

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F963/01**: British History Enquiries
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1660

Mark Scheme for January 2013

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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

© OCR 2013

Subject-specific Marking Instructions that apply across the whole question paper to be included here.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	AO1a and b	AO2a
1	13–14	15–16
2	11–12	13–14
3	9–10	10–12
4	7–8	8–9
5	5–6	6–7
6	3–4	3–5
7	0–2	0–2

Notes related to Part A:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

Marking Grid for Question (a)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
Total for each question = 30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13–14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15–16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11–12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13–14</p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9–10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10–12</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7–8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8–9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5–6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6–7</p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3–4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3–5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0–2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0–2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
1	20–22	42–48
2	17–19	35–41
3	13–16	28–34
4	9–12	21–27
5	6–8	14–20
6	3–5	7–13
7	0–2	0–6

Notes related to Part B:

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20–22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42–48</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17–19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35–41</p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. • Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. • Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p style="text-align: center;">13–16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. • Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. • There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">28–34</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. • Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. • Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">9–12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. • May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. • An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p style="text-align: center;">21–27</p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. • Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. • Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p style="text-align: center;">5–8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. • There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. • There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">14–20</p>
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3–4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7–13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0–2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0–6</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The Sources are similar in that they agree that there had been invasions from Scotland in C and Wales in D. In C Malcolm took advantage of the absence of the king and in D the implication is that William was not present when the attacks were made. In both cases William was determined on revenge to make both the Scots and Welsh aware of their temerity in attacking his borders. Neither of his attempts was marked with much success.</p> <p>The Sources differ in that the Welsh in Source C were able to escape more easily from William's vengeance. They probably particularly resented the French garrisons along their borders and fought with their usual determination and enthusiasm. They made use of their knowledge of some difficult terrain and the English could not pursue them effectively. Source D, in contrast, states that the invasion of Malcolm failed and though William lost his fleet, his position was more secure than in C and he had the support of his brother, something he did not always enjoy.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both Sources are from chroniclers with church backgrounds. Both are English with little sympathy for Celts or for the looting and pillaging faction of the Welsh and Scots. They are not that critical of William, despite his reputation for lacking sympathy with the church. Source D describes him as energetic and Source C says God was on his side and implies that the loss of his fleet was unlucky and not his fault.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that the Scottish border was vulnerable as there was no Norman penetration much beyond Newcastle and Malcolm invaded on several occasions, especially when the Norman kings were in Normandy. Edgar Atheling, who had a claim to the English throne was often at his court, and his aim seems to have been to cause trouble, to project his power and possibly gain parts of Cumbria and Northumberland. Wales was a similar story with Norman rule being seriously disrupted by the rising which destroyed Montgomery and other castles.</p> <p>In terms of judgment both are equally useful for information on the respective land borders, both written in the more stable reign of Henry I and both from respected English religious chroniclers. Florence of Worcester may have been particularly sensitive to border invasions.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations, so they may be grouped according to their view. The supporting view, that the invasions by sea were the greater threat is supported in Source A with reference to 1069, and partly by Source B, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in reference to 1085. The opposing view is found in the detail of Source A, Orderic Vitalis and Source D, Henry of Huntingdon and to an extent in Source E, the modern historian.</p> <p>The supporting argument is seen in Source B where Cnut was in alliance with the Duke of Flanders and clearly assembled a considerable force. The tradition of Scandinavian invasions would have heightened the threat felt. He took advantage of William's absence and this vulnerability is mentioned in Sources C, D and E. But William was able to raise a large force against Cnut, even though he was in Normandy when the invasion was initiated and his scorched earth tactics were a deterrent to a Danish landing. In Source C the land threat comes to nothing. Also in Source A there is another immediate post Hastings threat by sea from Swein, heightened by implied English support and by the desire to avenge Stamford Bridge in 1066 and maintain the Danish claim to the throne.</p> <p>The opposing argument is that the land threat was greater and more continuous (5 expeditions in E). Source A suggests that William I was not much bothered by the threat of a seaborne invasion since he left his men to deal with it and carried on hunting. Sources C and E show that Malcolm was a serial invader who inflicted much damage, while Source D suggests the Welsh had the capacity to be a real threat given that they could retreat into 'mountains and woods'. In C Malcolm's invasion forced William to return from Normandy. Knowledge would suggest he had then to invade Scotland and force peace on Malcolm at the truce of Abernathy. Malcolm invaded again, and was killed in 1093 at the battle of Alnwick. Malcolm's threat was made more serious by the presence in 1091 of Edgar Aetheling. Source C refers to the initial part of William's counter-attack where a Norman fleet was wrecked in a storm off Tynemouth whilst counter-attacking Malcolm's forces in Northumberland. William recovered and pushed on into Scotland, later fortifying Carlisle against further depredations.</p> <p>Regarding the provenance and context, candidates could argue from their contextual knowledge that none of the invasions were that threatening. Malcolm timed his invasions carefully to get maximum effect. But he was finally defeated and killed, along with his son in 1093. The Danish threat ended in 1086 with the murder of Cnut and the Danes never fully exploited the possibilities of joining with other Norman enemies. As for the Welsh, Source D shows they could be a local threat but eventually the building of castles enforced Norman rule</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>there, even if Wales was not totally subjected to royal authority. The Marcher Lords had the real power, but they did not challenge the crown directly. Hence candidates are likely to conclude that the Norman kings were not, in fact, under threat from invasions, by land or sea, partly because of their vigorous defence of the kingdom they had won at some cost. The sources largely take a predictable point of view. Whatever the English chroniclers felt about the Norman Conquest, they did not wish to see further disruption and threats to security. Support for the Danes was limited to those with grievances already, often in the North, while both the Welsh and the Scottish king were taking advantage of the preoccupation of the Norman kings elsewhere, as most of the Sources indicate. Even the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which criticises the ravaging of coastal areas as a defence seems to agree that deterring invaders was a good move.</p>		
2	<p>(a)</p> <p>The Sources are similar in content in that they both discuss dealing with unemployment at a time when it was an increasingly serious problem. Both sources are Acts of Parliament which give responsibility for enforcement to the justices of the peace in the counties. Both sources compel unemployed people to work and provide penalties for non-compliance. Source B forces those regarded as unemployed to work as slaves to masters who identify them as such, and Source E forces some sections of the unemployed to work in farming if they are not involved in trades or crafts.</p> <p>However, the sources differ on rules for the unemployed. Unlike Source B, Source E applies to the unemployed who are to work in farming but excludes students and those with land, property or family support. It also applies to particular groups who will serve apprenticeships in crafts and trades. Knowledge might be used to evaluate ‘those aged between 12 and 60’. By that time some parishes raised a poor rate to support ‘impotent poor’ such as young children, the disabled and aged. In Source B, similarly to E, ‘unemployed’ applies to the able-bodied. However, B is open to abuse, as it applies to anyone hanging about the streets for 3 days refusing an offer of work, allowing employers an unpaid workforce on the testimony of ‘two honest witnesses’. This might be linked to its repeal because it proved unworkable, as mentioned in the steer. Similarly, apprentices are not paid wages, but in contrast are provided with food, lodging and the training required for a skilled trade. In contrast, Source B encourages ill-treatment and ‘vile’ work for those falling foul of the Act, to punish vagrants. The 1563 Act also has its flaws. Source E allows JPs to limit county wage rates. This in practice often meant a reduction in wages, implied by penalties for employers who paid higher wages.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Provenance and context should be linked to content. The Vagrancy Act in B is to benefit only employers, whereas The Act of Artificers, Source E, makes provisions for seven-year apprenticeships to benefit both the workers and the economy by prioritising skills and ensuring wages are paid. Source B may be seen as untypical of Somerset's reputation for humanitarian 'commonwealth' views, and the information on its repeal in 1550 might be seen as untypical of the ruthless reputation of his successor, Northumberland. Knowledge of low wages and inflation under Edward might be used in evaluation. Source E might be seen as more typical of the Elizabethan government's encouragement of trade and industry in context of fewer social and economic problems than Edward's reign. Some may argue that JPs showed an increased sense of duty and loyalty to Elizabeth in 1563 compared to Somerset in 1547. Source B may be seen as untypically vicious compared with Source E, as Edward's minority was a time of particular instability and unrest compared to the reign of Elizabeth. A substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources may be grouped by interpretation. Sources A and C argue that the ruling classes are to blame, whereas Sources B, D and E disagree. Sources B, to an extent D and to a lesser extent A suggest that many of the unemployed are workshy and employers fear even those who are blameless. Sources D and E suggest that the ruling classes wished to provide employment and decrease the numbers of vagrants.</p> <p>Sources A and C agree that the rich have turned poor men out of their homes, A in the countryside and C in London. In Source A, royal land grants to the gentry, rack renting and high entry fees are the reason for their eviction, forcing them to turn to crime. This might be set in context of social change after the Dissolution of the Monasteries. Source C stresses not only eviction, but the loss of charity and alms houses. Both suggest that greedy landlords are to blame for their destitution when no social support was available and few parishes had yet established an effective poor relief system, especially for the able-bodied poor.</p> <p>Provenance might be used to aid evaluation of blame. The author of Source A calls himself 'a poor craftsman' and travels throughout the country, so has first-hand experience which will be useful as evidence. His audience is Henry VIII himself and his purpose to alert him to the failure of existing laws. It may be inferred that his own livelihood was under threat due to depopulation of the villages which were markets for his goods. He has sympathy with the poor and takes their side against the ruling classes. The author of Source C is an educated Protestant clergyman, a humanitarian and commonwealth supporter who wishes to improve</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>England's prosperity. He takes a strongly moral tone towards the uncharitable attitudes of the rich, their greed and lack of pity for the unemployed poor. He uses the literary form of poetry and the mouthpiece of a merchant to deflect personal criticism, a common 16C literary style. His experience is indirect and subjective, and his poem is dated soon after the 1549 rebellions, the fall of Somerset and rise of Northumberland, a time of untypical crisis. The tone of the two Sources (A and C) is similar and both are useful personal views, but the author of C has a more authoritative status and will reach a wider literary and religious audience.</p> <p>A counter argument defends the actions of the ruling classes. Sources D and E suggest schemes to provide work and increase employment, though liberty and mobility of labour are undermined by E in a similar way to B. It might be inferred that such proposals took a long time to implement, from the time lapse of 11 years between D and E. The limits placed on wages make Source E a flawed solution. Source B was difficult to implement, as justices of the peace refused to enforce the Vagrancy Act, while Source E was enforced, depressing wages at a time of inflation and population rise. Source E might be set in the more prosperous context of peace and new trade routes under Elizabeth.</p> <p>Alternative arguments blame the unemployed themselves and circumstances beyond the control of the ruling classes. Sources B mentions those 'lurking like a beggar' or 'idly wandering the streets'. Sources B and E suggest that local authorities oversaw the labour market. The steer to B, together with the content of A and D, give evidence that statutes had been issued to try and provide work. The provenance of Source D is broader, ie citizens of London, who, like Crowley in C, wish to improve prosperity. Knowledge of the circumstances of the collapse of the Antwerp wool market in 1551, bad harvests and disease might help explain this failure. Source D mentions the impact of wars and sickness. Source E represents the state intervening in what had previously been a guild system so attempting to overcome hindrances to its intervention.</p>		<p>A supported overall judgement is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious context. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>The Sources are similar in content as both provide rules for managing money to defend the counties. In Source A the tax is to go towards paying royal forces to defend the county and city of Worcester, while in Source B the tax is to pay forces to suppress rebels and maintain garrisons to protect the counties of Berkshire Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire. Both Sources give the local inhabitants a role in deciding the rate and collecting the tax: in Source A, the amount is to be assessed by ‘four or more inhabitants of every parish or village in the county’ according to the usual rate and, similarly, in Source B local Committees have ‘the power to tax their counties at a level they can all pay’.</p> <p>However, the Sources are markedly different in the types of revenues to be managed. Source A refers to the contribution, a Royalist tax declared only on the authority of Charles I, without Parliament’s consent. The introduction to Source A suggests that memories of ship money might cause resistance to the contribution. In contrast, Source B refers more broadly to revenues declared by Parliament’s Ordinances, which include voluntary loans, Parliamentary contributions and weekly assessments. The Sources differ on the processes by which revenues are managed. Source A specifies the continuation of the existing local management system, using the High Constables and the county High Sheriff under the auspices of the Justices of the Peace of the individual county of Worcestershire. In contrast, Source B groups the three counties of Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire into an Association, so that their Committees may raise taxes jointly. The amount of the revenue is decided differently, with continuity in Source A and change in Source B. In Source A, the King specifies that Worcester shall raise £3000 a month, according to the usual rates of payment. In contrast, the Association Ordinance, Source B, allows the Committees to tax their counties at a level they can all pay, not exceeding £400 week. Source B differs in allowing the Committees to confiscate (sequester) Royalist and Catholic property. The provisions for spending the revenue also differ: Source A is hierarchical and traditional, whereas Source B is novel, collaborative and more democratic. Source A implies that the Justices of the Peace shall oversee the spending of the revenue, whereas Source B allows the appointment of a Treasurer who will spend the revenue according to a majority vote of the joint Committees. Thus, Parliamentary counties are more accountable to their local communities within a national management structure controlled from London, while royalist counties continue the system of Justices of the Peace being accountable to the King.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Provenance and contextual knowledge might be integrated into the comparison. While the author of Source A is King Charles I, the authorship of Source B is Parliament. It might be known that Worcestershire in Source A, had a strategic position for access to Royalist headquarters not far away at Oxford, and that Parliamentary forces had retreated from Worcestershire in 1642. The 3 counties associating in Source B were the main theatres of war. Oxford was besieged and Oxfordshire was central to the war; John Pym was born in Buckinghamshire, which was predominantly parliamentarian with some pockets of royalists. Berkshire lay directly between London and Oxford, and experienced the first and second Battles of Newbury and the continual presence of royalist or Parliamentary garrisons in its towns and castles during 1643–44. It may be judged that Source B is the better evidence as its content is an ordinance passed by Parliament rather than a royal declaration. It might be seen as more transparent and informative. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources are likely to be grouped by interpretation. Sources E and B support the interpretation that Parliament was organised and ruthless in managing supplies in comparison to the King. Both Sources B and E concern Parliamentary-controlled areas and are useful evidence of the efficient organisation and collection of supplies. In Source B individual county power structures have given way to collaboration between county committees in Associations. Realistic levels of tax are to be fixed collaboratively so that collection is effective and resistance minimised. This point might be developed by linking to Source E, where Parliament forces efficiently organise the seizure of weapons and horses as well as money for use by Parliamentary troops.</p> <p>Parliament's effective organisation may be compared with the inefficiency of royalist organisation of supplies, cross-referencing with Sources D and to an extent C. It might be argued that Source A gives evidence of some Royalist efficiency in organising supplies in the county and city of Worcester, which may be typical of Royalist-held counties as a whole. In evaluation, it might be inferred that detail is limited in Source A. The Source might be used at face value to argue in favour of royalist efficiency by suggesting that the King used a supply system which had worked effectively prior to the 1630s. However, this view might be evaluated in light of resistance, using knowledge that financial expedients of the Personal Rule damaged the reputation of the King and his officials, linking to Source C's comment that people 'previously distrusted your Majesty'. Source D to an extent agrees that the royalist system raises money effectively – 'orders have been issued to spend the weekly rates', but Sir Richard</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Grenville complains of ineffectiveness of local commissioners in managing resources. He claims they hinder his military role in blockading Plymouth in the hope of taking his power away. Knowledge might include royalist problems in blockading ports controlled by Parliament in the attempt to gain access to trade revenue which gave Parliament superior resources. As for provenance, Grenville’s fears might reflect the insecurity felt by royalist aristocrats under attack in what they may have seen as a class war, so may not be fully reliable.</p> <p>Both sources are also useful evidence for Parliament’s ruthlessness in managing supplies. Davenport, in Source E, seems dismayed by the injustice of the Chief Commissioner’s broken promises as he considers himself a neutral. He suggests Parliament is ruthless as well as efficient. His case was fairly typical, supporting the view that Parliament’s instructions in Source B were followed ruthlessly and perhaps sometimes unjustly. Papist and royalists (‘delinquents’ as stated) are singled out for harsh treatment including property confiscation.</p> <p>In contrast, Davenport says that Rupert merely ‘ransacked’ an already depleted house. The provenance of Source E might be evaluated for reliability or use, being Davenport’s private journal, which could be used for a property claim when the war ended. Source C also makes a personal complaint about the ruthlessness of one high-handed officer, who is claimed by the authors to have undermined the authority of royal commissioners by extorting unwarranted taxes which the county could not pay. His actions are claimed to have undermined management of the King’s supplies. The later date of Sources C and D suggest that resources have become more difficult to provide, in royalist areas at least.</p> <p>Grenville’s purpose in Source C might be to deflect blame in case of military failure, exaggerating his problems for a sympathetic audience, fellow aristocrat Lord Colepepper. The tone of his complaints suggests personal and class animosity by both sides: he considers the local commissioners ‘slow-witted’, with ‘very earnest desire to destroy my former authority’. Thus they may not have been as ineffective as he suggests. The commissioners in Source D blame Leveson for undermining their authority and aim to divert the responsibility for inadequate supply. Both Sources C and D are evidence for poor organisation and cooperation between royalist officials and army commanders. The King’s resources are squandered. On the other hand, Parliament’s system, based on a distribution of power, encouraged co-operation and efficiency. Knowledge of the strengths of the Parliamentary Army might also be seen as a factor in efficient management of supplies.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Sources B and C might be cross-referenced for a further view concerning the regional chances of managing supplies, in light of the relative prosperity of areas each side controlled. The introduction to Source B states that Parliament held London, which ‘was to raise £10,000 a week’. In contrast, the opening line of Source C calls Royalist-held Staffordshire a ‘poor and wasted county’. Thus Parliament’s effective organisation of supplies came from the more prosperous areas under their control, and this might be seen to qualify the value of these Sources for the interpretation. Knowledge might be used to explain that control of London enabled a centralised system and allowed Parliament to assume the semblance of a legislative body, whereas authority in disjointed royalist areas depended on Source A’s ‘absolutist’ style. Evaluation of context and provenance should be integrated into the argument. Knowledge of the theatres of war and areas controlled by the two sides need not be detailed or extensive even for the higher levels of the mark scheme, but there should be a sense of context, for example in relation to key areas such as London and Oxford.</p> <p>A supported overall judgement is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of knowledge and Source limitations. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</p>		

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@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 2013

