

A LEVEL
Candidate Style Answers

HISTORY A

H505
For first teaching in 2015

Unit 1 Enquiries Question

Version 1



Contents

Introduction	3
Y102 Anglo Saxon England and the Norman Conquest	4
High level answer	4
Medium level answer	5
Y106 The Early Tudors and Y107 The Later Tudors	6
High level answer	6
Medium level answer	7
Y108 The Early Stuarts	9
High level answer	9
Medium level answer	10
Y109 The Making of Georgian Britain 1678-c. 1760	11
High level answer	11
Medium level answer	12
Y110 From Pitt to Peel	13
High level answer	13
Medium level answer	14
Y111 Liberals, Conservatives, and the Rise of Labour and Y112 England and a New Century	15
High level answer	15
Medium level answer	16
Y113 Britain 1930-1997	17
High level answer	17
Medium level answer	18

Introduction

OCR has produced these candidate style answers to support teachers in interpreting the assessment criteria for the new GCE History A specification and to bridge the gap between new specification release and availability of exemplar candidate work.

This content has been produced by senior OCR examiners, with the support of the Subject Specialist, to illustrate how the sample assessment questions might be answered and provide some commentary on what factors contribute to an overall grading. The candidate style answers are not written in a way that is intended to replicate student work but to demonstrate what a **'HIGH LEVEL'** or **'MEDIUM LEVEL'** response might include, supported by examiner commentary and conclusions.

As these responses have not been through full moderation and do not replicate student work, they have not been graded and are instead, banded to give an indication of the level of each response.

Please note that this resource is provided for advice and guidance only and does not in any way constitute an indication of grade boundaries or endorsed answers.

Y102 Anglo Saxon England and the Norman Conquest

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that William II 'Rufus' was totally ruthless in dealing with opposition to his rule.

High level answer

Only Source C does not support the view that William Rufus was totally ruthless in dealing with opposition to his rule, although Source B is more implicit in its support with its comments about the actions of his bishop, whilst Source D partly supports the view in its comments about his military prowess. Source A argues the most strongly that he was ruthless.

Source A strongly supports the view that Rufus was ruthless in dealing with opposition to his rule, making reference to his 'vengeance' and use of 'severe penalties', whilst turning a blind eye to the guilt of others. However, the writer does accept that he was more sparing towards the elderly who had served his father, but it then says that was only because they would soon die. Written by an English monk, who lived in Normandy, Oderic Vitalis had a reputation for chronicling events and there does not appear to be any reason why he would not report what he believed to be the truth. His views are further supported by the situation in which William found himself; he was faced by an alliance of magnates who wanted to restore Robert, Rufus' brother to the throne and therefore to maintain his position Vitalis is correct that he had to be ruthless.

Sources B and D partly support the view that Rufus was ruthless. B focuses on the actions of the Bishop of Durham, Ranulph, against whom, according to Peter of Blois 'no one who dared in any way to murmur against his words or deeds' and that he was 'most cruel' and 'woefully oppressed the whole kingdom'. It is likely that Ranulph was simply following instructions as the source argues that he was William's special adviser, suggesting William was ruthless and this is given some support in the source as it states that William 'conquered all his adversaries'. Although it was written by a poet, who might be accustomed to exaggerating, there is no reason to doubt his reliability, particularly as his view of Ranulph appears to be supported by the fact he was hated for being corrupt. D also partly supports the view as it discusses the military skill of William in banishing rebels. However, it must be remembered that this would have been the accepted way for a king to deal with rebels at the time. However, the source also suggests that he was not totally 'ruthless' as 'redistributed to the men who were loyal to him lands he had confiscated from the disloyal'. Not only was he ruthless, but as with most monarchs of the time he realised that he had to be pragmatic and build up a support base and the Source shows that he mixed the two elements in ensuring his authority, even restoring the rights of hunting and forests to them.

Source C, on the other hand, does not show William to be ruthless in his treatment of opposition, but offered appeasement and reform. Instead the source shows William 'explaining 'his need to them' and asking them for help and in return promising them 'the best law that there had ever been in this country'. According to the Source this appeal worked as they came to his aid. However, although the Source argues that William used diplomacy to build up support to defeat Odo, ultimately he did use the pressure of force to ensure that his uncle left England and returned to Normandy because he was a supporter of William's brother, Robert, who wanted to claim the English throne. Although this appears in the Anglo Saxon Chronicle, which is a key source for the period, it must be remembered that it went through many revisions, so its accuracy can be questioned.

The sources do suggest that Rufus was, if not totally ruthless, very ruthless in his dealings with opponents. He used advisors who were willing to uphold this approach, as seen in Source B, and even when he did use other tactics it was to give the power to enforce his will. However, it must also be remembered that not only were monarchs of this period expected to resort to force, he faced a strong threat to his throne from his brother.

Examiner commentary

- The answer is well focused not just on 'ruthless' but 'totally ruthless' and does draw a distinction between the two. The provenance of the sources is evaluated, although with Source D it could be developed. Own knowledge is used to support or challenge the views in the Sources so that a balanced judgement about the view of the sources on the issue in the question is reached.

Medium level answer

Source A certainly agrees that William was ruthless in dealing with opposition as it mentions him taking vengeance and imposing severe penalties on rebels. However, it does also say that he spared some of the older rebels, but it also says that this was only because he knew that they would soon die. In many ways the view in A is correct as William had little choice but to be harsh to those who opposed him if he was to prevent his brother, Robert, from taking the throne from him. The source also suggests that his policy worked as some who had been disloyal were so concerned by the punishments he gave that they changed and supported him.

Source B suggests that William was able to bring his enemies under control and this also suggests that he might have been ruthless, particularly as it says that there was 'no one who dared in any way to murmur against his words'. More importantly, it also argues that his special adviser, the Bishop of Durham was 'most cruel' and 'woefully oppressed the whole kingdom'. As he was William's special adviser it is likely that he was doing what William wanted and agreed with, suggesting once more that William supported such tactics. This view of Bishop Ranulph appears accurate as he had a reputation for being cruel.

Source C does not agree with the view that William was ruthless. The Source argues that, despite treachery against him William followed a policy of appeasement and reform to win their support, promising the best laws and the end to unjust taxes. However, it also argues that such a policy did not last, but it did win him support and allowed him to remove Odo who had been supporting Robert and force him to return to Normandy. Therefore it can be argued that although William raised forces to deal with threats, he won support by negotiation and promises, although they were not always kept as happened with the Forest Law.

Source D only partially supports the view that he was ruthless. He did set out to crush those who opposed him, as happened to Gilbert Fitzrichard, but he accepted his submission and did not punish him. Further force was used to deal with Odo and Mortain, as well as Durham, suggesting that force and suppression were the methods he used to put down unrest, but this was expected of a medieval monarch and he would have been seen as weak had he not acted in this way. However, the source also argues that although he was ruthless in driving out those rebels who opposed him, he was not totally ruthless because he 'redistributed to the men who were loyal to him lands he had confiscated from the disloyal', further suggesting he behaved as expected. William was careful to reward some who were loyal because he needed support to stop the challenge of his brother, Robert, from Normandy and therefore the argument of the source appears to be reliable.

William faced a serious challenge to his position from Robert of Normandy and therefore the sources that argue he was ruthless towards the rebels who supported Robert is, at least in part, valid. It might also be argued that he was ruthless because made promises about reform, which were not always kept, as Source C suggests. It can therefore be concluded that William was often ruthless in order to secure his position.

Examiner commentary

- The response is focused on the idea of 'ruthless' and examines the view of each source about the issue. Some contextual knowledge is used to explain all of the sources, although it could be developed and more precise. What is absent is the consideration of the provenance of the Sources, which are accepted at face value and this will prevent the response from being awarded more than medium band.

Y106 The Early Tudors and Y107 The Later Tudors

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that female rule was a serious problem in the 1550s.

High level answer

Sources D and C suggest that female rule could be a serious problem, whereas Sources A and B do not consider it a serious problem, with Source A more concerned about the question of legitimacy, whilst Source B does not see female rule as a problem because, according to Mary Tudor, her subjects promised to obey her at her coronation.

Source D appears to offer the strongest argument that female rule was a serious problem. Knox argues that female rule was 'unnatural and insulting to God' and subverts 'good order and justice'. Written in 1558 it could be argued that there was some validity to Knox's view as he had experience of the reigns of both Mary Tudor in England and Mary Queen of Scots and neither appeared to have brought stability to their countries. England had witnessed unrest in 1554 with Wyatt's rebellion and Mary Queen of Scots was driven out of Scotland. However, it is unlikely that Knox's view was typical of views in England as many, particularly those of a Protestant or reformist outlook supported Elizabeth. Moreover, many most expected Elizabeth to marry and therefore Knox's concerns in his last sentence that as a ruler her 'sight is blindness', 'strength, weakness', 'advice, foolishness' and 'judgement, frenzy' would not have applied as she would be guided by her husband.

Although Source C appears to suggest that female rule could be a serious problem given the need for Parliament to pass an Act of Parliament for a marriage treaty between Mary and Philip, it could also be argued that as Parliament was able to limit Philip's power in England it was less of an issue. There were obviously concerns about a female ruler being dominated by their husband, particularly a foreigner and one as powerful as Philip, hence the restrictions placed on his power with the Queen having 'total control of all offices, lands and revenues, and grant them to natural born Englishmen.' The Source also makes it clear that Parliament was concerned about being dragged into wars because of the marriage and again took measure to ensure this would not happen. However, despite the treaty England was drawn into war against France and Spanish influence did become a problem, suggesting that even with the Act female rule was a problem. Parliament might impose detailed restrictions, as Source C shows, but the problem was enforcing them. Therefore, although Parliament might attempt to impose restrictions, in practice they did not work, suggesting it was a serious problem.

However, Sources A and B are less concerned about the problem of a female ruler. Source A's focus is on the problem of the legitimacy of the ruler. The Devises is more concerned about the legitimacy of Mary and Elizabeth, although it also acknowledges the problems there would be if either came to the throne and married a foreigner as he would 'practise his own country's laws' and 'subvert the commonwealth of this our realm'. However, the source has greater concerns than a female ruler as Lady Jane Grey is put forward as a possible heir, and when the Devises was later altered she was actually named as heir. However, the Source was written either by Northumberland, who had personal reasons to exclude Mary and Elizabeth so as to maintain his influence, or was written by Edward who, for religious reasons wanted to exclude Mary so that Protestantism would continue. This therefore raises questions about its reliability as its purpose was to justify excluding Mary and Elizabeth. Similarly, Source B does not see female rule as a problem, but the Source was written by Mary herself and was designed to rally support for her when she was under threat from Wyatt's rebellion. According to the Source female rule was not a problem as not only had the people sworn at her coronation to 'obey me', but she also argues that 'we shall speedily overthrow these rebels', suggesting that even with a female ruler a rebellion could easily be put down. The Source also challenges the view in Source D that a woman ruler was the equivalent of the weak leading the strong as in this instance it is Mary who is being strong and disregarding the Council's advice to leave London. There is also some justification in Mary's words as her speech did much to rally support and Wyatt was stopped soon after this speech at the gates of the city, suggesting that one of the concerns about female rulers – namely the problem of dealing with unrest – was unjustified. However, one of the causes of the rebellion was Mary's decision to marry and as Source C shows there were problems in having a female ruler as she was expected to marry but there was the problem of who she should marry and limiting their power.

The Sources suggest that there were potential problems of having a female ruler, not simply as Source D argues because it was unnatural but because of who they should marry and the powers that the husband would have. However, as Source A suggests there were other problems, such as legitimacy which were also a concern and probably more so as it allowed Lady Jane to be named as a possible heir. The support there was from many for Elizabeth also suggests that D exaggerates the concerns about female rulers.

Examiner commentary

- The response is focused on the question of a 'serious problem' and reaches an overall judgement as to whether the Sources support the view. The Sources are evaluated and own knowledge is used to place them in context and evaluate the views they offer. The response is driven by the sources and their provenance is fully considered in reaching a judgement about their reliability. The response would reach the lower end of Level 6.

Medium level answer

The Sources offer different views about how serious the problem of a female ruler was in the 1550s. Source A suggests that it was not a serious problem, even though Edward excludes both Mary and Elizabeth. Source B shows that even if there were problems such as rebellion a Queen could stand up to the threat. Source C suggests that it was not a problem as the power of the monarch's husband could be limited. Source D does see female rulers as a problem.

The problems there were during Mary's reign suggest that female rulers were a problem. There was faction fighting in her council as Mary was unable to control it and there was unrest in the country because Mary married Philip of Spain. Parliament was concerned about this and tried to dissuade her, whilst there was a serious rebellion, Wyatt's, which came close to overthrowing her. This rebellion could have been even more serious if the other three-prongs of the rebellion had risen and if Wyatt had headed straight for London before defences were prepared.

Source A argues that a female ruler could be a problem, particularly if the monarch married a foreigner who would follow his own country's rules and therefore ignore or override the laws of England. However, the reliability of this source has to be questioned as it is written by Edward to justify excluding Mary and Elizabeth and he was trying to find a good reason to disinherit them. This becomes even clearer at the end as it does not exclude the possibility of Lady Jane Grey coming to the throne.

Source B shows Mary in a strong light and suggests that she is a strong ruler who can defeat rebellion. However, the source was written by Mary and she is trying to rally London against Wyatt's rebellion and therefore she wants to appear strong. She calls on her subjects to remember the promise they made to obey her, which might suggest some had forgotten it and that her position was weak. However, the Source shows her skill at rallying the City and suggests that being a female ruler did not mean there were problems.

Source C can be argued either way. The fact that Parliament passed a treaty limiting the powers of Philip suggests that they were concerned about a female ruler being able to control their husband, on the other hand, as Parliament was able to limit his powers quite strictly it might also be argued that it should not be seen as a problem. The source shows the powers that Parliament had and how it was able to act to limit the power of a female ruler's husband.

Source D is very clear that the rule of a female posed very serious problems. Knox saw female rule as 'an insult to God' and 'the subversion of good order and justice'. The very title of his book shows how he viewed female rulers, but it should be remembered that Knox had experienced the rule of Mary Queen of Scots and that it had been a disaster, with civil war and unrest in Scotland and he was also aware of the problems Mary Tudor had faced and this may have resulted in this view.

Some of the sources show that female rule did present difficulties, but not all and this suggests that female rule could be a problem but that it might not always be serious.

Examiner commentary

- There is focus on the question and the answer does try and link the material to the question, but the own knowledge although accurate and relevant is not used to evaluate the sources and is discrete. There is some consideration of the provenance of the sources and some discussion of the views of the sources in relation to the question, with realization that some could be used to support either view. As a result this response would be on the cusp of Levels 3 and 4.

Y108 The Early Stuarts

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that the policies of Cromwell's Protectorate were designed to heal divisions.

High level answer

Sources A and C clearly put forward the view that the policies of the Protectorate were designed to heal the divisions created by the Civil Wars. Source D also suggest that the aim, although it argues it had failed, was to heal the divisions. However, Source B, focusing on the rule of the Major Generals does not suggest that the aim was to heal divisions, but rather to impose a strict moral order.

Source A, The Instrument of Government, does show an attempt to heal one of the major causes of division, namely that of religion as it states that 'no-one shall be compelled by penalties to accept the official faith' and that those who differ in their beliefs will be 'protected in the exercise of their religion', whilst laws that go against this are null and void, although it does make an exception for Catholics. This view is supported by Cromwell's desire for religious toleration which, in practice, was extended to all Protestants, Catholics and even Jews, although it could be argued that in practice toleration did not always occur as was shown by the case of James Nayler. It must also be remembered that the Instrument was designed to bring about a constitutional settlement and does not take account of the actual policies introduced by the Protectorate, which did not always aim at healing divisions, as can be seen with the introduction of the Decimation tax.

The view of healing divisions appears to be reinforced by Source C as it argued that the Major General were introduced to heal the divisions after Penruddock's royalist rising, also arguing that their concern was for peace. However, the very fact that Cromwell admits that the Major Generals went beyond the law and were hardly under the control of parliament mans that in reality were likely to be divisive, rather healers of division. Moreover, Cromwell's view about the purpose of the Major Generals needs to be treated with caution as he was attempting to justify their rule and therefore would present them as healing divisions. These doubts about the healing nature of their rule is reinforced by popular reaction to them and the view that their rule was little more than a military dictatorship as is seen in Source B.

Source D supports the view that the aim of the Protectorate had been to heal divisions but Cromwell, writing towards the end of the period, acknowledges that both the Protectorate Parliaments and the Major Generals had failed in this aim and this is further reinforced by the rejection of the Humble Petition. Even as late as 1657 there were divisions in the country further supporting Cromwell's view, but in accepting his view of the failure he is also putting the blame partly at the hands of the army who had wanted more radical solutions. It can therefore be argued that although Cromwell acknowledges the failure to heal divisions, he is attempting to blame the army and absolve himself from blame and should therefore be treated with caution.

However, Source B does not suggest that the aim of the policies was to heal divisions, but rather it was to impose strict, puritan moral values on the country. In contrast to Source A, which allowed a wide range of views, Source B is instructing the Major Generals to impose punishments on those who 'take the name of God in vain and those who do not observe the Lord's Day'. These are actual instructions, which were given to the Major Generals and are therefore evidence of the actual policy that the Protectorate Parliament wanted. This is reinforced by actual actions taken by the government over the imposition of taxation and the division of the country, which suggest they were more concerned with discipline and even the establishment of a military style rule to bring order than they were with healing divisions.

Although the sources do suggest that there had been an intention to heal divisions, the actual policies pursued, particularly those outlined in B, suggest that order and discipline were more important. The healing of divisions may have been an aim as suggested in both A and C, but in practice this was overridden.

Examiner commentary

- This is well argued with a consistent focus on 'designed to heal divisions'. All the sources are fully evaluated and the evaluation is clearly linked to the actual question. Own knowledge is directly linked to the sources, although it could have been further developed and a little more precise. A clear judgement is reached about the view of the sources about the issue in the question and this is consistent with the argument in the main body of the answer.

Medium level answer

The sources offer different views about whether the policies aimed at healing the very large divisions within the country. There was certainly much for Cromwell's government to do after the Civil War and the sources will be evaluated to see whether the policies aimed to do that.

Source A is an extract from the Instrument of Government and does give the impression that the aim was to heal divisions. The Source focuses on religion and states that 'no-one shall be compelled by penalties to accept the official faith', although Catholics are exempted from protection to exercise their religion. However, the Instrument is trying to establish a constitution for the Protectorate and does not provide evidence of the actual policies that were implemented which may not have been as tolerant as the Instrument suggests.

Source B can be contrasted with Source A as it shows the harshness of the rule of the Major Generals and how they were instructed to ban most forms of entertainment. It is unlikely that such policies would win support from many and therefore it is unlikely that this would help to heal the division as many still enjoyed entertainments such as horse-races or the theatre. This source provides an example of the actual policies that they were being asked to implement and suggests that the aim was not to heal divisions but to enforce order and discipline. This can be linked to Source C, which partly contradicts Source B as it suggests that the Major Generals were 'invented to heal the divisions after Penruddock's Rising'. However, the reliability of this claim should be treated with caution as Cromwell is trying to justify the system and even he admits that the government has 'had to go beyond the law to preserve itself', again suggesting that it was unlikely to be healing divisions but rather reinforcing the idea of an imposed government.

Source D argues that attempts to settle the nation, and by implication, heal divisions had failed. It does argue that this had been the aim, but again the reliability of the view has to be questioned as Cromwell is blaming the army for this failure, referring to the Protectorate Parliaments and Major Generals as 'theirs', thus trying to remove blame from himself.

Although some of the sources suggest that the aim had been to heal the divisions, the reliability of these sources is questionable. The one source, Source B that deals with policies suggests that the Protectorate was more concerned with improving the moral behaviour of the people and therefore I conclude the sources do not support the view.

Examiner commentary

- The Sources are evaluated by examining their provenance, although even this could be developed. The answer is focused on the question set and does attempt to link the Sources to the actual issue in the question, however no own knowledge is used in the evaluation and this limits the level that can be attained.

Y109 The Making of Georgian Britain 1678-c. 1760

Using these three sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that from the start of his reign James II was mistrusted.

High level answer

Only Source A puts forward the view that there was not mistrust of James on his accession to the throne. The other three Sources suggest that there was at least some apprehension or potential for distrust about his accession and that it was necessary for the new king to give reassurances about his intentions. However, Source C does suggest that James was able to overcome the concerns by giving reassurances about maintaining existing laws.

Sources B and D offer the clearest indication that there was mistrust for James, even at the start of his reign. Source B is evidence that James himself was aware of the mistrust as his speech to his Privy Council immediately after his coronation, referring to his reputation for arbitrary power, shows his concern to reassure the landed classes that he will continue to 'preserve this government in church and state as it is now by law established'. However, the fact that James felt the need to reassure his counsellors suggests that there was genuine unease about his accession and that he was aware of this following his open acknowledgement of being a Catholic during Charles II's reign. The speech also gives a further suggestion as to why there was mistrust and this was the Church, which he appears to support not for religious but political reasons and this concern is also seen in Source D. In both these Sources James defends the Church because it is a 'friend to monarchy' further emphasizing the political rather than religious reasons he was willing to defend it. This concern is shown in the Source as the clergy of London still want reassurances that it 'should be the religion established by law', Anglicanism that is defended. However, Source D was written by an opponent of James, who went into exile after his accession and supported those who acted to remove James in 1688. Source D also puts forward the view that although there was little sorrow shown for the death of Charles, there were 'as few acclamations of joy for the present king', which further suggests that many had their doubts. Even his comment about loyal addresses, which might be a sign of support and a lack of fear about James' rule is not convincing evidence that there was support for him as the University of Oxford was a traditional royalist stronghold, as was seen during the Exclusion Crisis and therefore more likely to support James. The very fact that James felt the need to issue reassurances is the clearest indication that there were concerns about his intentions.

Source C also suggests that there were some concerns, however it also suggests that James was able to overcome them through his declaration that he would 'defend the government of England both in Church and State as by law established', which if Source C is correct would dampen his reputation for arbitrary rule mentioned in Source B. But once again, it could be argued that the need to reassure the Privy Council suggests there was mistrust. Furthermore we should treat the impact of the reassurances, mentioned in C, with caution as they were written by a Tory member of the gentry who was more likely to be sympathetic to James than the author of D. Reresby appears to be accepting James' comments at face value and ignoring the concerns that would soon manifest themselves in the unrest of both Monmouth and Argyll's rebellions.

Source A is the only Source that does not hint at mistrust and this might be considered surprising at it written by a Whig, the group who would later lead the Revolution that removed him. However, although Peterborough states that 'everything is very happy here' and 'Never a king was proclaimed with more applause' it comes from an aristocrat who was probably more concerned with stability and might have welcomed the initial reaction to James as it appeared in contrast to the instability of the years of Exclusion. As this was written in private correspondence to Isham there is little reason for Peterborough not to express his genuine view of the reaction to the accession. The landed aristocracy may have welcomed the reaction to James' accession as it appeared to suggest that stability was possible and that division, apparent in the years 1681-5 had ended. The elite were willing to give James a chance, as was also seen in their lack of support for Monmouth a few months later and this Source appears to confirm that view.

All the Sources, with the exception of A, put forward concerns and evidence of mistrust about James' accession. Perhaps the clearest indication of the mistrust is that James himself thought it necessary to give reassurances and try to dispel the idea that he supported arbitrary government.

Examiner commentary

- The answer is focused on the key issue in the question and assess the extent to which James was mistrusted. The provenance of the Sources are clearly and fully evaluated in relation to the question. Own knowledge is applied to support or challenge the views put forward and a judgement about the Sources and their view is reached.

Medium level answer

Source A puts forward the view that there was no mistrust when James came to the throne as 'Never a king was proclaimed with more applause'. The Source also argues that he was courted by most men, further suggesting support for the new king, which would be unlikely if he was not trusted. Peterborough also predicts a happy reign, which would be unlikely if he was not trusted. The Source appears to be from private correspondence between a member of the aristocracy and the elite and would therefore have no reason not to report what he genuinely believed and had either seen or heard.

However, Source B, reporting James' own comments suggests that even he was aware that there were concerns about this accession. As James was aware of the need to reassure people that he would 'preserve this government in church and state as it is now by law established' it supports the view that there was mistrust and James needed to win the people over, particularly after he had openly declared his Catholic religion during his brother's reign.

Source C is quite similar in its view to Source B as it again shows the need for the King to quieten the concerns of people by issuing promises to uphold the laws and established church. However, it also says that his promises were believed and this suggests that he was able to dispel the mistrust. However, this was written by a Tory MP who were more sympathetic towards James and monarchy and accepted the king's words at face value.

In contrast Source D gives the specific example of the clergy of London expressing concern as to whether the king would uphold 'religion established by law'. It also argues that there was little joy shown for the accession of the new king. Neither of these comments are surprising as they are written by a Whig bishop who went into exile soon after James came to the throne. Even his comment about loyal addresses uses Oxford as an example because it was a royalist stronghold. These comments would suggest that the reliability of D should be questioned.

Most of the sources suggest there were concerns, even if C suggests that they were overcome. Some of the Sources are less reliable, but B, which reports James' own comments acknowledges that even he knew he was mistrusted and therefore it can be concluded that there was at least some mistrust.

Examiner commentary

- The Sources are considered and their provenance is discussed, although in the latter case it could be more fully developed. There is a clear attempt to link the material to the actual focus of the question. There are hints, but no more, of the use of own knowledge, but this needs to be developed. It is a sound answer which shows an understanding of the Sources but the limitations mean it would be awarded a solid medium level band.

Y110 From Pitt to Peel

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that the Factory Acts did more harm than good.

High level answer

The view that factory legislation has done more harm than good is most strongly stated in A and most strongly argued against in B. C supports A but notes some beneficial effects and D is against the whole effects that factories have on young women so may either be arguing that more regulation is needed or that mere regulation would not stop the bad effects.

Source A from a Whig journal of 1835 considers that regulating the hours children work or preventing them working in factories under the age of 8 would lead to children being turned loose in the streets, being 'idle' and picking up vicious habits rather than being trained in work habits and being used to regular patterns of behavior. This is typical of the Whig reforms of the 1830s, which stressed the moral aspects of work and self-reliance, such as the 1834 Poor Law. It reflects a common view that 'idleness' was worse for children than working hard. It was a view that might well have been shared by families who needed the support given by child labour as it was common for children to work alongside parents in some factories. As the alternative to making a living was, after 1834, the workhouse than there was a case for this. However, to dismiss the evidence of Sadler seems wrong. There was considerable hardship for children in factories with poor standards of safety and over work. This seems to be more concerned with the dangers from juvenile crime – such as portrayed in 'Oliver Twist' than with the evidence produced by reformers and is an unreliable guide to the effects of legislation. It is supported to an extent by the evidence from a Northern factory owner in C who has more direct experience than the writer of A. He questions the assumption that all labour is severe and like A is concerned about what children excluded by law from factory work will do, suggesting that they might be driven to even worse employment in the mines. Mines were not regulated until 1844. By implication he is suggesting that children under 13 working only 8 hours may be an improvement, but they are still employed. Individual employers like this source may have tried to ensure that conditions were not too severe, but if cross-referenced with B, there is still a problem of neglect. The source may not reflect typical conditions, but it may well be true that partial regulation of some aspects of child labour without more general regulation may simply have driven children to seek labour elsewhere in even worse conditions, such as mines or even in some homes where children worked long hours for little. Source B is from a source with a vested interest in factory reform and comes from an official report on factories. He sees a change for the better since 1833 with more acceptance of the benefits of regulation by employers. Cruelty and oppression by implication have become less of a problem and there are prosecutions which seem to show the act is working. By reference to the problems of 1833 in the last sentence, the source is implying that these problems are becoming less. The report would naturally wish to stress the success, since the whole idea of inspection and regulation was relatively new and had been challenged by many as oppressive and likely to cause rather than relieve hardship. The number of inspectors was small and there were not many successful prosecutions. The acceptance by owners of the principles of regulation may be exaggerated given the continuing opposition to later acts and the attitudes shown in A and C. The limited terms of the act for example giving two hours of education after what was still a long day's work for nine to thirteen year olds may not have achieved the results suggested, but the source does show some good results. Source D is more an expression of middle class concern about the impact of factory work on young women than an analysis of the harm or benefits from actual legislation. There had been a debate about the Ten Hour bill in 1846 and women's hours had been regulated in 1844, so this may have led to factory work being more attractive to women than domestic service which was less well paid. The idea of women not learning household management and skills seems to be importing some of the middle class values and concerns of the early Victorian era to working class areas where young female labour was essential for families. It reflects the type of concern about the moral and social damage done by factories common among Tory radicals of the time rather than considering the effects of factory work on health and the exploitation of female labour, say, in textiles to maintain low costs in the hard years of the 'hungry 40s'. As it was hard for younger women in many families not to work, then it was not a strong argument to say that more factory legislation would only encourage them to develop poor housekeeping habits.

Overall the most compelling arguments come from the sources with direct experience of the impact of factories. Both may not be typical as not all employers were as concerned about welfare as Mr. Greg and Mr Horner may be exaggerating the effects the legislation about and the inspection of factories. However, in the long term as legislation grew in the century and did offer valuable protection, the view of B seems more compelling even if in the short term there may have been disadvantages from a middle-class perspective.

Examiner commentary

- All four sources are considered and the provenance of all four is taken into account. The answer focuses on the issue in the question and does not merely describe or explain what the sources are saying generally. There is knowledge, which is used, and some of it is detailed. There is a sense of argument and a decision is made at the end about the issue. There is an awareness of the historical context.

Medium level answer

Source A is very much against factory reform and points out its bad effects on young people. It says that bad conditions have been exaggerated by Sadler and that children prevented from working in factories or with restricted hours such as the act of 1833 laid down will be on the streets and will be idle and subject to vicious habits, probably crimes like pickpocketing or even child prostitution. They will lose the discipline and good work habits brought about by factories. This view ignores the terrible conditions for the young in factories and is by a Whig who may be biased as they thought that the lower classes needed to be controlled. Source B is from a factory inspector so he might be biased in favour of the acts and think that his inspectors had done a good job. He thinks that owners and workers think that the acts have been just and that cruelty and oppression are now no longer common. He thinks that since 1833 when there were problems with child workers not having enough air and exercise or proper education then the acts have done much good and not caused harm because everyone agrees with them and they tried to deal with real problems. However he may not take into account the fact that there was still a lot of hardship and that the acts did not deal with everyone.

Source C agrees with A though he does point out that children under 13 were working less, which was a good thing. The strongest point that Greg makes is that if children do not work in factories then they may go on to even worse jobs like mines and also says that the acts do not stop child labour altogether. He says that not all child labour was severe. However that is just his personal view and he may not know. Children often hands their arms torn off in machines and there are picture of them crying so he may not be right.

Source d says that young women who work in factories may not make good working class wives as they will not have been trained in needlework or in cleanliness or order, as they will have been working in factories. A lot of people like the middle class writer of this source did not agree with factory work and thought it was bad for both young girls and boys. Girls did not get taught as much as boys and a lot would have been expected them if they got married, so this source may think that more factory legislation is needed to make sure girls have time to learn important domestic skills.

The early factories, particularly in the north and in textiles needed a lot of children and women to work in them as children were cheap and were used for jobs which required them to use their small fingers in complex machines. They often got tired and there were a lot of accidents. Many people were concerned about the new factories and the first factory legislation goes back to 1802. There was an important factory act in 1833 to help young people but many people thought it was wrong to interfere in *laissez faire*. (sic) Many factory owners did not agree with the regulations but they were a help in making Britain more modern and preventing young people from working too long and having accidents, so my own knowledge and the sources lead me to think that the factory acts did more good than harm.

Examiner commentary

- This does address the question and it comes to a view. The sources are linked to the issue and most of the writing is relevant, though the use of the evidence is uneven. There is some reference in general terms to the provenance of the sources, though again this is variable. There is some knowledge, but it lacks detail and is not well applied to the sources and becomes a mini-essay at the end.

Y111 Liberals, Conservatives, and the Rise of Labour and Y112 England and a New Century

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that Asquith should bear the responsibility for splitting the Liberal Party in 1916.

High level answer

The Liberal split in 1916 between Asquith and Lloyd George had a disastrous effect on the party and has been blamed on the weakness of Asquith as well as the ambition of Lloyd George. Source A seems to show that Asquith was out of touch with his party by agreeing to a coalition and that he looked 'old and worried'. The source suggests that he was forced into a coalition rather than taking the initiative, but also that at this stage he was still popular with his party as they gave him an ovation. The overwhelming impression is that Asquith was not really strong enough to prevent a coalition in 1915 and a weak leader should not have been leading the country and so it is really not Lloyd George's fault for opposing him in the following year and splitting the party. The source is from a Liberal who was present so is strong evidence for the divisions already in the party by 1915. He was correct in seeing a grave situation with the heavy losses of the campaigns of Loos and Lens in 1915 and accusations of shell shortages as well as the initial failures at Gallipoli. However the coalition with the Conservatives did not mean much of a sacrifice of power, as they were mainly content to leave the main offices in the cabinet in Liberal hands.

Source B also shows Liberal splits even before Lloyd George challenged Asquith in 1916 as there were divisions about conscription between Chamberlain on the Conservative side and McKenna, a Liberal minister and Henderson for Labour. There was also disagreement about withdrawal from Gallipoli following the Turks managing to hold the British and Anzac troops close to the beach landing areas. Asquith had to find a way of keeping the government together but the fault does not from this source seem to be predominantly Lloyd George's. This is despite the fact that the author seems to be hostile to Lloyd George and says that Lloyd George 'was much afraid he had muddled the Ministry of Munitions' against the view that Lloyd George had increased the efficiency and output of arms manufacture. Asquith on the other hand seems to have allowed divisions to appear, to have allowed an expedition to be sent to Gallipoli, which has been unsuccessful, and not to have taken a clear line on conscription. The source reveals a weak prime minister but does not put Lloyd George at the center of the divisions.

By November 1916 the situation had become more desperate after the terrible losses of the Somme campaign and the increasing view by some Conservatives and Liberals aided by a press campaign that Asquith was an inadequate war leader. Source C shows that the prime minister thought that Lloyd George was intriguing against him by engineering the proposal to install a new war committee on which Asquith should not sit. Asquith believes this would 'fatally impair' the confidence of his loyal colleagues, somewhat contradicting the view of B that he has only limited confidants. As the letter is not to a fellow Liberal but to the Conservative leader yet reveals a split among the Liberal leadership, it seems quite candid. It shows Lloyd George as manipulative but also that Asquith was weak – referring to the intolerable burden of '...anxiety'. By this stage Lloyd George had been showing himself an energetic and successful Minister of war and also exploiting his contacts with leading Conservatives and the press to press for changes in the cabinet. He was, therefore, as Asquith says, responsible, but given the dangerous situation that Britain was in by November 1916 and the obvious weakness of Asquith, shown by the fact that he is unburdening himself to his former political enemy, perhaps he is not entirely to blame for the split.

The feeling against Asquith is shown in D as 'Letters from all parts of the country' are urging D (David Lloyd George) to take over. Asquith's refusal to accept not being Chairman of the new war committee may be evidence of his lack of understanding of his inability to lead. However the evidence also suggests that both Lloyd George and Bonar Law were aware of the consequences of insisting on the new committee that 'it will smash the government' and therefore split the party. Frances Stevenson was deeply involved with Lloyd George and at the heart of what was going on. The source is also not for publication so she is frank and Lloyd George is seen as intent on a 'smash' by making the insulting proposal that the prime minister should be excluded from the key war committee. However, the view that 'the PM is absolutely hopeless', born out by the failures of 1916 and the need for a reorganization of government such as Lloyd George put in practice after December 1916, puts the blame more on Asquith.

By 1916 the losses of the war did seem to require a different sort of leadership more accepting of 'total war' and mobilization of all national resources. Asquith's deep Liberal beliefs, shown in A with his unwillingness to enter a coalition. Made him unsuitable. Lloyd George's much less principled approach allowed him to accept greater wartime controls, extension of conscription, more government control of factories, negotiations with unions to maintain production and a reorganized war cabinet with different ministries and a small inner circle. It is difficult to blame Lloyd George for wanting better leadership and it could be seen that Asquith was more responsible for the splits by resisting change. The new coalition of December 1916 might not have been the 'smash' that D refers to had Asquith not gone on in December 1918 to force a vote of non confidence in the government over the accusations of General Maurice and split the party.

Examiner commentary

- This answer tries very hard to keep a focus on the question and to use the sources in relation to the key issue. All four are used and not merely described. There is some reference to the provenance and to the context in which the sources were written. There is some knowledge which is directly applied to offer a critical commentary on the evidence and a clear understanding of the possible debate is shown with a view being offered.

Medium level answer

Two of these sources are from 1915 and two are from 1916. A deals with the forming of a new coalition between Liberals, the Conservatives and Labour. It shows that the party was divided with some MPs being against the coalition ('some spoke very strongly against the coalition') but in the end being united as they gave Asquith 'an over-powering ovation' showing that he could deal with splits and was not responsible. The split came later when things in the war had got worse. This is a diary so will not be biased and the writer is a Liberal MP so should know what had gone on. Source B is also from 1915 and shows more splits with McKenna and Henderson being opposed to Chamberlain and Bonar Law agreeing with Lloyd George that troops should leave Gallipoli. It shows that Asquith was not responsible for the Liberal split because he was 'trying to find a way to keep the government together'. However as this is a Liberal politician speaking he may be exaggerating and perhaps Asquith's weak leadership has led to the splits. This was in the war when there were problems. Source C blames Lloyd George for the split because 'he does not inspire trust' and says to Bonar Law that 'your proposal has been engineered by him with the purpose of replacing me'. Lloyd George wants to replace Asquith and so is responsible for the split. Asquith is not just going against Lloyd George because he says that 'Lloyd George has many qualities', so this is balanced and we can believe it, especially as Asquith is writing in a private letter and he is in a position to know.

Source D is also from someone in a position to know as the writer is close to Lloyd George and she (sic) blames Asquith for being 'absolutely hopeless' as he has lost willpower. If he is weak then he is to blame for staying on as prime minister and so the split is his fault. However she does say that if Lloyd George (D) and Bonar Law act together it will smash the government. That would cause a bit of split so Lloyd George has caused the split by allying with Bonar Law, but it is Asquith who insists on being chairman of the new war committee, so it is really his fault.

There were many casualties in the war because of the bad conditions on the western front and the way that Haig forced his troops to attack and be killed by German machine guns so it was Asquith's fault as he was a weak leader and the war needed a stronger leader like Lloyd George. Source D is the most reliable as it was primary and from someone who knew what was happening.

Examiner commentary

- This sticks very closely to the question and tries hard to interpret the sources making some clear points, illustrated by close reading of the passages. However, there is very limited knowledge of the context, so the critical comments are not supported. There is some attempt to consider the provenance, but for an effective judgement of the evidence there needed to be much more reference to the situation and knowledge of both Asquith and Lloyd George as wartime leaders.

Y113 Britain 1930-1997

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that Churchill was proposing unrealistic policies with regard to gaining international support against Hitler in the 1930s.

High level answer

Both sources from Churchill himself see gaining international support as vital and realistic. A is written with hindsight in that a Grand Alliance did eventually defeat Germany and Italy and Japan and the British air force did play a big part in the outcome of the war. B is written in 1938 before Hitler had taken Austria and Czechoslovakia but when there was a distinct threat of German expansion. Churchill was appealing for some positive action and overstated the possibility of getting support. In both sources Churchill thought it possible for Britain and France to act jointly. In C the Franco-British link would lead the coordination of military planning with other nations under the 'honourable' role of the League. In A Churchill argued that Britain and France acting together could have deterred Germany. This does not seem realistic for despite their large army France was deeply divided politically and had constructed a great defensive line called the Maginot Line which indicated that they were more concerned with just defence than deterring Germany or leading any alliance. In A Churchill may have wanted to defend his pre-war warnings that action needed to be taken. In B he is not in government and did not have to consider how realistic his suggestions were; his aim was to push Chamberlain to taking action against a German threat.

Both A and B also refer to the role of the League of Nations, but by 1937 it was clear that the League of Nations could not prevent war. The USA was not a member. Italy, Germany and Japan had left the League and any action would depend on Britain and France who had not done much to help the League prevent aggression. This seems unrealistic and it was not very clear who the other nations in the world that would come together in a Grand Alliance were going to be in Source C.

Sources B and D are seemingly more realistic. The Chiefs of Staff were in a position to be able to know about Britain's defenses and they advised that even with the assistance of France and other allies, Britain's forces were not enough to protect its territory, trade and empire. This might show that Churchill was being unrealistic about the hopes he placed in foreign support; on the other hand it might show how important it was to try and get foreign support since Britain could not defend itself alone. The view is supported by the steady disarmament (some of it resulting from Churchill's own policies in the 1920s) under the Ten Year Rule. Major rearmament had only started from the mid 1930s and then concentrated on defence rather than building up the army. However, the defence chiefs could have been exaggerating in order to get more money for the services. Source D seems also more realistic than Churchill. Chamberlain is not making a public speech but writing to his sister so says what he really thinks and that is that everything Churchill says seems to be right 'until you examine its practicality'. The USA was unlikely to join any peacetime alliance because public opinion was against war. The USSR was undergoing purges which were destroying the leadership of its armed forces and in any case Chamberlain was opposed to communism and would not get support for an alliance with Stalin. France was not seen as a strong ally. Italy was an ally of Hitler. So Chamberlain was right to see the impracticability of a Grand Alliance and also to see that effective League of Nations action was unlikely.

A and C though consistent with each other in seeing international support as the only way to deter Hitler and prevent war seem to be unrealistic and they are by someone deeply involved who had made this issue a key part of their political career. The alternative views are also by people with vested interests. The Chiefs of Staff needed to point out dangers and to persuade the government to give them more resources. They dismiss the possible help of allies without explanation even though France had a very large army and if Germany had had to face even the threat of Russia and a two front war, this might have deterred German expansion. Chamberlain, too, had decided on a policy of appeasement, as the main solution so would not want to consider the alternative. In the end, Germany was defeated by a Grand Alliance, so even if there were difficulties in getting one in the 1930s as B and D suggest, it does not mean that this was unrealistic.

Examiner commentary

- There is a clear focus on the question here. All the sources are considered and all are analysed in terms of additional knowledge and also the provenance. The sources are tackled in a sensible order and an overall argument emerges. The historical context is well understood and used to make judgements.

Medium level answer

Some of these sources think that there should be more links with other countries to prevent war. Churchill in source A thinks this is realistic as he thinks that greater action by France and Britain together with a building up of the British air force and working with the league of Nations could have prevented war. This was realistic as Britain needed a bigger air force and needed allies as Germany was becoming more of a threat. However it is by Churchill and may be biased.

Source B does not think that it is realistic to rely on France and other allies because even with their help Britain did not have enough defences to maintain Britain's independence, its overseas empire and its trade. This was because Britain faced threats from three powers Germany, Italy and Japan and was not strong enough alone to fight them all if they attacked it. This was realistic as they were the heads of the armed service and knew what the situation was. They are being realistic about the limited help that France would give as France was very weak as it showed later on.

C is another speech by Churchill which again says that Britain and France should work together and talks of a 'Grand Alliance' which should coordinate military planning and show a 'moral sense' and work under the 'honourable' League of Nations. This was realistic because Britain did not have enough forces to fight alone as B says. However Churchill might have biased because the government preferred to negotiate with Germany which Churchill did not agree with and he wanted Britain to be strong enough by allying with other powers to fight Germany. As Hitler was very extreme and wanted to conquer Europe this was more realistic, but it would have been difficult to get foreign help as the League of Nations was very weak.

Source D thinks Churchill was very unrealistic because Chamberlain writes to his sister that he had the idea of getting foreign support but this idea was not possible 'when you come to examine its practicality'. So he thinks that his policy of appeasing Germany is more practical than Churchill's idea of using the League of Nations and getting a Grand Alliance with France and other countries. He is writing a letter so this will not be as biased as Churchill who was making a speech. Hitler wanted to revenge the Treaty of Versailles and so made a treaty with Italy and remilitarized the Rhineland, invaded Austria and got most of Czechoslovakia after the Munich agreement. He was determined to take over Poland and this caused war. He was very extreme so it was not realistic to stop him by getting allies and the League of Nations, so Churchill was not as realistic as the other sources.

Examiner commentary

- This deals with all the sources and attempts to link them to the issue of 'realistic'. It takes some notice of the origins of each source, but little is made of this. There is some attempt at judgement and there is some knowledge of the historical context, but it is not well applied to the sources to assess them. The question has been understood and an answer, based on the sources with some knowledge has been offered.



We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

If you do not currently offer this OCR qualification but would like to do so, please complete the Expression of Interest Form which can be found here: www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest

OCR Resources: *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the teaching of OCR specifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by the Board and the decision to use them lies with the individual teacher. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

© OCR 2015 – This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this message remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content:
Square down and Square up: alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications:
resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk

We will inform centres about any changes to the specification. We will also publish changes on our website. The latest version of our specification will always be the one on our website (www.ocr.org.uk) and this may differ from printed versions.

Copyright © OCR 2015. All rights reserved.

Copyright

OCR retains the copyright on all its publications, including the specifications. However, registered centres for OCR are permitted to copy material from this specification booklet for their own internal use.

ocr.org.uk/alevelreform

OCR customer contact centre

General qualifications

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2015 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.

