





















**USING THE MARK SCHEME**

Please study this Mark Scheme carefully. The Mark Scheme is an integral part of the process that begins with the setting of the question paper and ends with the awarding of grades. Question papers and Mark Schemes are developed in association with each other so that issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed from the very start.

This Mark Scheme is a working document; it is not exhaustive; it does not provide 'correct' answers. The Mark Scheme can only provide 'best guesses' about how the question will work out, and it is subject to revision after we have looked at a wide range of scripts.

The Examiners' Standardisation Meeting will ensure that the Mark Scheme covers the range of candidates' responses to the questions, and that all Examiners understand and apply the Mark Scheme in the same way. The Mark Scheme will be discussed and amended at the meeting, and administrative procedures will be confirmed. Co-ordination scripts will be issued at the meeting to exemplify aspects of candidates' responses and achievements; the co-ordination scripts then become part of this Mark Scheme.

Before the Standardisation Meeting, you should read and mark in pencil a number of scripts, in order to gain an impression of the range of responses and achievement that may be expected.

Please read carefully all the scripts in your allocation and make every effort to look positively for achievement throughout the ability range. Always be prepared to use the full range of marks.

**INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS**

- 1 The co-ordination scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the Team Leaders and will be discussed fully at the Examiners' Co-ordination Meeting.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

1. Describe **two** examples of challenges to the power of Parliament in the period 1979–1990.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [4]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	<p>First mark for identification of measures + second mark for descriptive detail for each response.</p> <p>Note that a maximum of 2 marks can be given for correct identification of measures even if more than two measures are identified.</p> <p>All content is indicative only and any other correct examples of challenges to Parliament in the period 1979–1990 should also be credited.</p>

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Points marking	<p><i>One way in which the power of Parliament was challenged in this period was the Miners' Strike of 1984–1985. The British government wanted to close many coal mines and stop wage rises for miners. At the time the government owned the coal industry. The National Union of Mineworkers organized a large scale strike which lasted from March 1984 to March 1985 to oppose these changes. However, the strike eventually failed.</i></p> <p><i>Another way in which the power of Parliament has been challenged is the way in which Prime Ministers have tried to pass more laws and other measures without putting them to votes in Parliament. Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was accused of this and so was the Labour leader Tony Blair.</i></p>	<b>4</b>

2. Explain why, by the early 1800s, there were criticisms of the systems to elect MPs to Parliament.

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [4] AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [4]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.  No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response demonstrates a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li>This is used to develop a full explanation and convincing analysis, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically contain a range of description and explanation that is directly relevant to the question e.g.</p> <p><i>There were many reasons why Britain's system of electing MPs was being criticised by the early 1800s. One of the most obvious problems was that only a small proportion of the population could vote. A person could only vote if they owned land or property of a certain value. This meant that the majority of the population could not vote, which was especially serious as the population of Britain roughly doubled from around 5 million to 10 million between 1700 and 1800. This meant that the majority of the population could not vote which in turn led to protests.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason why the voting system was being criticised was that as Britain went through an industrial revolution workers started working in factories and living in industrial towns. Conditions in these towns and factories were often very poor and yet with no vote there was little chance for workers to make a protest or get laws changed to help them. Even if the majority of workers could vote, many of them would have no MP to vote for which they objected to. The new industrial towns which were emerging in the 1800s had no MPs. At the same time there were rotten or pocket boroughs which were either non-existent or controlled by local landlords.</i></p>	<b>7–8</b>

<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is linked to an analysis and explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically contain description with explanation that is directly relevant to the issue in the question e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason why there was criticism of the voting system was that a person could only vote if they owned land or property of a certain value. This meant that the majority of the population could not vote which in turn led to protests.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that even if the majority of workers could vote, many of them would have no MP to vote for which they objected to. The new industrial towns which were emerging in the 1800s had no MPs. At the same time there were rotten or pocket boroughs which were either non-existent or controlled by local landlords.</i></p>	<p><b>5–6</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates some knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• This is used to attempt a basic explanation, using second order historical concepts, of the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to the issue in the question e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason for criticisms was that even if the majority of workers could vote, many of them would have no MP to vote for which they objected to. The new industrial towns which were emerging in the 1800s had no MPs despite being rich and importance centres of industry.</i></p> <p><i>Some people were influenced by the ideas of the French Revolution or radical thinkers like Thomas Paine.</i></p>	<p><b>3–4</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Response demonstrates basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> <li>• There is an attempt at a very basic explanation of the issue in the question, which may be close to assertion. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.</p> <p><i>At the time there were many new ideas which influenced people, like Thomas Paine and his book the Rights of Man.</i></p>	<p><b>1–2</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

## 3. How significant a change was the Glorious Revolution for Britain?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [10] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [4]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.  No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full, well-developed explanation and thorough, convincing analysis of historical events/period in terms of the second order historical concept(s) in the question.</li> <li>This is supported with a range of accurate knowledge and understanding that is fully relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically contain a range of description and explanation that is directly relevant to the significance of the changes brought about by the Glorious Revolution e.g.</p> <p><i>The Glorious Revolution was significant because it brought about changes for Parliament. As a result of the Glorious Revolution, Britain gained a Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights put limits on the power of the monarch and protected the rights of Parliament. It also gave the right of free speech in Parliament to MPs and ensured that Parliament would meet every year. The Bill of Rights also ensured that a Protestant monarch would take the throne of England.</i></p> <p><i>However, while the Glorious Revolution brought in a lot of changes for some groups, many historians believe that the way Britain was governed did not change all that much. The monarch was still by far the most powerful figure in the land. Parliament gained the right to be listened to, but king and Parliament working together to rule the country was not really a new idea. Some historians argue that the Revolution did not affect ordinary people, it just secured the position of those already in power e.g. the nobility.</i></p>	<b>11–14</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and analysis of the historical events/period in terms of the second order historical concept(s) in the question.</li> <li>This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically contain description with explanation that is directly relevant to the significance of the changes brought about by the Glorious Revolution e.g.</p> <p><i>The Glorious Revolution was significant because it brought about changes for Parliament. As a result of the Glorious Revolution, Britain gained a Bill of Rights which protected the rights of Parliament. The Bill of Rights also ensured that a Protestant monarch would take the throne of England.</i></p>	<b>7–10</b>

	<i>However, while the Glorious Revolution brought in a lot of changes for some groups, many historians believe that the way Britain was governed did not change all that much. The monarch was still by far the most powerful figure in the land.</i>	
<b>Level 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has an explanation and simple analysis of the historical events/period in terms of the second order historical concept(s) in the question.</li> <li>This is supported by some knowledge and understanding that is mostly relevant to the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain description of events that is linked to the changes brought about by the Glorious Revolution e.g.</p> <p><i>The Glorious Revolution was highly significant because it brought about many changes. Britain gained a Bill of Rights. It was also put into law that a Protestant monarch would take the throne of England.</i></p> <p><i>There were other changes which came in as well. The joint monarchs William and Mary had to give up certain rights which monarchs had always had, such as the right to collect customs duties.</i></p>	<b>4–6</b>
<b>Level 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a basic explanation about the historical events/period in terms of the second order historical concept(s) in the question.</li> <li>The response includes limited basic knowledge that is relevant to the topic of the question.</li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points e.g.</p> <p><i>The Glorious Revolution took place in 1688. It was caused by James II's plans to make Parliament less important and to make England more Catholic. James was overthrown by William of Orange.</i></p>	<b>1–3</b>
<b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.		<b>0</b>



4. 'Between c.1000 and 1750 monarchs relied on co-operation with their subjects rather than conflict'. How far do you agree with this statement?

<b>Assessment Objectives</b>	AO2: Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second order historical concepts. [16] AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. [8]
<b>Additional Guidance</b>	Where only co-operation <b>or</b> conflict is considered, answers cannot reach above the top of Level 2.  At Level 4, answers should select examples of co-operation and conflict from <b>both</b> the medieval and early modern periods.  At Level 5, answers should deal with 'how far' in a nuanced way and reach a valid conclusion.  The 'Indicative content' is an example of historically valid content; any other historically valid content is acceptable and should be credited in line with the levels of response.  The 'Indicative content' shown is not a full exemplar answer, but exemplifies the sophistication expected at each level.  No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that remains unrelated to the topic in the question.

<b>Levels</b>	<b>Indicative content</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and thorough analysis of historical events and periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is developed to reach a convincing, substantiated conclusion in response to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding, appropriately selected from across the time period specified, that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></li> </ul>	Level 5 answers will typically select a range of relevant examples of co-operation and conflict from across the medieval and early modern eras which support a balanced argument and reach a valid conclusion e.g.  As Level 4 with <i>Overall, it could be argued that it was the successful kings and queens who favoured conflict over co-operation. Of course all monarchs did not conflict or co-operate all of the time with their subjects but it is reasonable to say that the more a ruler co-operated with his or her subjects the more successful they were.</i>	<b>19–24</b>
<b>Level 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response has a full explanation and analysis of the historical events and periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to develop a fully supported answer to the question.</li> <li>This is supported by a range of accurate knowledge and understanding, covering the time period specified, that is fully relevant to the question.</li> <li><i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant</i></li> </ul>	Level 4 answers will typically select relevant examples of co-operation and conflict from across the medieval and early modern eras which support a balanced argument e.g.  <i>Medieval kings like Edward I understood the importance of co-operating with his subjects. Although he was one of England's most powerful monarchs he knew he had to keep the good will of his barons. For example, in 1297 he re-issued Magna Carta to show his barons he would obey its principles. In the Tudor period, Elizabeth I was a good example of a monarch who co-operated with her subjects.</i>	<b>14–18</b>

<p><i>and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Her policies on religion were generally supported by Parliament, and MPs mostly supported her on issues such as the treatment of the poor.</i></p> <p><i>A good example of a medieval monarch who preferred conflict to co-operation was John. He was notorious for imposing high taxes and harsh punishments on his barons. In the end it backfired and he faced a rebellion and had to agree to Magna Carta in 1215. From 1629-1640 Charles I needed money but he refused to call Parliament because MPs kept arguing with him and criticising him. By 1640 Charles' policies on taxes and religion made the situation very tense between himself and Parliament and by 1642 Charles faced a civil war which eventually resulted in his execution in 1649.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response has an analysis and explanation of the historical events and periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and is used to give a supported answer to the question.</li> <li>• This is supported by accurate knowledge and understanding, from the time period specified, that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically select relevant examples of co-operation and conflict from either the medieval and early modern era which support a balanced argument e.g.</p> <p><i>In the Tudor period, Elizabeth I was a good example of a monarch who co-operated with her subjects. Her policies on religion were generally supported by Parliament, and MPs mostly supported her on issues such as the treatment of the poor.</i></p> <p><i>From 1629-1640 Charles I needed money but he refused to call Parliament because MPs kept arguing with him and criticising him. By 1640 Charles' policies on taxes and religion made the situation very tense between himself and Parliament and by 1642 Charles faced a civil war which eventually resulted in his execution in 1649.</i></p>	<p><b>10–13</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response has an explanation about the historical events and periods, which uses relevant second order historical concepts, and gives an answer to the question set.</li> <li>• This is supported by some knowledge and understanding, from the time period specified, that is relevant to the question.</li> <li>• <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify examples of conflict or co-operation from either the medieval or the early modern era e.g.</p> <p><i>The statement is not correct. If we look at King John he did not co-operate with his subjects. He went to war with them and had to accept Magna Carta.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <p><i>The statement is correct. The feudal system meant that nobles and the king worked together based on the nobles getting land from the king and fighting for him in return.</i></p>	<p><b>6–9</b></p>

<p><b>Level 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The response has a basic explanation about the historical events and periods in the question, though the specific question may be answered only partially or the answer may be close to assertion that is not supported by the preceding explanation. Second order historical concepts are not used explicitly, but some very basic understanding of these is apparent in the answer.</li> <li>• There is basic knowledge and understanding that is relevant to the time period specified and the topic of the question.</li> <li>• <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically demonstrate simple knowledge e.g.</p> <p><i>In the middle ages there were lots of conflicts between the king and his subjects. One example was that the Normans fought to maintain their power.</i></p>	<p><b>1–5</b></p>
<p><b>Level 0</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>		<p><b>0</b></p>

SPECIMEN

## Assessment Objectives (AO) grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	SPaG	Marks
1	4					4
2	4	4				8
3	4	10				14
4	8	16				24
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>30</b>				<b>50</b>

SPECIMEN