

GCSE (9–1)
Candidate Style Answers

HISTORY A (EXPLAINING THE MODERN WORLD)

J410
For first teaching in 2016

J410/10 War and British Society c.790 to c.2010

Version 1



Contents

Introduction	3
Question 1	
High banded response	4
Commentary	4
Medium banded reponse	4
Commentary	4
Question 2	
High banded response	5
Commentary	5
Medium banded reponse	5
Commentary	5
Question 3	
High banded response	6
Commentary	6
Medium banded reponse	7
Commentary	7
Question 4	
High banded response	8
Commentary	8
Medium banded reponse	9
Commentary	9

Introduction

This resource has been produced by a senior member of the GCSE History examining team to offer teachers an insight into how the assessment objectives are applied. It illustrates how the sample assessment questions might be answered and provides some commentary on what factors contribute to overall levels.

As these responses have not been through full moderation, 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.

Question 1

Describe two examples of the impact of the civil wars of the period 1642-1651 on the population of Britain.

[4 marks]

High banded response

One impact of the Civil War was requisitioning. The armies only carried enough food for a short time, so local towns had to provide food, horses and billets for the soldiers, even if they didn't want to.

Another impact was the increased taxation, which was needed to pay for the armies. For example, new excise duties were raised on a range of foods, like salt and beer, which meant people had to pay higher prices.

Examiner commentary

The candidate has identified two separate impacts, and each one has a development in the form of some extra information.

Medium banded response

One impact was providing resources for the army. Another was recruitment, because lots of people were recruited. Another impact was looting, since soldiers often stole things.

Examiner commentary

The candidate has correctly identified impacts, which means that they have 2 marks. However, they have added a third impact which will not contribute since the question only asks for two impacts. Instead, this answer would be improved by adding an extra description to the first two points.

Question 2

Explain why the feudal relationship between king and barons broke down in the reign of King Stephen (1135-1154). **[8 marks]**

High banded response

One reason that the relationship broke down was because some barons questioned Stephen's right to the throne. When Henry I died in 1135, he left the throne to his daughter, Mathilda. Although not all barons supported Mathilda, Stephen's claim to the throne was only as a nephew so it was common knowledge that he did not have a direct legal claim to the throne, except by bypassing Mathilda's claim as a woman. Miles of Gloucester is an example of a baron who changed his support to Mathilda because he thought she had a better claim. Therefore some barons questioned his right to rule, which weakened the feudal relationship between Stephen and his barons.

Another reason was that Stephen's actions made him appear weak. He was unable to achieve a significant victory against his opponents. He was fighting enemies from Scotland and Wales, as well as a powerful enemy from Normandy with Geoffrey of Anjou, Mathilda's husband. Stephen was unable to achieve a strong victory, and he was even captured in 1141 at the Battle of Lincoln. So these actions made him appear weak, and the feudal system was based upon the king being strong, so this contributed to a broken down feudal relationship.

A third reason was that the barons used the civil war as an opportunity to get more wealth and power, especially since Stephen appeared weak. For example, Ranulph of Chester rebelled because Stephen would not give him land. Others took land, or refused to pay taxes, because they thought that the king was too weak to stop them, and this damaged the way that the feudal system was supposed to work.

Examiner commentary

The candidate has selected three good reasons, and explained each one clearly. It is worth noting that the reasons are supported by detailed own knowledge, with clear examples, and also linked back to the issue in the question.

Medium banded response

The feudal relationship broke down between Stephen and his barons during his reign. Stephen spent his reign fighting against Mathilda. Mathilda was supposed to be the queen, but Stephen claimed that as a man and a nephew of Henry I, he would be better for England. Some of the barons felt that his claim was weak, and chose to support Mathilda instead. Also Stephen was a weak king and he struggled to show that he was a success, especially in battles, which made many of his barons view him as weak.

Examiner commentary

This candidate is covering relevant material, and the information is accurate. It is generally quite descriptive though, and the detail is less specific than candidate A. To improve this answer, some specific examples of knowledge should be added, and the link between the issues and the break in the feudal relationship needs making, for example that the issues over the claim, which some barons doubted, led barons to switch allegiance away from him, thus breaking down their relationship.

Question 3

How far were the Jacobite campaigns of 1715 and 1745 significant for Britain?

[14 marks]

High banded response

The 1715 and 1745 Jacobite Uprisings had significance for Britain, mainly Scotland and England.

In 1715, the uprising showed that there was Scottish opposition to the new Hanoverian government. They were able to quickly build an army of 8,000 men which was larger than the government forces. It showed that Scotland still a patriotic resistance.

The 1715 Uprising had less of an impact on England. They did reach Preston in Lancashire, but many of the Highlanders had not wanted to leave Scotland and it was a weak invasion. It did not make a significant impact on England.

The end of the 1715 uprising showed that it had not had very much impact on either Scotland or England. The British Government treated it gently. They passed a Disarming Act to prevent Highlanders having weapons, and built up some forts, but they let the rebels return home safely. They even promised to spend £20,000 on Scots speaking schools. So although 1715 was a real threat, it did not have a huge significance for Britain.

The 1745 uprising was far more significant for both England and Scotland. For Scotland, it showed that there was still a real Jacobite feeling, but this time it also showed that the Lowlands were very much divided because the Jacobites only recruited 5000 men and the Lowlanders refused to support them. It was significant for the English because the English troops were busy fighting in Europe, and the Jacobites managed to get all the way to Derby, only 125 miles from London, which was a much bigger problem than in 1715. Also, the Jacobites managed a significant victory against government troops at Prestonpans.

Also, the end had more significance, especially for Scotland. The Jacobite troops were crushed at Culloden where they tried to charge musket lines with swords and were shot. This led to the breaking of the Scottish Jacobite threat. Also, the government dealt more strongly with it, so the power of the Scottish clans was destroyed and never rebuilt.

Overall, both uprisings had significance for Britain, but the 1715 was a relatively small significance whereas in 1745, the uprising was a real threat and the aftermath led to significant changes so it was far more significant.

Examiner commentary

All of the key aspects are in this answer. It has specific detailed knowledge and it covers both of the uprisings. It does not describe, but analyses the different aspects of significance, and at the end there is a judgement. It is true that the judgement at the end could be developed more, but in light of the time constraints of the exam question and the overall quality of the answer, this would be placed in the top mark band.

Medium banded response

In 1715, the Jacobite Highlanders marched southwards because they did not like the Hanoverian government. They formed an army of 8,000 and made it to Preston in England before they retreated. This was a bit significant because it was a threat to England and showed the attitudes in Scotland, but when it ended, the British government did not punish the rebels so it was not that significant.

The 1745 uprising was much more significant. An army of 5,000 soldiers marched south. They got to Derby which shows that this was a real threat to England. The English army was fighting in Europe, so it struggled to organise a defence. They even managed to beat a government army at Prestonpans which left the Jacobites controlling Scotland and gave their army guns to use. So it was quite significant because it was a real threat to the British government.

Examiner commentary

This answer just reaches a medium band. To improve, the answer needs to cover the significance of both uprisings. This answer does address significance of both, but it is better on the 1745 uprising whereas the 1715 comments are weaker, vague and implicitly applied to the issue in the question. Therefore, it is a medium banded response. To raise the mark, it first needs to cover the 1715 uprising with a more analytical focus on significance, and to improve, it needs to cover a range of aspects of significance.

Question 4

'Between 1500 and 2010, wars were supported by the population.' How far do you agree with this statement?

[24 marks]

High banded response

Between 1500 and 2010, wars were often supported by the population of Britain. However, there are also examples where wars were less supported.

There are a number of examples of wars which were well supported by the population. One is the Napoleonic Wars. Because the population felt that there was a real threat of invasion from France, there was patriotic support for the war. People bought souvenirs and newspapers showed cartoons mocking Napoleon. Books like *Pride and Prejudice* glamorised officers and people encouraged recruitment. When Nelson died after Trafalgar, there was a national mourning for his funeral, and Wellington was voted as Prime Minister later on because of his reputation as a hero.

Also in the First World War, people supported the cause. Men joined the war at the start in large numbers in Kitchener's army and Pals' battalions. Also many women worked in munitions factories. By 1918, about 45% of the working age population of women were working, even though only about 25% had worked before the war. This showed that people supported the war effort.

Also in World War 2, the British newspapers spread the idea of the "Dunkirk spirit" and being "in it together" and even though there was some looting in the blackout, generally the British population worked together to keep going during the war. People felt that they were fighting an evil Nazi regime, and this united them and meant that the war was quite popular.

However, there was not the same level of support in all wars from 1500 to 2010. For example, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, there was a lot of fighting against Catholic Spain, for example the Spanish Armada of 1588. The country was Protestant but there were also a lot of Catholics and these would not have supported fighting a Catholic country. Some wanted France or Spain to invade so they could put a Catholic monarch on the throne.

Another example is in 2003, when Tony Blair declared British support for the war on Iraq. Even though there were people who supported this war, the media and many in the population were very critical. This was especially the case when it was found that there were no WMDs in Iraq, and it led to a Chilcot Enquiry to decide whether the Government had broken the law.

Overall, generally the British population has supported wars. There are examples of wars, like Iraq, where the population has not been supportive, but in the majority, especially where Britain was threatened, the population was fully supportive of the war. So the statement is more true than not true.

Examiner commentary

This answer is very well structured. It starts with a very brief introduction which shows a two sided idea. Then the answer is organised into two sides, first of all in support and then against the statement. The examples range across the period, covering the full time scale, and they have specific examples backing them up. At the end, the judgement is specific. It does not simply sum up the two sides, but reaches a decision about the overall statement.

Medium banded response

There are some examples which show that the population of Britain did support wars in the period 1500–2010. One example is that in World War 1, men queued up to join the army. Later on, when conscription started, only a small number were conscientious objectors. Women also supported the war effort. For example, some women worked in munitions factories as canaries, this was quite dangerous and about 400 women died, but women still supported this work.

Another example is World War 2. Even when the cities of Britain were blitzed, people continued to work for the war effort and to support the government. People also bought war bonds in a National Savings Campaign which showed that they were supporting the government in the war.

However, not every war was popular. In 2001, Britain joined the war in Afghanistan, and in 2003 the war in Iraq. Some people supported this, but many newspapers printed articles criticising the government. There were marches and protests in Britain saying that the British army should not be involved. When it was proven that there were no WMD in Iraq, people became more critical of the government and some even said that Tony Blair was a war criminal.

So overall, some wars were supported by the population but some were not.

Examiner commentary

This answer definitely shows some relevant knowledge. It has specific details, which is good. However, there are a couple of key areas to improve to raise the mark. Firstly, it starts by mentioning 1500–2010 but actually only uses examples from WW1 onwards, so it does not cover the period. Secondly, whilst it has a balanced summary of the two sides, it does not use this to answer the question and to evaluate the statement. Improving these two areas would give a higher mark.



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.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing 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 delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. 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.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print 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

Looking for a resource?

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to-find-resources/

www.ocr.org.uk/gcsereform

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 2017** 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.

