasing

Level 2 **Makes unsupported inference(s) from the source** [3-4]

I can learn that monks must have cared about the medical health of the people (1)(3)

1 mark for each unsupported inference

Level 3 **Makes supported inferences from the source** [5-6]

I can learn that monks must have cared about the medical health of the people (1) because they began to train physicians (S). I can also learn that perhaps the care was not all that widespread (1) because we are told that only 'several' monasteries had infirmaries (S) (6)

1 mark for each supported inference

Notes:

- Inferences are conclusions which can be drawn from the source and which are not directly stated in the source.
- Inferences must be valid, i.e. they must reasonably be drawn from the source.
The most likely in this case are that monks did care, were knowledgeable, were at centre of medical care, that medical care was patchy, that it is relatively new in the Middle Ages.
- When marking, indicate each inference with an '1' and support with 'S'.

RELIABILITY OR WHAT SOURCE DOESN'T SHOW IS IRRELEVANT

2 Study Source B.
How reliable is this source as evidence about medical care in English monasteries in the Middle Ages? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [10]

Level 1 **Answers based on the date/undeveloped provenance of source (Benedict is boss, he's a saint etc)** [1-2]

I think it is reliable because it is written by someone who was an important leader in the monasteries movement (1)

1 mark for provenance or date **2 marks** for both.

Level 2 **Answers which confuse utility with reliability** [2-3]
(no matter how much detail is given!)

I think this source is very useful. It tells me that monks were supposed to look after the sick as if 'they were Christ himself'. It shows how committed they were.

OR: **Answers commenting on content (doesn't say much, unsupported accusations of bias etc)**

Level 3 **Answers which infer 'balanced position'** [4]

I think it is very reliable because it gives both the good side and the bad side. It says that they have to have a special room to treat the sick etc, but at the same time it tells us that they were forbidden to study medicine.

Level 4 **Answers which appreciate that it is the doing of it, not the saying which counts** [5]

It is all very well St. Benedictine saying this is what they should do, but it proves nothing unless they did it.

Level 5 **Answers which consider typicality (including time span)** [6-7]
OR: Answers which attempt to prove OR disprove what is said in Source B by reference to other sources

It is very difficult to know if this applied to all monasteries. This one is about Benedictine monasteries, but Source E tells me that there were also other monasteries (7)

Award **6** for bald statement (they might not all be like this) and **7** for any explanation

Level 6 **Both parts of Level 5**
OR Answers which attempt to prove AND /disprove what is said in Source B by reference to other sources [8-10]

This is true. Source A says monasteries were giving treatment outside the monastery, so that fits in with what Source B says. But they were also training to be doctors and Benedict is supposed to have banned studying medicine. So that doesn't fit (9)

8-9 Typicality and one side of reliability

8-9 For both sides of reliability

10 For typicality and both sides of reliability.

NB Contextual knowledge can be used in Levels 5 and 6 as long as a fact not on the paper is introduced.

- 3** Study Sources A, B and C.
How far does Source C support the view of monasteries given in Sources A and B? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

N.B The nature of Source C means that candidates may be more likely to find things from Sources A or B which are not supported in Source C (null – correspondence), rather than are contradicted by it.

Level 1 Answers which consider superficial/undeveloped similarities and/or/differences [1-2]

I think it does. Source A talks about providing medical care and there is evidence of it in Source C (1)

1 mark for comparison with Source A or B. 2 marks for comparison with both.

Level 2 Answers which see similarities OR differences/null correspondence in terms of monasteries' role in medicine [3-4]

3 marks for comparison with Source A or B. 4marks for comparison with both.

Level 3 Answers which see similarities AND differences/null correspondence in terms of monasteries' role in medicine [5-7]

Source A says that monasteries were beginning to train physicians and introduce infirmaries. There is an infirmary in Source C, so that fits (S), but there is no evidence in Source B to support the idea of treatment outside the monastery (N/C). Source B says that special rooms have to be set aside for treatment and, again that fits in with the infirmary (S). But it also says sick people must be treated like Christ and that is not shown in Source C (N/C) (7)

5/6 marks for similarity and difference (n/c) on one source

7 marks for similarity and difference (n/c) on both sources (where just lump two sources together, treat as one)

Level 4 Answers which, in addition to Levels 2 or 3 note that Source C CANNOT be used to support or oppose aspects of Sources A and B. [8]

.... Source A says that monasteries were beginning to train physicians and introduce infirmaries. There is an infirmary in Source C, so that fits (S), but how can I tell if they are treating people outside a monastery when all I have is a plan of the monastery?

Answers must explain why source cannot support, not just say it.

If Level 2/3 not done first, award Level 2 four marks

In marking, use symbols S (for similarity), D (for difference) N/C (for null-correspondence)

- 4 Study Sources D and E.
How similar are these two sources? Use the sources to explain your answer.
[8]

Level 1 Answers based on provenance or dates [1-2]

They are similar because they are both by modern historians (1)

1 mark for time or authors 2 marks for both

Level 2 Answers based on topic/or message. But without support from the sources [3]

Yes they are similar. They both talk about the good things that monks did in medicine.

OR Describes two sources and then conclude 'so they are similar'

Level 3 Answers which see similarities OR differences/null correspondence and provide support from sources [4-5]

I think that they are very similar. Source D criticizes the role of the monks when it says that 'the quality of medical practice during the period left much to be desired'. There is criticism in Source E as well, because it says that the 'idea that 'monks and friars were the doctors of the Middle Ages is a huge myth'. (5)

Award 4 marks if only one side is quoted/paraphrased. (ie Source D says and Source E agrees)

Level 4 Answers which see similarities AND differences/null correspondence and support from sources

[6-7]

I think that they are very similar. Source D criticizes the role of the monks when it says that 'the quality of medical practice during the period left much to be desired'. There is criticism in Source E as well, because it says that the 'idea that 'monks and friars were the doctors of the Middle Ages is a huge myth'. But they also disagree .Source D gives the impression that 'there were many physicians in monasteries', but Source E says that monks having medical skill was unusual. (7)

Award 6 marks if both sources are not quoted/paraphrased for both sides of the answer

Level 5 Level 4 answers which reach a conclusion that, in the final analysis, the sources are saying the same thing.

[8]

...but let's face it, whatever the similarities or differences, both sources are really saying that things weren't as great as people sometimes say.

They must do Level 4 first and then reach a generally positive conclusion

NB. Source E does NOT show that they used supernatural methods.

Where valid difference found in Lev 3 or 4 (as opposed to nc) mark at top of level

- 5** Study Source F.
 ‘These three illustrations are about medical care in a nunnery, so they are of no value to an historian studying medical care in monasteries.’ Do you agree?
 Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer. [8]

Level 1 Those answers which accept the hypothesis that a source about nuns can't be of any use (and perhaps explain why using common sense) [1-2]

I don't think it will be of value. I want to know about monasteries and this is about a nunnery(2)

Level 2 Those answers which state that regardless of the context information can be extracted [3-4]
OR : make general comment that if nuns did it, so would monks

It's about a nunnery, but it still tells me a lot of useful things that went on in these sorts of places. I can see sick people being cared for and food and drink being provided (4).

Level 3 Those answers that detail similarity/differences in practice in monasteries and nunneries. [5-6]

In Source F you can see nuns tending for the sick by praying and giving them natural remedies. This is exactly what monks would do too as they also believed in prayer and had herb gardens . (6)

Level 4 Answers, which in addition to L2 or L3 carry out explicit cross-reference to other sources to establish relevance of Source F [7-8]

I think this is very useful as it tells me about what a good job was done in the nunneries. I can see sick people being cared for and food and drink being provided According to Source B a special room was supposed to be set aside for the sick in monasteries. This nunnery has such a room so it was probably true about monasteries as well (8)

Answers which do this without doing L2/3 first should be marked at **L2/ 4 marks**.

Answers which simply make bald statement that other sources support or just identify which source supports without providing support should be marked at **L3/5 marks**

- 6** Study **all** the sources. ‘Monasteries made an important contribution to caring for the sick in the Middle Ages.’ How far do these sources support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use. [10]

Level 1 **Answers which do not use sources** **[1]**

Monasteries were very important. They did a lot of good work in caring for the sick.

At this level candidates just write about monasteries or monks are caring for the sick.

Level 2 **Non specific source use i.e. no supporting detail, no reference to source by letter or quote** **[2-3]**

Definitely. If you look at the sources you can see that monks had a very important job in looking after sick people in the community. They are feeding them and caring for them.

At this level candidates may talk of ‘the sources’, ‘Some sources’, or even identify sources without using the detail in them

Level 3 **Uses source(s) to support OR oppose interpretation** **[4-7]**

Yes they did. If you look at Source A it tells you that monks cared for patients outside the monasteries (Y) and Source D also says that there were many physicians in monasteries (Y) (5)

One mark for each source used

Level 4 **Uses source(s) to support AND oppose interpretation** **[6-9]**

Yes they did. If you look at Source A it tells you that monks cared for patients outside the monasteries (Y) and Source D also says that there were many physicians in monasteries (Y) (5) But Source E says the whole thing is a myth (N) and Source D also says the quality left much to be desired (N), so I'm not sure (7)

One mark in level for each ‘pair’ of Y/N used: **If a candidate uses the same source to argue Yes and No, this counts as a 2 mark pair.**

Award up to TWO bonus marks for ANY consideration of the reliability, sufficiency etc off sources (2 x 1 simplistic or 1 x2 developed) but mark must not exceed 10

- To score in L3/L4, there must be source use, i.e. direct reference to source content.
- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues covered by the sources is not enough.

When marking, indicate each valid source use for ‘important’ with ‘Y’, and ‘not important’ or doesn’t address issue with ‘N’.

Mark Scheme 1935/22
June 2005

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT THROUGH TIME

Introduction

OCR will have sent you a copy of the booklet INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS. This gives details of all administrative procedures. You should read it carefully before starting to mark. The additional notes below deal with instructions that are specific to this paper and how it is to be marked.

- 1 This marking scheme has been designed to assess candidates' skills in using sources, and their understanding of concepts relating to these skills, such as reliability, proof, similarity/difference. None of these skills and conceptual understandings can be demonstrated without the use of knowledge and information, but the testing of knowledge for its own sake is never the primary objective.
- 2 The marking scheme does not give examples of all possible, rewardable answers. There will almost always be a range of support which could be used in an answer. *Examiners must recognise and reward relevant material, even if it is not included in the marking scheme.* Just as important, where an example of an answer is given in the marking scheme, markers should not expect all rewardable answers to duplicate the example.
- 3 It is important to keep in mind that in the examination candidates have a limited amount of time to demonstrate what they can do. The skills and concepts being assessed are not all straightforward. Marking should not, therefore, be punitive. It should reward candidates for what they have managed to achieve, and not penalise them for lack of knowledge, understanding or skill.

Levels of Response Marking

- 4 This type of marking scheme rewards the level of skill or understanding displayed in an answer. The marker's task is to read the answer and identify the level it has reached. If a candidate's answer reaches a particular level, it **MUST** be awarded a mark within that level, regardless of any other considerations. A marker does not have the discretion to place what s/he regards as a weak/strong example in a level lower/higher than that to which it corresponds.
- 5 Often a level will comprise a band of marks. The marking scheme will usually give specific directions for the award of marks within a band, but where it does not, the marker has discretion to choose an appropriate mark within the band, bearing in mind the amount of supporting information used, and whether the answer can be regarded as a strong/weak example of the level.
- 6 Do not expect the whole of an answer to demonstrate attainment at the same level. Candidates may include a variety of perceptions, at various levels, in their answers. It is the highest level achieved in any part of the answer, no matter how brief, that earns the final mark to be awarded.
- 7 In levels of response marking, the award of marks within an answer is not cumulative, and neither does an answer have to demonstrate achievement in lower levels to be awarded a higher level mark.

- 8 Examples of responses which are given in the marking scheme are no more than examples. They are not prescriptive. There will be many other answers which fall within a given level. **The important aspect of each level is the LEVEL DESCRIPTOR.** Do not try to match the candidate's words with those in the example; rather, match the quality of the answer with the level descriptor.
- 9 If you come across an answer which is valid, but which does not fit into any of the level descriptors, consult the senior examiner who is supervising your work. He will advise you on placing the answer in the most appropriate equivalent level.
- 10 As a marker, your most important task is correctly to identify the level into which an answer falls. Deciding on the correct mark *within* a level is also significant, but it is unlikely to make such a difference as an incorrect decision about a level.
- 11 Where an answer merits the top mark in a level, do not hesitate to award it. There is no sense in artificially deflating marks by always awarding low marks within a level. If all markers were to adopt such an ungenerous approach, the effect would simply be to narrow and bunch the total mark range available.

Marking Technique

- 12 Half marks are never used, and must never be awarded.
- 13 The maximum mark for each question is fixed. Never transfer marks from one question to another.
- 14 You must mark the scripts in the following way:
- As you read an answer, you will come across certain passages which clearly satisfy the requirements of a particular level. Underline such material, and note in the right-hand margin the level being achieved (e.g. L2). By the end of the answer there may be several such annotations.
 - You may, if you wish, make other notes in the margin, briefly explaining why you have awarded a certain level. These will be helpful to anyone who subsequently checks your marking.
 - *When you finish reading an answer, the highest level achieved will be evident from your notes in the right-hand margin. Now you must decide the mark within that level to be awarded. When you have decided, write the level and the mark as follows in the right-hand margin at the end of the answer (e.g. L4/7) and draw a circle round it to indicate that this is the final mark awarded. There will, then, be a circled mark for every question.*
 - *When you have finished a script, transcribe the circled question marks to the front page of the script for totaling.*

Question 1 [6 marks]

Study Source A. What impressions of Robin Hood does this source give you? Use the source to explain your answer.

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| Level 1 | Gives surface details from the source
i.e. his physical appearance
<i>e.g. It shows me that he carried a bow and arrow/shows me he was strong.</i> | [1] |
| Level 2 | Details derived from the provenance
<i>e.g. he was bold/an outlaw/lived in Sherwood Forest etc.</i> | [2] |
| Level 3 | Unsupported impression(s) from the source about his character or capabilities
<i>e.g. I can tell he was very brave/honourable/daring etc.</i>
One = 3 marks, two or more = 4 marks | [3-4] |
| Level 4 | Supported impression(s) from the source
<i>e.g. It looks like he was very brave because he's shown carrying his bow and arrow and standing alert ready to deal with any danger.</i>
One = 5 marks, two or more = 6 marks | [5-6] |

Notes:

- Impressions must be valid, i.e. drawn reasonably from the source, and be about his *character* or *capabilities*. Do not allow invalid impressions based on the idea that he looks rich/upper class/posh (his clothes are those of an outlaw, i.e. scruffy)
- When marking, indicate each impression with 'I' and support with 'S'.

Question 2 [7 marks]

Study Source B. How far does this source approve of Robin Hood? Use the source to explain your answer.

- Level 1** **Can't say - it doesn't talk about approving** **[1]**
- Level 2** **It must have or they would not have written about him - undeveloped** **[2]**
- Level 3** **Yes or no, supported from source detail** **[2-3]**
[Indicate each item of support with Y or N in the margin]
 e.g. No, I don't think he can have approved because he describes how he cuts the sheriff's head off when he was lying on the ground.
- Level 4** **Yes and no, supported from source detail** **[4-5]**
 e.g. *[As L3 plus] but he did approve of Robin in some ways because he calls him 'good' Robyn.*
- Level 5** **L4 plus identifies overall approval based on tone of source** **[6-7]**
 i.e. notes both sides of the argument, but then sums up the source as a whole.
 e.g. Although Robyn is described as doing some violent things, the whole atmosphere of the source is saying 'Look at this brave man and all the exciting adventures he got up to'. You can tell the writer would have approved of Robyn no matter what he did.

OR

- L4 plus explains the provenance to claim that overall he *must* have approved**
 i.e. uses the status of 'A Gest' to argue that these stories would never have been collected together without overall approval of what the stories stood for.

Note: in L5 answers ultimately treat the source as a whole, rather than relying solely on looking at individual details of approval/disapproval

Question 3 [9 marks]

Study Source C. How useful is this source as evidence about Robin Hood? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

- Level 1 Provenance only [1]**
e.g. Useful/not useful because it's from long after, it's Scottish etc.
- Level 2 Not useful because of what it does not say/show [2]**
i.e. about Robin Hood
e.g. *It's not much use at all. It leaves loads of things out about Robin. It doesn't even mention Sherwood Forest or the Sheriff of Nottingham.*
- Level 3 Useful for what it says/shows about Robin Hood [3-4]**
Uses source content.
e.g. It gives me lots of useful information, like he had a hundred men supporting him.
- Level 4 Both L2 and L3 [5]**
- Level 5 Not useful/useful because it's un/reliable [6-7]**
These answers raise the issue of reliability, and *explain* whether or not the source is reliable, but there is no explicit cross-reference.
e.g. (i) they analyse the *content* of Source C – it is balanced, so reliable, or it contradicts itself, so it's unreliable. (ii) they claim it must be untrue because Robin never existed (but unsupported). (iii) they argue that the time difference between the 1190s and when it was written means that there must be problems with the evidence. (iv) the history is about 'Robert' Hood, not 'Robin, so doubts that it was the same person, etc.
- Level 6 Uses explicit cross-reference to other sources to test reliability [7-8]**
Cross-ref must be by explicit quote or identification of source by letter. The Background Information counts as a source.
e.g. Well, it can't be that useful because it says that Robin Hood and Little John lived around the 1190s and robbed people, but he's actually just talking about made-up people, because we know from Source E that the whole Robin Hood thing wasn't real and just started with stories about forest elves.
Note: attempts to cross-refer to 'one's own knowledge' are doomed because there can be no factual knowledge against which this source can be tested.
- Level 7 Useful because of what we can infer from it about the significance/status of the Robin Hood legend [9]**
e.g. The really useful thing about this source is that we can see how widespread and important the Robin Hood legend had become by 1521. This Scottish historian has heard so much about Robin Hood that he treats him as if he was a real person who lived in the 1190s, and includes him in his History book.

Question 4 [9 marks]

Study Source D. Is this picture reliable as evidence about where Robin Hood was buried? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Level 1 **Any answers which accept the source as proof/reliable** **[1-2]**
e.g. That's what it shows, so it must be reliable/it has his name, so it must be.

Level 2 **Undeveloped rejections of the source as proof/reliable** **[3-7]**

It can't be because he never existed

OR

Doubts based on provenance

Doubts could be based on date, or wrong name, or grave now destroyed, or distance from Nottingham etc.

OR

Nature of the picture

i.e. Doubts that it is Robin's grave, but solely on basis of what the picture shows.

e.g. I'm not sure that this can be the grave. It doesn't say it's Robin's grave on the stone. You can't really see anything specific, it could be anyone's grave, it's not grand enough for Robin Hood etc.

For each reason given, mark 'R' in the margin: a mark per reason to a max mark of 7.

1 reason	2 reasons	3 reasons	4 reasons	5 reasons
3 marks	4 marks	5 marks	6 marks	7 marks

Level 3 **Explanations of unreliability of provenance using explicit cross-reference** **[8-9]**

e.g. The gravestone is inscribed with the name 'Robard Hode'. How do we know that this is really Robin Hood? It could be almost anyone. If you look through all the sources you can see how people just used the name 'Robin Hood' for any old outlaw. This is what Source E says, so he's Robyn Hode in the Gest, Robert Hood to the Scottish historian, Robard Hode on this gravestone. It's obvious there were dozens of Robins. It isn't at all likely that the real Robin was buried here.

Question 5 [9 marks]

Study Source E and F. How similar are these two sources as evidence about Robin Hood? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

- Level 1** **Answers on provenance alone** **[1]**
e.g. They are similar because they are both written by historians.
OR
Similar because they are both about Robin Hood
- Level 2** **Deals with source content, but no valid comparison** **[2]**
i.e. no valid matching of content
- Level 3** **Not similar, because one source says something which the other does not** **[3]**
e.g. No they aren't really similar because Source E tells us that the story of Robin came from myths about forest-elves, but Source F doesn't even mention that.
- Level 4** **Identifies agreements or disagreements** **[4-5]**
e.g. They are similar because both of them accept the fact that Robin might not ever have existed.
- Level 5** **Identifies agreements and disagreements** **[6-7]**
e.g. [As L5 plus] However Source E is certain about this and is specific about the origins of the story being in English and Scottish myth, whereas Source F is uncertain, and allows for the possibility that Robin was a real person, but just thinks it doesn't matter.
- Level 6** **Recognises similarity of the importance of the legend to the audience/that the audience has created the legend** **[8-9]**
e.g. Both share the view that the important thing about the story of Robin Hood is the hope it gave to ordinary people that there was a better life, and that someone could stand up for freedom against the authorities.

- Give higher mark within Levels 4/5/6 where answer is well supported by source detail.
- Levels 4/5/6 have genuine comparison, i.e. direct matching of content. Answers in L2 may think they are comparing, but they do not provide genuine matches.

Question 6 [10 marks]

Study all the sources. Do these sources show that Robin Hood was a real person? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use.

Level 1	Answers on Robin Hood – no valid source use	[1-2]
Level 2	Non-specific source use i.e. no supporting detail, no reference to source by letter or quote. At this level candidates may talk of ‘the sources’, ‘some sources’, or even identify sources without using the detail in them.	[3]
Level 3	Uses source(s) for or against the idea that Robin Hood was real	[4-7]
Level 4	Uses source(s) for and against the idea that Robin Hood was real	[7-9]

Bonus of up to two marks in any level for any evaluation of a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc but total for question must not exceed 10.

Notes:

- To score in L3/L4 there must be source **use**, i.e. direct reference to source content, related to the hypothesis.
- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues in the sources is not enough.
- Marks in L3/L4 to be awarded on numbers of sources used. One mark per source used. To determine mark in L4, discount the *higher* number of Y/N into L3, then count number of sources remaining in L4.
- When marking, indicate each valid source use with ‘Y’ for real and ‘N’ for ‘not real’.
- Refer to the table below for allowable source use:

Yes	No
B(prov only) C D F	B(prov only) D E F

Please note: Source A cannot prove or disprove Robin existed. The *content* of Source B is also unuseable. However, Source B can sensibly be used in relation to its *provenance* (and this could be used either way).

Report on the Components

June 2005

1935 11-15 and 1035/01: Paper 1

General Comments

The performance of this year's candidates was in line with that of previous years. Many candidates demonstrated evidence of much hard work over the two years of the course. Their knowledge was sound and they were able to apply this and their skills and understanding to the questions in relevant and interesting ways.

The number of candidates studying Crime and Punishment continues to slowly grow but Medicine is still by far the more popular option. Of the Depth Studies, American West remains the most popular with Germany continuing to grow in popularity. The entry for Britain continues to fall while there was a small but significant increase in the entry for Elizabethan England.

Despite the impressive performance of many candidates, examiners were left with the feeling that there were a number of candidates who could, and should, have done better than they did. These candidates did not suffer from a lack of knowledge. Their weakness was a failure to understand how to apply their knowledge to answer the questions. Some candidates appeared to be determined to write about everything except the question. This was most evident in the most straightforward questions. For example: in response to Medicine 2(a) they wrote at length on Greek supernatural approaches, while in Medicine 3(a) there were many long and detailed answers on all aspects of Roman medicine except for public health. There was evidence that these candidates knew the relevant material because they often turned to it in the last two or three lines of their answers.

It is clear that the performance of a significant number of candidates could be improved by more attention being paid to areas such as: understanding what a question is asking; thinking about what knowledge is, and is not, relevant for a particular question, and quickly drawing up a rough plan of the answer. Candidates need to understand that examiners are not impressed by how much candidates know. Marks are gained for one thing only - answering the questions. Many candidates see a keyword such as 'Romans' and simply write down everything they know about them. This year there was another group of candidates who wrote perfectly logical but totally general and vague answers that lacked any historical detail. These answers hinted at good understanding on the part of the candidates but low marks were awarded because of the lack of historical examples.

Sort, sharp exercises giving candidates practice in asking what a given question requires, selecting what knowledge is relevant, and not relevant, and planning how to use such knowledge in responding to the question ie planning an answer, would help these candidates enormously. It appears that, for some candidates, these are difficult hurdles for which they need more practice in overcoming.

In the Development Studies a weak grasp of the chronology of the main periods, events and people, is still a problem. In Medicine, for example, examiners were interested to learn that the Renaissance extended into, and included, the nineteenth century, while the Romans and the nineteenth century were divided by just a few years. In Crime and Punishment the suffragettes were fighting for the vote in the Middle Ages. These are just a few symptoms of a general uncertainty in regard to the chronological map of the theme studied. Past reports have advocated greater use in the classroom of simple timelines and charts to reinforce both the correct order of main developments and the relative position in time of different individuals and events.

A number of candidates this year demonstrated an impressive knowledge of relevant material but failed to use it construct explanations and arguments. These candidates appeared to think that a description or a narrative constituted an explanation. Candidates should also be made aware of the fact that in part (c) of the structured essay questions at least two sides of an argument have to be explained and explored before a conclusion is reached. Even the better candidates need more help with establishing criteria on which to make judgements about the relative significance of different factors. Surprisingly, many candidates could have done much better in part (a) of the essay questions. They should be discouraged from writing down everything they know and encouraged to write concise answers that either identify five relevant points, or briefly develop two or three points.

This year's answers demonstrated fairly widespread misunderstanding of some key terms. The main examples were: Renaissance, public health, dissection and surgery, propaganda. There were also parts of the specification content that were generally not known well. These included: reasons for improvement in 19th century public health, the Rebecca Riots, prison reform in the 19th century, conditions of convicts in Australia, the Elizabethan theatre, reasons for the spreading of cattle ranching to the Plains, the reasons for the decline of the cowboy's traditional way of life, confusion between the two economic crises in Germany in the 1920s, youth groups opposed to Hitler, Botha's policy of Total strategy, reasons for supporting apartheid.

Comments on specific questions

Medicine Through Time

Q1(a) All parts of this question were well answered, particularly (a) and (c). In (a) the majority of candidates were able to infer from the source that Greek medicine was supernatural. They then used details from the source and from their own knowledge to confirm this (just a reference to one or two points in the source plus a reference to e.g. Asclepius was enough to score full marks). Some candidates then proceeded to use up precious time by writing an essay of a page or more on Greek medicine while others decided that they would explore the limitations of the source by explaining that it does not tell us anything about the natural approaches of the Greeks. No marks were awarded for this because the question did not ask 'how useful' is the source. This is one example of candidates not reading the question carefully. Fortunately, this did not affect the mark awarded to candidates because many of them had already reached the top level in the mark scheme.

Q1(b) This question was answered less well than parts (a) and (b) and produced a wide range of answers. The weakest candidates based their answers on surface features and argued that no progress had taken place because touching was being used in both sources. Rather better answers identified that both sources contain supernatural ideas and also concluded that therefore there had been no progress. Better candidates identified the methods in the sources as supernatural but then went on to use their knowledge to explain that there was progress going on in medicine during this period. Specific examples of such progress were required to take answers to a high level.

Q1(c) This question was answered well by many candidates. Most were not surprised and were able to explain why about beliefs about bad air for Source C and why flagellants whipped themselves for Source D. A few candidates thought that the whipping was to drive evil spirits from the body, and there was also a handful of

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

candidates who were surprised that people in the fourteenth century were so stupid as to indulge in such practices.

Q2 Many candidates ended up scoring 4 or 5 marks for part (a) but wasted much time in the process by writing about the supernatural beliefs of the Greeks and even about other periods in the history of medicine. Some candidates wrote general answers and only slipped in details such as the Four Humours, clinical observation and the Hippocratic Oath in the last few words of their answers. Candidates knew the basic facts but were sometimes let down by a failure to respond to a straightforward question in an appropriate way. Better candidates wrote answers full of relevant detail but wrote far too much - some answers extended to over a page in length. There was a wide range of answers to part (b). An encouraging number of candidates realised that the question was about reasons why advances were possible during the Medical Renaissance and explained factors such as the renewed interest in Greek writings, the work of artists, the printing press and the increasing use of dissection. However, there were other candidates who simply described the work of people such as Vesalius and Harvey when the question required them to explain why Vesalius and Harvey were able to discover what they did. A few candidates appeared to not come across the term 'Medical Renaissance' before and struggled. Some appeared to think that it included the work of Pasteur, Koch and Fleming. There were fewer good answers to part (c). Many candidates tended to describe the advances rather than explain why they were important. However, even a number of the average candidates suggested that the Greeks were more important because they laid the foundations for what was discovered during the Renaissance but were not able to develop this into an argument. There were some excellent answers where candidates used a comparative approach and explained reasons why the advances of one period were more important than those of the other period. The most noticeable feature of many of the answers was how many candidates knew a lot but failed to use their knowledge to answer the question. Many candidates need more help in how to construct an argument about comparative significance of factors or periods.

Q3 Some candidates managed to write a page or more about the Romans without mentioning a single example of an advance in public health. The better candidates score full marks within a couple of lines, but far more candidates scored the marks through a scatter-gun approach. They wrote down everything they knew about the Romans and picked up marks along the way. Whether these candidates actually understood what is meant by the term 'public health' was unclear. There were other candidates who clearly had no idea what the term means.

Part (b) was not answered well and in many cases there was a suspicion that candidates had chosen Question 3 on the strength of part (a) and had failed to realise what was coming in part (b). There was general ignorance of factors such as the work of people like Chadwick, Snow and Pasteur, the cholera epidemics and the Great Stink. Candidates who did identify factors such as these were unable to develop explanations from them. Some candidates explained that it was possible to make advances because conditions were so awful. They then simply described the terrible conditions of the early nineteenth century. Other candidates ignored 'public health' or 'the nineteenth century' and wrote essays about Florence Nightingale and Fleming. It was not unusual to come across answers that claimed that the Romans sailed over to nineteenth century Britain and helped them out with their public system. In (c) the Romans were almost universally hailed as being more important because without them nothing would have been possible in the nineteenth century. Most candidates appeared to believe that all the developments in the nineteenth century were the result of the work of the Romans! A lack of knowledge of developments in the nineteenth century was also a general

weakness. However, there were a few candidates who knew about both Roman and nineteenth-century public health, and were able not only to explain why such developments were important, but also compare their importance.

Q4 This question was less popular than the other two optional questions and was either answered very well or very badly. In response to (a) better candidates scored full marks by concentrating on the problems of pain, bleeding and infection. Other candidates wrote about the poor reputation of surgeons and general factors such as lack of money and ignorance. Some candidates wrote about opposition to dissection. Confusion between surgery and dissection was a problem for some candidates in their answers to all three parts of Question 4. In (b) some candidates showed no sense of period and wrote about opposition to dissection before the Renaissance while others wrote about Vesalius and Pare. There were also many good answers which concentrated on factors such as opposition to anaesthetics. About a quarter of the candidates who answered (c) appeared to have never heard of Lister and Simpson and wrote general answers totally lacking any knowledge. Many of the remaining answers demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the work of the two men and there were some good comparisons, particularly along the lines of Lister being more important because of the increased threat of infection brought about by more ambitious operations because of the use of chloroform.

Crime and Punishment Through Time

Q1(a) Candidates were divided between those who realised Source A was about witches and those who failed to understand this. A minority ignored the fact that the woodcut was from the seventeenth century and wrote about medieval trial by ordeal. The majority not only knew the source was a test for detecting witches but were also able to explain how it was supposed to work. Far fewer candidates were able to place their answers in context and explain why there was such a fear of witches at this time.

Q1(b) The fact that Source B was about women prisoners appeared to cause problems for some candidates who resorted to everyday empathy with claims that they were getting what they deserved or that they were getting away with very soft punishment. A minority of candidates used their contextual knowledge of the period and wrote about attitudes at the time towards issues such as the separate and silent systems or towards women. Some of the better candidates quite legitimately related their answers to the prison reforms of Elizabeth Fry.

Q1(c) Candidates were divided between those who recognised that the source was about the suffragettes and those who did not. The latter struggled and wrote generally about torture or about how nasty men are. These candidates were surprised that torture was still being used at such a date, or not surprised that men were being so nasty to women. Candidates who realised that the poster was about suffragettes usually wrote good answers with their explanations for not being surprised including details of the suffragette campaigns, hunger strikes and the Cat and Mouse Act.

Q2 Few candidates chose Question 2 but most of those who did attempt it produced good and well informed answers. It appeared that candidates chose their optional question well and only attempted Question 2 if they know something about crime and punishment in the Middle Ages. Part (a) was generally answered well with sound knowledge of hue and cry, tithings and wergild demonstrated. The few weaker candidates wrote in general terms about torture and brutality. Some answers to (b) contained detailed descriptions of the changes but much less in the way of explanations of why the Normans made the changes. However, there were some very good answers

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

about, for example, the desire to establish control and the need to avoid alienating the Saxon population unnecessarily.

Q3 This was overwhelmingly the most popular optional question and there was a full range of answers. In (a) most candidates had a good to reasonable knowledge of transportation, although some wasted time by writing about issues not relevant to the question such as the reasons for its introduction and assessments of its effectiveness. This sometimes meant that such candidates did not bother to describe transportation and therefore lost marks they could easily have gained. Again, the importance of reading and understanding the question is highlighted. Part (b) produced a full range of answers. For a few candidates, who clearly knew very little, the Bloody Code was simply about torture and revenge. Another group of candidates failed to answer the question because they wrote about its effectiveness rather than why it was introduced. A third group produced rather general answers on the theme of deterrence. However, there was an encouraging number who were able to score maximum marks by explaining two or three reasons. It was good to see many of the better candidates explicitly comparing the relative success of the Bloody Code and transportation. Many used the reluctance of judges and juries to convict as the reason why transportation was more effective. There were also, however, some very simplistic judgements about transportation involving claims that as everyone thought it was as good as a holiday, large numbers of people went around committing crimes just so that they could be sent to Australia where they made their fortunes by prospecting for gold. Some candidates would have benefited from having more accurate and realistic information about the appalling conditions often faced by prisoners in Australia.

Q4 This question was answered by very few candidates. It was either a refuge for the desperate who knew nothing about the Rebecca Riots, or for a handful of candidates a self-contained topic about which they knew and understood a lot. It is surprising that so little attention appears to be given to this topic as it is the kind of case study, with a strong and clear story, that candidates often find easy to remember and understand.

Elizabethan England

Q1(a) This question caused some candidates difficulties because they appeared to know little or nothing about the Elizabethan theatre. Other candidates wrote generally about problems facing the theatre instead of writing only about factors that can be inferred from the source such as no curtain, no scenery and open to the sky. However, a majority of candidates were able to use the source and their knowledge together produced at least reasonable answers.

Q1(b) Candidates who knew little tried to argue that if the Queen approved of the theatre (from Source B) then the authorities would be forced to as well. Most candidates, however, were able to go beyond this and explain reasons why, and ways in which, the authorities, did not approve of theatres. Reasons explained included: spread of disease and crime, general fear of large gatherings of people, and the political messages of some of the plays. Some candidates thought that the Puritans as a group could be taken as part of the 'authorities' and wrote answers that would have been more relevant to part (c).

Q1(c) The weaker candidates gave general answers such as 'strict people' or 'people who did not like fun'. Some of these recognised that the writer of Source C was in some general sense a supporter of religion but then decided that he must be a Catholic and wrote answers that had little validity. A good number of candidates had little trouble with

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

the question. They identified the author as a Puritan and then used their knowledge to explain several reasons why Puritans did not like the theatre.

Q2 The two optional questions were equally popular. There were many good answers to 2(a) with plenty of detail about the activities of vagrants and vagabonds. Only a few candidates were unable to score a good mark.

Some of the answers to (b) lacked specific knowledge. There were many general answers referring to them being seen as lazy, but with little sense of period. These answers could have just as easily been about attitudes in almost any period of history. Some candidates thought it was enough to simply repeat what they had written for (a) and just describe what vagrants did. Better candidates, and there were many, explained specific reasons such as fear of disorder and rebellion, the problems they caused in cities, and Puritan attitudes about idleness.

In response to (c) many candidates thought it was enough to just describe what the authorities did. Knowledge was demonstrated of the harsh punishments, initiatives taken by towns such as Norwich, and the Elizabethan Poor Law. A small group of better candidates realised that an assessment of the success of the policies was called for. When it was attempted, it was done well. A common line, and quite legitimate argument, was that the authorities failed when they treated everybody the same way and simply tried to punish everyone, but were more effective when they discriminated between different types of poor and tried to help those who could not help being poor and jobless.

Q3 Answers to (a) were either very good, and full of relevant detail, or very poor and demonstrating a total lack of knowledge. Many candidates went beyond a surface description and explained features such as 'the middle way'. It was encouraging to see so many answers demonstrating a mature understanding of the Settlement. A few candidates went too far and wasted their time by describing Elizabeth's religious policy throughout the whole of her reign. This sometimes distracted the candidates away from the question and they ended up scoring few or no marks. Questions about Mary, Queen of Scots, are also answered well with the candidates demonstrating detailed knowledge.

This year's answers to (b) were no exception to this.

In (c) there was a full range of answers. The weaker candidates knew something, but thought that all they had to do was to describe the activities of the by and Puritans. However, there were many candidates who explained in detail and with good understanding why Catholics were such a threat. The average candidates found it more difficult to repeat this with the Puritans but better candidates produced some excellent answers and were able to go on and assess who posed the greater threat. They usually chose the Catholics because they wanted to depose Elizabeth whereas the Puritans did not. There were a few fascinating attempts to try and argue that the Puritan threat was greater. These made sense, were supported, and were well rewarded.

Britain 1815-51

Q1(a) This question was answered well by a surprisingly high proportion of the candidates. A few misunderstood the drawing and thought that it was published to persuade people to vote, but most understood that it shows a pocket borough. These candidates used their knowledge to go on to explain that it must have been published to support the case for reform of parliament. The best candidates placed such answers in the context of the campaign for reform in the early 1830s

Q1(b) A few weaker candidates could do little more than repeat or paraphrase the words of the source without any real understanding. However, most were able to explain that the author was more worried about what would happen if the Reform Bill was not passed than if it was passed. An encouraging number of candidates developed their answers by using their knowledge to explain what these worries were and why they were held by certain groups at that time.

Q1(c) This question produced a range of answers. The weaker candidates either described the painting or claimed in general terms that it is not useful because it shows only one place at one time. Although few candidates appeared to know about the particular events in Newport, most did demonstrate solid knowledge of the Chartists more generally and were able to use this to challenge the impression given by the painting that the Chartists were violent. The best candidates provided examples of both moral and physical force Chartism and explained about the different ideas of Lovett and O'Connor.

Q2 More candidates chose this question than Question 3 although not by a large margin. Part (a) was generally answered well although some candidates wasted time by describing conditions in mines. Some wrote very general descriptions that could have been about almost anywhere unpleasant, while others spent more time describing the living conditions of the workers than conditions in the factories. This often distracted candidates from writing down straightforward details about working conditions which many probably knew. Fortunately, these candidates constituted a minority, and many scored full marks.

Answers to (b) were either very good or very poor. The weak candidates tried to argue that conditions were so wonderful that no reform was necessary or filled their answers with generalities with no specific facts. The better candidates had little trouble in explaining several valid reasons such as attitudes of *laissez faire*, resulting increase in costs, making British industry less competitive, and depriving poor families of money they badly needed. Many of these explanations displayed a mature understanding of the issues.

Part (c) was less well answered with a general lack of knowledge of specific reforms. Many did explain about legislation not being enforced because of a lack of inspectors, but they were not really sure what this legislation consisted of. This resulted in many rather general answers with little evidence to base a conclusion on.

Q3 Most candidates who attempted this questions were able to write full and accurate descriptions of the events at Peterloo for part (a).

Part (b), about the Swing Riots, was answered much more satisfactorily than questions on the same topic in previous years. Most candidates were aware of the issues related to threshing machines and the consequences for agricultural labourers of the economic slump.

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

In (c) Peterloo was written about much more successfully than the Swing Riots. Candidates appeared to know little about how the authorities reacted to the Swing rioters, but knew chapter and verse about the mishandling of Peterloo. The better candidates were able to go beyond the events in Manchester and include measures such as the Six Acts.

The American West 1845-95

Q1(a) This question was generally answered well. A few candidates took the source at face value and claimed it gave an accurate and useful account of the Plains Indians. However, most candidates were more sceptical than this and questioned it because it was from Horace Greeley. It was encouraging to see few candidates simply stating that the source was of no use because it is biased. Most used their knowledge of the Plains Indians to explain that the Indians were hunters and nomadic rather than farmers. There were some excellent answers explaining the views of Greeley as representing Manifest Destiny. The best candidates, and there were a reasonable number, explained how the source is particularly useful as evidence of white attitudes towards the Plains Indians.

Q1(b) There were many good answers to this question with only a small minority of candidates simply dismissing the source because of bias. Some of the other weaker candidates used everyday empathy to claims that the source proved how nasty and cruel the Indians were, and rather better answers used the fact that the old man had volunteered to be left as evidence that the Indians were not cruel. However, most candidates produced good answers by using their knowledge and understanding to explain why the Indians practised exposure. These answers were usually based on explanations related to the importance of the buffalo to the Indians, the fact that the Indians were nomadic, and the idea of making a sacrifice for the good of the whole tribe.

Q1(c) This question also produced many good answers. This is a topic which candidates remember and understand well. Some of the better candidates were so intent on writing down everything they knew that they failed to realise the question was asking about attitudes. Instead, they explained the different reasons the whites and the Indians had for killing the buffalo without getting to attitudes. This left them in a middle level in the mark scheme scoring only reasonable marks. Many candidates went beyond this and explained the different attitudes of the Indians and the white men towards the buffalo.

Q2 Although part (a) was generally well answered there was a significant number of candidates who explained the problems faced by the settlers on their homesteads rather than during the journey. Part (b) produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates appeared to have never heard of the Homestead Act and made up interesting, but completely wrong, answers. Other candidates failed to realise that the question asked about Government motives and mistakenly tried to turn the question into one about 'push' and 'pull' factors and the reasons why people went West. However, better candidates produced some excellent answers with many of these using the concept of Manifest Destiny, while others explained motives such as driving the Indians from the land, increasing the size of the Union and stopping speculators from buying the land. Many candidates knew a lot about homesteaders for part (c) but often failed to use their knowledge in the most effective way. It was common to find candidates explaining the problems facing homesteaders and then explaining the different ways in which the problems were overcome. The impression was given that all homesteaders solved all their problems. This left most answers failing to reach the top levels of the mark scheme because there was no explanation of problems that were not easily overcome or of the families that gave up and returned East. This left most answers unbalanced.

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

Q3 This question was less popular than Question 2 and the answers were generally less good. In (a) some candidates thought the cowboys spent their time herding buffalo while others used the whole of their answer writing about what cowboys got up to when they got to town. However, the majority of candidates knew a reasonable amount of accurate detail about the cowboys work and scored a good mark.

Part (b) was less well answered leaving examiners wondering why some of the candidates had chosen this question. Knowledge of the reasons why cattle ranching spread to the Plains was generally poor.

The only reason that was known by a reasonable number of candidates was the coming of the railroads. A few candidates mentioned the growing demand from the northern industrial towns but very few candidates appeared to have heard of Goodnight, Loving, McCoy or Abilene.

In (c) few candidates knew anything about the Johnson County War and answers about the weather tended to be general and lacked knowledge of the specific consequences of the years 1886-1887. Most candidates were able to connect the invention of barbed wire with the decline of the cowboys more effectively, but overall there were few good answers.

Germany 1919-1945

Q1(a) This question produced a wide range of answers. The weakest candidates who knew little about the historical events were able to infer that something nasty was being done to Germany. However, most candidates were able to relate the cartoon to the Treaty of Versailles although some just interpreted the cartoon rather than moving on to the purpose of its publication. A good number of candidates used their knowledge in a relevant way to explain possible purposes of publication, for example, to criticise the harshness of the Treaty, to blame the French for Germany's plight, and to stir the German people into opposition to the Treaty. A few candidates failed to take note of the date of the cartoon and wrote about the Ruhr which they thought had been given to France as part of the peace settlement.

Q1(b) A minority of candidates were extremely confused and thought the cartoon and the question were about Hitler. As can be imagined, this did not lead to good answers. Other candidates got far too involved with the details of the cartoon and completely ignored the context. These candidates often spent a page or more explaining how the French army was being portrayed as a woman to discredit the French and show how weak they were. Such answers then developed into essays about attitudes towards women at the time. A number of candidates confused the Ruhr with the Rhineland or thought that the Ruhr was awarded to France as part of the Treaty of Versailles. Rather more than half the candidates used their contextual knowledge appropriately and explained that they were not surprised because the Germans were angry at the French invasion of the Ruhr. An encouraging number of candidates developed their answers further by including references to relevant factors such as the industrial importance of the Ruhr to Germany and the German failure to keep up with reparation payments which they considered very unfair.

Q1(c) There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates just wrote about the problems of 1923, while other confused events in 1923 with the consequences of the Wall Street Crash. Better candidates were able to explain the contribution of Stresemann and debate how stable the economic recovery was. There were some very good answers that argued that the recovery was never sound, built as it was on foreign loans.

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

Q2 In part (a) most candidates managed to mention points such as tackling unemployment and providing strong leadership and better candidates score full marks. However, a significant number of candidates wanted to spend most of their time writing extensive answers about Hitler's attitudes towards the Jews and appeared to be unaware that he had any other policies.

There were many good answers to (b) with most candidates realising the opportunity for Hitler to deal with the Communist threat but only the very best candidates managed to suggest a second way in which the fire was useful - this was usually either as an excuse for issuing emergency powers or as providing help for the Nazis in the March elections.

Part (c) provided more problems for some of the candidates. There was surprising confusion between the Night of the Long Knives and Kristalnacht, while others just wanted to write about policies for eliminating the Jews from Germany. A number of candidates appeared to have not heard of either the Night of the Long Knives or the Enabling Act. Even the better candidates who knew something about the period tended to write only about the factor which they saw as more important and thus failed to produce balanced answers or comparisons.

Q3 In (a) some candidates did not know the meaning of 'propaganda' and wrote about miscellaneous aspects of German history. Other wrote about Nazi promises and policies rather than types of propaganda. Most, though, were able to identify a wide range of methods such as radio, marches and rallies, and Hitler's speeches.

Most candidates were able to score at least a reasonable mark in (b) by explaining about Nazis ideas about Aryan superiority. The better candidates were able to go on and explain further reasons such as blaming Jews for defeat in WW1 resentment towards Jews because of their success in business. Other groups such as gypsies, homosexuals and Communists were often mentioned but rarely explained. A few weaker candidates tried to base their answers on Hitler's personal hatred of Jews because of his earlier experiences.

Answers to part (c) were very strong on the success of the Nazis in winning the support of young people, but only the best candidates could write in detail about failure, for example, the existence of groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and Swing. A number of candidates failed to read the question carefully and instead of writing about the young, wrote about Germans in general.

South Africa 1948-1995

Q1(a) Candidates were able to make inferences from the cartoon about what was being said about Vorster but struggled to explain the purpose of the cartoon in the context of 1961.

Q1(b) A few candidates thought the cartoon was just illustrating apartheid in action, or even supporting it, but most were able to explain the correct message.

Q1(c) Answering this question well depended on having some knowledge of the Bantustans. This was rare, and many candidates simply used the surface information of the source in an uncritical way to conclude that black South Africans did benefit.

Q2 Part (a) was answered reasonable well with most candidates able to give several valid examples. Candidates struggled with (b) and tended to describe apartheid rather

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

than give reasons for why white South Africans supported it. The nearest most candidates got to a valid explanation was to say how whites benefited from apartheid. Apart from a few of the better candidates part (c) was not answered well. Answers lacked specific knowledge and were very general.

Q3 Part (a) was answered well with most candidates demonstrating knowledge of the Soweto Riots, but few knew much about Botha's policy of 'Total Strategy' for (b). Part (c) produced some better answers although too many of the answers again lacked specific examples.

1035/01 Short Course

NB The general comments, and the comments on the essay questions on Medicine and Crime Punishment for 1935 apply equally to 1035. Below are comments on the source based questions.

Comments on specific questions

Medicine Through Time

Q1(a) All parts of this question were well answered, particularly (a) and (c). In (a) the majority of candidates were able to infer from the source that Greek medicine was supernatural. They then used details from the source and from their own knowledge to confirm this (just a reference to one or two points in the source plus a reference to e.g. Asclepius was enough to score full marks). Some candidates then proceeded to use up precious time by writing an essay of a page or more on Greek medicine while others decided that they would explore the limitations of the source by explaining that it does not tell us anything about the natural approaches of the Greeks. No marks were awarded for this because the question did not ask 'how useful' is the source. This is one example of candidates not reading the question carefully. Fortunately, this did not affect the mark awarded to candidates because many of them had already reached the top level in the mark scheme.

Q1(b) This question was answered less well than parts (a) and (b) and produced a wide range of answers. The weakest candidates based their answers on surface features and argued that no progress had taken place because touching was being used in both sources. Rather better answers identified that both sources contain supernatural ideas and also concluded that therefore there had been no progress. Better candidates identified the methods in the sources as supernatural but then went on to use their knowledge to explain that there was progress going on in medicine during this period. Specific examples of such progress were required to take answers to a high level.

Q1(c) This question was answered well by many candidates. Most were not surprised and were able to explain why about beliefs about bad air for Source C and why flagellants whipped themselves for Source D. A few candidates thought that the whipping was to drive evil spirits from the body, and there was also a handful of candidates who were surprised that people in the fourteenth century were so stupid as to indulge in such practices.

Q1(d) Most candidates understood that the cartoon was published as a warning about the water although there were a few who thought it was published to show people where

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

they could get medicines from. To gain high marks candidates needed to put their answers into context by explaining why it was published in the 1860s in particular. The best candidates were able to do this in detail.

Q1(e) Many candidates struggled with this question because they failed to understand the sarcasm of the author of Source F and took it at face value as an endorsement of Pasteur's theories.

Q1(f) Most candidates managed to score a lot of marks with this question.. They were able to explain how some sources support the interpretation and how others do not. It was good to see so many candidates explaining rather than asserting. A small minority of candidates appeared to be totally unprepared for this type of question and struggled badly. Some of them ignored the sources and wrote a short essay on the role of religion in medicine.

Crime and Punishment through Time

Q1(a) Only a few candidates copied or paraphrased the information in Source A. Most were able to infer from the two cases something valid about medieval justice e.g. that they were humane and tried to take into account the relevant circumstances. A small minority of candidates concluded that they were 'soft' in the Middle Ages and that Margaret should have been executed.

Q1(b) Candidates were divided between those who realised Source A was about witches and those who failed to understand this. A minority ignored the fact that the woodcut was from the seventeenth century and wrote about medieval trial by ordeal. The majority not only knew the source was a test for detecting witches but were also able to explain how it was supposed to work. Far fewer candidates were able to place their answers in context and explain why there was such a fear of witches at this time.

Q1(c) A small number of candidates was able to provide contextual reasons for the harsh punishment of women but most had to rely on the information in the source.

Q1(d) The fact that Source B was about women prisoners appeared to cause problems for some candidates who resorted to everyday empathy with claims that they were getting what they deserved or that they were getting away with very soft punishment. A minority of candidates used their contextual knowledge of the period and wrote about attitudes at the time towards issues such as the separate and silent systems or towards women. Some of the better candidates quite legitimately related their answers to the prison reforms of Elizabeth Fry.

Q1(e) Candidates were divided between those who recognised that the source was about the suffragettes and those who did not. The latter struggled and wrote generally about torture or about how nasty men are. These candidates were surprised that torture was still being used at such a date, or not surprised that men were being so nasty to women. Candidates who realised that the poster was about suffragettes usually wrote good answers with their explanations for not being surprised including details of the suffragette campaigns, hunger strikes and the Cat and Mouse Act.

Q1(f) This question was generally well answered although a small minority of candidates insisted on ignoring the sources and writing an essay on the punishment of women. Most were able to explain how some sources support the interpretation, while others do not.

1935/21: Paper 2

The Role of Monasteries in English Medicine

General Comments

The paper seems to have caused candidates few difficulties (with the exception of the misreading of Source E mentioned in the discussion on Question 4 below). There were very few unfinished scripts and almost no evidence that candidates did not understand the questions that were set.

Having said that, there continue to be a number of problems with examination technique which mean that some candidates fail to secure the marks which their obvious ability warrants. These technical deficiencies are set out below, with an indication on how to improve performance by overcoming them.

- Candidates sometimes fail to support inferences (see Question 1). Top marks are reserved for support and so candidates should be encouraged to use quotations to back up what they say.
- Candidates often fail to address both sides of the argument when addressing 'How far' questions (See Questions 2, 3 and 4). Centres need to advise candidates to ring the word 'how' when they see it in an answer and to take it as an instruction to provide a two-sided answer.
- Many candidates do not understand the difference between reliability and utility – or how to test for reliability. A possible teaching approach might be to have candidates say 'do I believe it?' every time they use the word 'reliability' in lessons. They then need to be constantly reminded that reliability is checked by plausibility (is it likely?), typicality (does it prove that it's all/always like this) and cross-reference to other sources or their own specific knowledge (do others or historical fact support the source?)
- On the final question candidates ignore reliability and fail to find sufficient examples on both sides. A useful approach here might be to encourage candidates to prepare a grid before they answer. The grid will have room for four examples on each side, plus two comments about reliability. After such preparation, the answering of the question becomes mechanical

Individual Questions

Question 1

It is apparent that centres need to do further work on the specific requirements of individual question-types. As has been the case on previous papers, a significant minority of candidates made this very straightforward question into something much more difficult. Whilst we can only admire candidates who attempt to give full answers, a more careful reading of the question would have led to the realisation that only one side of the equation was required here. Candidates were not asked 'How much?' they could learn from this source, nor 'How far?' it was useful. So no qualifications were necessary, nor any evaluation of the reliability of the information. It was disappointing to see some able candidates draw in extensive contextual knowledge or information from other

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

sources to explain whether what they learned was unreliable/unreliable. This was not rewarded.

In this straightforward opening question, candidates had to do no more than make a conclusions (inferences) about what the source says, but which is not directly stated in it. If they supported those inferences from the source, they were marked at the highest level. For example, a careful reading of the source ought to enable candidates to make at least some of the following inferences:

'monasteries played an important part in medical care'
'monks must have had some ideas of the causes of illness'
'the level of medical care was respected by those outside the monasteries'
'medical care in monasteries was of a high standard'.

The marking for this type of question was very straightforward. Candidates who lifted information or paraphrased the source were marked in Level One (*'an historian could learn that monasteries were beginning to train their own physicians'*); candidates who made unsupported inferences were marked at Level Two (*'an historian could learn that monasteries were important in providing medical care'*). Where such inferences were supported, a mark in Level Three was awarded. The following example has two supported inferences and was awarded full marks.

An historian could learn that monks must have had a good knowledge of medicine as they were able to train physicians. The monasteries were an important part in medical care in the community as the neighbouring population came to them to use the infirmaries.

Question 2

One of the major difficulties in teaching how to analyse and evaluate historical sourcework is that a significant number of candidates continue to find it difficult to differentiate between reliability and utility. In some ways this is understandable, as the reliability of a source does affect its utility. However, candidates must learn that when they are asked about the reliability of a source, in essence they are being asked 'Do you believe it?' A satisfactory answer to such a question cannot be 'I believe this source because it tells me ...'. What the examiner wants to know is whether what it tells you is correct. Perhaps it would be of value here to remind ourselves of how candidates should be testing sources for reliability. An explanation of the hierarchy of mark scheme will show this.

Many candidates consider that primary sources are inherently more reliable than secondary sources. This is not true and was not rewarded. However, some reward (at Level One) was given for the suggestion that as the source was written at the time it *might* be reliable. Also marked at this lowest level were undeveloped comments on the provenance of the author (*'it is reliable because it was written by an important religious leader'*)

The utility/reliability confusion was marked at Level Two. Many candidates scored two or three marks by relating how useful the source was for telling us things about monasteries. Even the most detailed responses adopting this approach could not score above three marks.

A small number of candidates began to address the issue of reliability by noting that the source was 'balanced' in that it supported the idea of caring for the sick, whilst banning

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

the study of medicine. This was rewarded at Level Three. Higher marks (Level Four) went to those who noted that the source was part of a set of rules and that what was important was whether those rules were obeyed or not. The source did not tell us how far this was the case.

At the highest levels (Levels Five and Six), candidates addressed two issues:

Firstly, as they were asked about the reliability of the source as evidence about English monasteries in the Middle Ages, was the source typical of the behaviour that might be found? Perceptive candidates noted that the source was about only Benedictine monasteries and from the very beginning of the period. Perhaps behaviour was different in non-Benedictine monasteries and at a later part of the period?

Secondly, candidates looked for evidence elsewhere to support or oppose the comments of Benedict. Some candidates suggested that the information fitted in '*with what I know happened*'. This was not enough. Where they provided precise contextual knowledge on, e.g., the Church's attitude to dissection, however, reward was given.

Higher marks were, perhaps, more easily achieved by cross-reference to the other sources to consider whether Benedict's views were reflected elsewhere. It was possible to find support for his instruction to care in several sources (most notably Source A) and his objection to the study of medicine was also reflected in Source E.

Candidates could achieve full marks (Level Six) on this question either by using cross-reference to support and oppose what Benedict was saying, or by addressing the issue of typicality and 'one side' of reliability.

Question 3

This was a relatively straightforward cross-reference question and differentiation between candidates tended to revolve around the degree to which they noted the instructions that they should discuss 'How far?' Source C supported Sources A and B.

Weaker candidates gave answers which considered superficial or undeveloped similarities or differences. (*It does back up Source B because it shows some medical care and that's what Source B talks about*). Such weak answers were rare, however.

Most candidates were able to find support in Source C for what is related in Sources A and B. Most common were discussions on infirmaries, which are mentioned in Source A and the 'special room' mentioned in Source B. Many candidates noted the size of the church and related that to the importance or religion suggested in Source B.

Up to half marks were awarded for this approach. To gain higher marks candidates were also expected to find ways in which the sources were not supported. There were many valid examples of this ('*Source A says that patients were attended to outside the monastery, but there is no evidence of that. Source B says that there must be a god-fearing attendant, but that is not shown in Source C*') and high marks were awarded where both support and difference (or, more likely, non-corroboration) was addressed.

To achieve full marks candidates had to note support and/or lack of support but also consider the nature of Source C. The very best answers noted that as a map, Source C could not (as opposed to did not) provide us with evidence about the level of thoroughness adopted by an attendant, or treatment happening in areas not covered by the map.

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

Question 4

It is sometimes surprising to examiners to see how candidates can interpret sources. This question provided an excellent example of candidates interpreting Source E in an unexpected manner and therefore addressing the question in an equally unexpected way.

Source E talks of how writers at the time praised a monk's skill, '*but generally because it was unusual*'. This was a clear reference to monks not usually have the skill. Some candidates, however, read this as saying that monks carried out unusual medical practices and related these to the supernatural methods mentioned in Source D. Such an interpretation was not considered valid and was not rewarded.

What the examiners were looking for on this question was a comparison of detail to show the ways in which these sources were and were not saying the same thing.

Again, the reward given tended to revolve around the degree to which the question 'How far?' was understood by candidates to require an answer addressing both sides of the equation.

Where candidates made generalised or unspecific comments (*'they both talk about the good things that monks did'*) a low level mark was awarded. Most candidates reached Level Three by noting similarities or differences (*I think that they are very similar. Source D criticizes the role of the monks when it says that 'the quality of medical practice during the period left much to be desired'. There is criticism in Source E as well, because it says that the 'idea that 'monks and friars were the doctors of the Middle Ages is a huge myth'*). Better candidates noted similarities and differences (*...but they also disagree. Source D gives the impression that 'there were many physicians in monasteries', but Source E says that monks having medical skill was unusual.*)

Very few candidates achieved the highest level by noting the differences between the sources but arguing that the basic message was similar – things were not as good in monasteries as has often been suggested.

Question 5

This question caused few problems for candidates who, generally, are not prepared to accept that any source is of no value to an historian. The level of reward on this question tended to revolve around the degree to which support either from contextual knowledge or other support was used.

Weakest answers accepted the hypothesis as self-evident (*'This source is not about monasteries, so how can it be of any use?'*) Many answers explained how we can use the source to find out useful information (*It still tells me a lot of useful things that went on in these sorts of places. I can see sick people being cared for and food and drink being provided*) or that monasteries and nunneries were basically the same, but without explaining how. Up to six marks were available to those candidates who detailed ways in which the two types of institution were similar (*In Source F you can see nuns tending for the sick by praying and giving them natural remedies. This is exactly what monks would do too as they also believed in prayer and had herb gardens.*)

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

Highest marks went to answers which carried out explicit cross-reference to other sources to show how nunneries appeared to follow the same procedure as monasteries. (*According to Source B a special room was supposed to be set aside for the sick in monasteries. This nunnery has such a room so it was probably doing exactly the same thing as a monastery did. That makes it very useful*)

Question 6

It is pleasing to see that performance continues to improve on this final 'all-embracing' type of question. Only the very weakest answers ignored the sources and wrote about the role of monasteries in general, though there were some heart-breakingly good 'essays' on this topic. Centres must keep telling students that this question is about what the sources say and the only role of contextual knowledge is to help understand those sources.

The vast majority of candidates were able to consider the sources individually to explain how they showed an important contribution or did not do so. Where reference to individual sources was clear, and support was given from the source, this approach resulted in high marks. It was possible to use source to argue that a contribution was made (though Sources A-D were most obvious). Limitations to that contribution could be seen in Sources B, D E and F (*'it wasn't much of a contribution if the patient died!'*)

Candidates should note that it is good practice to use the same source to argue for and against the hypothesis (Sources B and D lent themselves most easily to such an approach). It is also very poor practice to group sources to argue, for example '*Sources A, B, C and D all support the hypothesis because they show caring*'. Sources must be addressed individually to show how each is related to the hypothesis.

Once again, it was surprising that so few candidates considered the reliability of the sources. Two marks are reserved for such an approach, and it is surely valid to end a discussion of Source B with a comment such as '*However, this source was written in 534AD so we don't know how far it gives an accurate picture of what went on in the whole period of Middle Ages*'

Very few candidates achieve full marks on this question. To do so requires them to find four examples supporting the hypothesis, four examples contradicting it and to make one valid comment about reliability. More candidates should be able to do this.

1935/22: Paper 2

Was Robin Hood a Real Person or just a Fictional Hero?

General Comments

Most candidates responded positively and enthusiastically to this year's paper, with little evidence of miscomprehension either of sources or questions. Certainly, average and weaker candidates found it easily accessible. However, the nature of the issue to be explored – *Was Robin Hood a Real Person or Just a Fictional Hero?* – did pose problems on one or two questions. These problems arose mainly from the difficulties candidates faced in using their contextual knowledge of a legendary figure. Some simply ignored the problem and wrote as if the legend were fact. Some attempted to evaluate what the sources said about Robin Hood in relation to what they knew about other, real outlaws. Very few were clear-sighted enough to realise that, if they were to use contextual knowledge at all, the only effective references would be to their knowledge of Robin Hood as a *legend*.

The improvements in the approaches candidates take to the questions, commented on at some length in last year's report, were maintained. Most importantly, answers have become much better focused on the specific requirements of the question, with the almost complete disappearance of copying out the sources before answering, and a noticeable reduction in the number of centres from which candidates spuriously apply every source-evaluation technique to every question, regardless of what is asked. However, this does still sometimes occur, more often than not from centres where candidates are clearly of above average ability, which suggests that they are probably following advice they have been given, rather than simply failing to understand what the questions demand. In practice, these answers lose focus, and perhaps most important, expend precious time with no additional reward. Thus, for example, on Q1, which asked only for inferences about Robin to be drawn from Source A, these candidates would be fretting about the source's reliability, or would be comparing what Source A showed with impressions of Robin from other sources. The best advice teachers can give their students is simply to give an honest, direct answer to the question, and not to try and second-guess the examiners.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

As usual, the paper started with a straightforward question. The idea of this is to provide an accessible task which will settle all candidates quickly into the paper, and give them confidence for the more challenging questions to follow. Source A provided a stereotypical image of Robin the Outlaw. Candidates were required to state what impressions of Robin could be gained from this source, and to explain how the source gave these impressions. The weakest candidates did not understand that an impression is something that can be inferred from a source, even though the source does not itself show it, and so they merely described surface features of the picture. The provenance also gave information about Robin – *he was bold, he was famous* – and a little credit was given to answers that used these points. However, the highest marks were reserved for answers which could both identify impressions – *he was confident, he was alert, he was skilled at fighting etc.* – and support these from the source. A couple of supported impressions would earn full marks.

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

I can tell from Source A that Robin Hood was a skilful archer [impression] as you can see that he is holding a bow and arrow and he is ready to fire [support]. The artist would not have shown him like this if he wasn't famous for archery. You can also tell that he was respected [impression] because of the banner which is like a scroll over his head [support]. This makes him look much more than a normal outlaw.

Examiners took a broad view of what were acceptable impressions, and anything plausible was rewarded. However, certain points were not accepted. For example, many candidates thought he looked rich, and supported this with references to his clothes. Since these looked like the clothes of an imaginary medieval outlaw, with nothing rich about them, this was ruled out.

Question 2

The key to answering this question successfully was to take account of the words 'how far?' This is an explicit prompt to consider both sides of an issue, and answers which looked at only one side – approve or disapprove – were inevitably limited. A small number of candidates misunderstood 'approve', and seemed to think the question was asking them to 'prove' something, usually Robin's existence. The source itself, an extract from 'A Gest of Robyn Hode', gave an unusually violent impression of Robin, whilst also offering plentiful hints of approving of what he was doing. At face value, then, it was possible to see how the source could support both approval and disapproval of his actions. Answers which illustrated both sides achieved a reasonable mark, but the highest level was reserved for answers which explained that the source *as a whole* approved, despite the fact that it also showed a negative side. This explanation could be done either through tonal issues – commenting on the specific vocabulary used and the overall impression of Robin given by the source – or by reference to the social context and attitudes of the time in which the 'Gest' was written. The following example illustrates the qualities required to reach the highest level:

You could look at the source both ways, approving and disapproving. It seems to approve of Robin because it keeps on calling him 'good', like 'always went good Robyn' and he bent a very good bow'. But then he does bad things like cutting off the sheriff's head without giving him a chance to fight back, and killing the king's deer, which you wouldn't approve of so much. However, overall it's bound to support Robin because that's what the Gest and the legend are all about – a hero who's prepared to fight the authorities and stand up for the poor people, challenging the unpopular forest laws.

It was extraordinary, given all the points in the source which could have been used, to see how many candidates based their answers on the idea that it must have approved *because Robin cut the sheriff's head off*. Although one cannot dispute the fact that it approves of Robin *despite* the violence, this is still different from approving *because of* the violence.

Question 3

The weakest of answers focus solely on provenance, and this is as true for utility questions as for any others. Here a significant number of candidates did not progress beyond commenting that the source was written by a Scottish historian who could not, therefore, have known anything worthwhile about Robin Hood. Ignoring the content of the source will always doom an answer to a low mark. The majority of candidates still answer utility questions by taking the source at face value and judging its usefulness on the basis of the information it provides or does not provide. By giving examples of both of these an answer can achieve roughly half marks. A better approach is to explain whether the content can be regarded as reliable or unreliable. Although such answers

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

are, in effect, confusing reliability with utility, the two concepts have a relationship, and the approach is therefore rewarded quite highly – it is certainly more sophisticated than face-value acceptance of the content. This source gave plentiful opportunities for analysis of its reliability. For example, the historian refers to Robin as ‘Robert’ – is this really Robin or does the different spelling raise doubts, either about the historian’s accuracy or as to whether they may be more than one ‘Robin Hood’? Other answers pointed out that the historian himself refers to Robin’s exploits being ‘told in song’ all over Britain, and suggested that the songs could constitute some or all of the historian’s sources, thus compromising his reliability. Any answer that pointed out that, whatever the source might say about Robin, it would be foolish to accept it as historical fact since we do not know that Robin actually existed, was placed within this level, and explicit cross-reference to other sources to demonstrate this was given extra credit.

It was, in fact, inappropriate attempts to cross-reference that constituted the greatest problem in answers to this question. There were plenty of candidates who attempted to demonstrate the credibility of the source by reference to how closely it correlated with their knowledge of the Robin Hood stories! Perhaps more understandably, other candidates attempted to prove the unreliability of the source by cross-referencing the ‘good’ Robin Hood against the exploits of real-life ‘bad’ outlaws such as the Folville gang. Since a major point of the Robin Hood legend is that he was *not* a typical outlaw, and neither was he demonstrably real, this was missing the point.

The very best answers showed awareness of the reliability issues, but were able to demonstrate aspects of the utility of the source that accommodated these issues, generally by showing that the source is evidence of the widespread appeal and significance of the legend by the early sixteenth century.

Source C is not very useful because what it says about Robin cannot be true since nobody really believes he ever existed. If you look at Source E you can tell that the Robin Hood stories were just like folk tales. But then again you could say that this is what Source C is useful for. It gives you evidence that the Robin Hood stories did not have to be true to be important. People loved the idea of a noble robber taking from the rich and giving to the poor. This idea was so popular that the stories spread far and wide, and by the time the historian wrote his book they were even thinking of him as someone who really existed. This shows how powerful the legend was to people’s lives.

Question 4

This was another question which turned on the issue of whether or not Robin was a real person. If he was, then the source could illustrate his grave. If not, then obviously it could not. The source gave plentiful hints about lack of reliability so that relatively few candidates, in the end, accepted it at face value. If they did, they could score a couple of marks at most. Most answers showed great reluctance to accept the picture as proof. However, as there were so many possible ways to explain unreliability, with no obvious conceptual or skill difference between most of them, it was decided to award an additional mark for each objection identified (up to the maximum stated in the markscheme). This example shows what was possible (the numbers in brackets identify valid objections, not the mark awarded, which would actually have been higher):

Source D is very unreliable. It cannot show Robin’s grave as he did not exist (1). Even if he did, the stories are about his life in Sherwood Forest so why would he be buried in Yorkshire? In those days that would be a long way to have to carry his body (2). Anyway, he was an outlaw so I don’t think they would have allowed him to be buried in church grounds (3). Even the source only says it was his

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

'supposed' grave, so this shows some doubt (4). And if we wanted to check this source we would be out of luck, as it was destroyed in the nineteenth century and doesn't exist any more (5).

Other answers identified even more problems with the source, but five was the maximum number to score. Some candidates used cross-reference to other sources to illustrate the source's lack of reliability. These usually concentrated on the name 'Robard Hode' in the inscription on the gravestone, casting doubt on the possibility of this person being Robin Hood in the light of versions of the name given in other sources. If well done, this was given a high mark. However, as usual, many of these attempts showed a lack of awareness on how properly to construct a cross-reference, and even on why they were cross-referencing at all! It might, then, be worthwhile to summarise the essential points of a successful cross-reference:

- A cross-reference is done as a check on the reliability of a claim made in a source. The answer needs to make this clear, rather than merely making reference to what another source says.
- The specific claim in the source that is being checked must be clear. Sources may make many claims, and examiners need to know what is being tested.
- The specific aspect of the source to which cross-reference is being made must also be clear. Vague references to another source 'agreeing' or 'disagreeing' are not enough.

Answers frequently leave out one or more of these elements, thus putting the validity of the cross-reference in doubt. Since cross-references are generally given a good mark in reliability/utility questions, whether or not an attempt at cross-reference is valid can make a significant mark difference.

Question 5

Similarity and difference questions pose particular problems for candidates. Similarity seems to be more straightforward – with regard to Sources E and F perhaps a majority of candidates found little difficulty in suggesting that both gave the impression that Robin Hood never existed. However, difference seems to be a more elusive concept. The mistake many candidates make is to assume that if two sources do not say the same or similar things, then they must be different. Their answers are full of quotes from the two sources, but they never succeed in matching these quotes to illustrate a genuine difference. What is missing is an awareness that a difference requires a common criterion to which the two sources relate. Thus, if one takes the issue of whether or not Robin existed, then Source E is certain he did not (it states he was originally a mythical forest elf) but Source F shows no such certainty (and suggests that it is not, in any case, a significant issue). This is a genuine difference. However, a statement such as the following does not identify a difference since it lacks a common criterion against which to judge:

I think the two sources are really different. Source E says that Robin's name was used for any robber leader who made his home in the forests, but Source F disagrees and says that Robin represented the ideal kind of life that people would have liked to live.

Candidates who could identify and illustrate both a similarity and a difference (as required by the prompt '*How similar?*') achieved a good mark. However, the best answers were not content to comment only on similarities and differences of points of detail, but instead focused on the overall messages of the two sources. They were able to identify that both are rather more about the *audiences* of the Robin Hood tales, than

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

about Robin himself. What they have in common is a view of Robin as a legend created by the common people to give them hope of a better life.

These sources have quite a lot that is similar about them. Neither thinks that Robin was a real, historical person, though Source E seems more sure of this than Source F. However, both think of Robin as a hero of the people, someone who is prepared to stand up against the evil laws and sheriffs who made their life a misery. They both think that Robin Hood was made up to give them a vision of something better than their own miserable lives.

Question 6

The nature of the task set for Q6 should, by now, be clear to all. It is, then, surprising that candidates generally do not do as well on this question as they might. The most usual failure is in not *using* the source content to illustrate agreement/disagreement with the hypothesis. This involves quoting that part or aspect of the source that offers the dis/agreement, or explaining what it is about the source that constitutes the dis/agreement.

The hypothesis was on whether or not Robin was a real person. Much of what candidates wrote either was not on this issue at all, or failed to consider whether the material being used could, by its very nature, offer any support to the argument being made. For example, the content of Source B (the extract from the 'Gest'), which describes Robin fighting the sheriff, cannot of itself be used to argue whether or not Robin existed. What counts is the fact that the 'Gest' was a collection of stories, so the argument must make use of the provenance rather than the content alone. Similarly, Source C is from a history book. It matters that the historian obviously thought Robin was a real person – in fact this matters rather more than what he actually says about Robin. In short, simply taking all the sources at face value, and repeating what they say, with a claim that each either supported the hypothesis or not, was not a tactic that, with this year's set of sources, worked well.

Having said that, reliability issues, which often are almost totally absent from candidates' answers, were this year to the fore. This had much to do with the relationship of the particular sources to the hypothesis. For example, Source D gave support to the idea that Robin might have been real – people are not buried unless they first exist! – and yet almost every candidate was unwilling to take it at face value, particularly as they had given the source a thorough grilling in their answers to Q4. This meant that it was far more common for candidates to score the bonus marks for source evaluation this year.

To illustrate that it really is possible to score maximum marks on this question, without having to write a particular lengthy answer, the following example is provided:

Some of the sources indicate that Robin could have existed, though they can't prove it. Source B is a good example. It's a collection of tales about Robin, which might make you think it's just fiction, but would there really have been so many stories if Robin or someone very like him had never existed at all? I don't think so. And Source C helps to back this up. The Scottish historian included Robin in his history book. You don't do this with legends who don't exist. As far as the historian was concerned Robin was a real robber, who robbed the rich and had a friend called Little John. He writes of him like a real person, but of course he might just have got all his sources from the stories, which would make him unreliable [bonus mark]. Source D is another example. It shows his grave, so if it's reliable, then obviously he existed. The problem is, the grave was destroyed

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

so we can't check it any more, which lessens its reliability [bonus mark]. On the other hand, some sources don't think he was real. Source E says he was just a mythical forest elf, and Source F says he was just an imaginary figure who represented an ideal kind of life for the people who listened to the stories.

A couple of sources used on either side of the hypothesis, with two sources evaluated, is the minimum requirement for the top mark. Few candidates achieved this, and of all the ways in which candidate performance could be improved, Q6 seems to offer the most open opportunity.

1935/03 and 1035/02: Coursework

Once again the vast majority of centres played their part in making the moderation process run smoothly. This was due to the care with which assignment annotation and marking were carried out and to the speedy and correct supporting documentation. The value of well over 90% of centres managing these requirements will always be emphasised by the difficulties that arise in trying to sort out 'the few'!

Marks this year crept up, but this was usually accounted for in progress in assignments that many centres continue to achieve in discussion with their coursework consultants, whilst others seem to have come to terms with the new specifications and have prepared students more effectively. The major suggestions that have been made by both coursework consultants and INSET providers have been the focus of tasks to ensure the objectives are met together with keeping the assignments down to a reasonable length.

History Around Us

Many moderators made comments on the quality of the work achieved in the History Around Us. As most centres devise their own assignment and choose aspects of work that are interesting and/or extremely local, it is really good to see the enthusiasm with which many candidates produce their findings. One comment that summed up the overall state of the HAU was:

The History Around Us continues to give candidates the opportunity to write much good, original history free from the plethora of web sites set up to help GCSE candidates through the trauma of coursework and doing a service to no-one.

The message is that genuine interest or a respect for the area of study achieves more than standardised assistance. Although a wide variety of different approaches to the HAU have been successful, the use of two or three tasks which involve the candidate in addressing some hypothesis about an event or site usually works best. Where the centre has taken care to combine an effective site with a small but helpful combination of other sources, the student will prosper. Many centres now use a direct task to cover the issue of evaluation, but others manage to achieve the same results with emphasis and good candidates.

The Modern World Study

The MWS has moved on in terms of quality for many centres, as they now focus on a smaller period of history or some specific historical events. Pleasingly, the range of topics has grown with Kashmir, the Post-Cold War world and terrorism all featuring. Many assignments work because they have started by addressing the key objective, to consider the role of the past in influencing the present. The greatest variation in quality emerges due to the candidates' willingness to use recent events in their assignments. Examples of this include the IRA bank robbery and McCarthy murder for Ireland and the post Arafat events. These are clearly helpful when set against others who struggle to go beyond the Good Friday Agreement. Overall, it is pleasing to see centres showing considerable initiative in the methods used to make this part of the coursework better.

In conclusion, there are two issues that cause concern with centres and moderators. The first one relates to the length of assignments. The recommendation is there for sensible reasons, but not to be slavishly adhered to. If most of a centres' candidates write somewhere around the word limit, that is very much what is wanted. It always

Report on the Components taken in June 2005

seems churlish to handicap students who go beyond the word limit through genuine interest in the subject!

Secondly, for moderators, after exhaustive tests, it can be revealed that card wallets are the easiest way to present candidates' work. Large numbers of plastic wallets can be extremely annoying and any packaging with staples can be, even worse, damaging.

Hopefully history teachers will continue to look forward in developing their assignments in the next twelve months, despite the many pressures upon them.

Short Course

Quality of coursework in the short course appears to be somewhat more variable than in the full award. There are many reasons for this, with centres deciding late to put students in for the short course, small numbers to build up an understanding of the assignment and the additional problem of having to cover all three objectives. Given these constraints, many centres achieve a great deal, but in some cases the assignments make poor comparison with the full course work.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
History A (Short Course) 1035
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
01	60	42	35	29	23	18	13	8
02	25	21	18	15	12	10	8	6

Overall

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	100	80	70	60	50	41	32	24	16
Percentage in Grade		2.9	6.3	9.8	25.6	17.8	17.5	8.3	4.9
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		2.9	9.2	19.0	44.5	62.4	79.9	88.2	93.1

The entry for the examination was 374.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
History A 1935
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Component Thresholds (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	75	55	46	37	31	25	18	13
12	75	60	51	43	35	26	17	9
13	75	56	47	38	32	25	17	11
14	75	58	48	38	32	25	18	12
15	75	56	48	40	32	26	18	11
21	50	32	28	25	21	17	14	11
22	50	30	27	24	21	18	15	12
03	50	40	34	28	23	18	13	8

Option Thresholds (weighted marks)

Option A (Medicine and Elizabethan England)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	158	139	120	102	85	68	51	34
Percentage in Grade		11.0	13.3	17.1	18.2	15.1	11.0	6.7	3.8
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		11.0	24.2	41.3	59.5	74.6	85.6	92.3	96.1

The total entry for the examination was 1023.

Option B (Medicine and Britain)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	164	146	128	110	90	70	50	30
Percentage in Grade		12.7	16.3	17.3	14.7	11.7	12.7	7.1	5.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		12.7	29.0	46.3	61.0	72.7	85.4	92.4	97.7

The total entry for the examination was 1260.

Option C (Medicine and American West)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	158	140	122	104	86	68	50	32
Percentage in Grade		8.0	14.9	18.4	18.9	15.4	11.0	7.1	3.7
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		8.0	22.9	41.4	60.3	75.6	86.6	93.7	97.4

The total entry for the examination was 15823.

Option D (Medicine with Germany)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	163	143	123	104	86	68	51	34
Percentage in Grade		9.0	17.5	20.7	18.3	13.0	9.8	6.2	3.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		9.0	26.5	47.2	65.5	78.5	88.3	94.4	97.7

The total entry for the examination was 9950.

Option E (Medicine with S Africa)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	155	138	121	105	87	69	51	33
Percentage in Grade		0.0	11.5	7.7	23.1	26.9	3.9	11.5	7.7
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		0.0	11.5	19.2	42.3	69.2	73.1	84.6	92.3

The total entry for the examination was 26.

Option F (Crime with Elizabethan England)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	156	137	118	100	84	68	53	38
Percentage in Grade		6.8	21.4	26.8	18.2	14.1	7.7	5.0	0.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		6.8	28.2	55.0	73.2	87.3	95.0	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 220.

Option G (Crime with Britain)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	167	147	127	108	89	70	51	32
Percentage in Grade		9.9	31.1	26.5	12.5	8.3	3.0	3.8	3.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		9.9	40.9	67.4	79.9	88.3	91.3	95.1	98.5

The total entry for the examination was 267.

Option H (Crime with American West)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	155	137	119	101	84	67	51	35
Percentage in Grade		3.3	10.6	15.7	17.1	18.5	12.4	11.8	6.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		3.3	14.0	29.7	46.8	65.3	77.7	89.5	95.5

The total entry for the examination was 1020.

Option J (Crime with Germany)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	161	141	121	102	85	69	53	37
Percentage in Grade		7.4	17.1	20.7	19.5	13.9	9.7	5.6	3.5
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.4	24.5	45.2	64.7	78.6	88.3	93.9	97.4

The total entry for the examination was 1957.

Option K (Crime with S Africa)

There were no entries for this option.

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	8.4	15.9	19.2	18.4	14.4	10.6	6.8	3.7
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	8.4	24.3	43.5	62.0	76.4	86.9	93.7	97.4

The total entry for the examination was 31553.

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

