

**GCE**

**History A**

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2016**

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
<b>BP</b>	Blank Page – this annotation <b>must</b> be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
<b>C</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a comparison of source similarity or difference is made, either of content or of provenance. In <b>Q(b)</b> it denotes an effective grouping (for two or more interpretations), linkage or cross reference between sources.
<b>J</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a judgement is reached on the sources <i>as evidence</i> using content and provenance. In <b>Q(b)</b> a judgement is made on how far the <i>sources</i> support an interpretation.
<b>P</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> the provenance is discussed and used as part of the judgement. In <b>Q(b)</b> a source's provenance is discussed discretely and not used to evaluate for the question. Linkage to the question is implicit.
<b>S</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a source or both sources are discussed separately and sequentially thus preventing comparison. In <b>Q(b)</b> the sources are approached sequentially thus preventing linkage and cross reference for the argument.
<b>XP</b>	Points of content and argument are juxtaposed – they are not comparable in <b>Q(a)</b> or the linkage made is inappropriate in <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>F</b>	In either question the approach to a source, the sources as a whole, or the response in general, is overly formulaic or generic, failing to engage with either source content or precise provenance and context.
<b>KU</b>	Knowledge is used appropriately to support, extend, explain (context) or question a source or sources.
<b>K</b>	Knowledge is 'bolt-on', there for its own sake and not used or linked to the sources.
<b>EVAL</b>	There is evaluation of the sources for the key issue and question. This can be used for <b>Q(a)</b> but is more likely to be used for <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>ILL</b>	The sources are simply used for reference or to illustrate an argument in <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>NAQ</b>	The points made are not linked to the question and do not answer it.
<b>?</b>	This is to be used in <b>both</b> questions where is a factual error, irrelevant material and, in <b>Q(b)</b> , an inaccurate, questionable or unconvincing grouping of the sources for the question. It is also to be used in <b>both</b> questions where a judgement is on the topic rather than the sources.
<b>NAR</b>	There is description, either of the sources or of knowledge, or simply a narrative.
<b>SEEN</b>	The page has been read. This <b>must be used on each page seen</b> to ensure that the whole response has been considered.

**NB.** A brief summative comment is required following both questions. Use the language of the generic mark scheme to justify the level you have awarded. For specific guidance please refer to the topic specific mark scheme. Marks awarded must match the comments given.

Here are the subject specific instructions for this question paper

Candidates should answer on only one Option. They should answer questions (a) and (b) on that Option. If they answer on more than one Option then the higher mark should be awarded. Do not allow marks across more than one option. If they answer on Q(a) comparing the wrong source or sources then no more than a high L6 mark can be awarded. If fewer than the 5 sources on Q(b) are used then the next level down from the one awarded otherwise awarded is given, although please use professional judgement here.

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

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

**Notes related to Part A:**

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

## Marking Grid for Question (a)

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

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

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

## Question (b) Maximum mark 70

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

## Notes related to Part B:

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



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

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

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

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	a	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that they both agree that William could be severe, destroying York in <b>C</b> and depriving his enemies of their lives in <b>D</b>. Both also suggest his methods could be justified. In <b>C</b> York had given hostages, indicating cooperation and then reneged, whilst in <b>D</b> the main problem was disloyalty.</p> <p>The Sources also <b>differ</b> in that <b>Source C</b> shows William personally bringing justice down on the city of York, while <b>Source D</b> has William using divide and rule tactics in a more subtle methodology. In <b>Source C</b> William reacts at once, while in <b>Source D</b> his actions build to a crescendo. <b>Source C</b> gives an example of another of William's methods, namely the replacement of Englishmen by Normans. <b>Source D</b> outlines William's escalating methods against those who were disloyal, while in <b>Source C</b> his patience is rather more rapidly worn out.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. <b>William of Malmesbury</b> had some appreciation of the way in which William became tired of the continual unreliability of the English, given his view that William was generally a fair master. <b>Hugh the Chantor</b> concentrated his work on York and was well-informed about affairs there. He considers that the attitude of the city of York fully justified William's violence. <b>Source C</b> is a little more measured in its evaluation and suggests that violence was a last resort for William if he could not get his way by guile. Since William did use both carrot and stick in his methods, candidates could argue a case for either Source as the more useful, but might feel that <b>D</b> had the broader approach.</p>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The focus must be comparative.</b> Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is good reason for not doing.</li> <li>• No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02)</li> <li>• The comparison must be for the <b>key Issue</b> –</li> <li>• If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded.</li> <li>• The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer.</li> <li>• Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation.</li> <li>• <b>Provenance</b> may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'.</li> <li>• <b>Stand-alone knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use <b>context</b> to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse.</li> <li>• Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Judgements</b>, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. <b>Judgement on the topic</b> rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</li> </ul>
1	b	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The <b>supporting</b> view, that William was hostile, is found in <b>Source B</b>, Orderic Vitalis, in part, in <b>Source C</b>, Hugh the Chantor and in <b>Source D</b>, William of Malmesbury. The opposing view, that he was friendly, is found in <b>Source A</b>, William of Poitiers and <b>Source E</b>, Deeds of Hereward and partly in <b>Source B</b>.</p> <p>The <b>supporting</b> argument indicates that the disloyalty shown by the English led William to be hostile to them. <b>Source B</b> shows the rebellion of Edwin and Morcar led William to bestow lands on Normans, on whose loyalty he could depend, while <b>Source C</b> indicates he rapidly lost patience with the English at York and moved in with considerable hostility. He also replaced a Saxon archbishop with a Norman. From <b>Source D</b> comes a more balanced account, but still one which shows William had no love for the English and rather delighted in setting factions of his enemies against one another to his own advantage.</p> <p>The <b>opposing</b> argument that William was ready to be friendly is illustrated in <b>Source A</b>. Here William I was prepared to pardon English earls and restore their lands. In <b>Source B</b> he also gave lands to Waltheof and a</p>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is to <b>assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge the given interpretation</b>. The <b>focus must be on the sources</b>, and use their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</li> <li>• A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but <b>no set conclusion is expected</b>. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is <b>good reason</b> for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</li> <li>• <b>Bolt-on knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Norman wife as a sign of favour. Similarly, <b>Source E</b> shows that William was in a forgiving mood and was only persuaded by his advisors that pardoning Hereward was a poor move. <b>Source D</b> shows that the problems could be resolved with the help of nobles who faced loss from the warfare.</p> <p><b>Contextual knowledge</b> could be used to argue that William I was in a difficult situation in England since his forces were vastly outnumbered and he was under threat of invasion on numerous occasions. Therefore, if he could not trust the English, he was bound to see them as his enemies. <b>Source A</b> shows that he was initially merciful to Morcar and Edwin, but they then deserted him and joined his enemies, although some argue that they were virtually under house arrest at William's court and saw rebellion as their only option. Northumbria remained in a state of simmering revolt for much of the reign. Waltheof joined the rebellion of the earls of East Anglia and Hereford and then had second thoughts and betrayed the plot but was, nevertheless, arrested and finally executed in 1076. He was denounced by his wife, Judith, proving her loyalty to her uncle. By the end of the reign there were no major landholders who were English.</p> <p>With regard to <b>provenance</b> candidates might suggest that the authors of the documents are often, almost surprisingly, even-handed. <b>Source A</b>, from one of William's greatest admirers, shows the king as almost too forgiving and just to the English. The only hint of suspicion comes in the need for castles to be held by reliable Normans. <b>Source B</b> has examples of gifts of land to both an Englishman and a Norman, and makes it clear, again, that key positions on the Welsh borders needed to be held by Normans. But it is more suggestive of hostility in the</p>		<p><b>unbalanced.</b> Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It follows that <b>knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source</b> (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01.</li> <li>• <b>Evaluation</b> of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.</li> <li>• Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below.</li> <li>• To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the <b>sources need to be grouped</b> according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. <b>Check that a grouping makes sense</b> – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made.</li> <li>• <b>A judgement based on the sources</b> is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing <b>or on the topic rather than the sources.</b> However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered.</li> <li>• Be impressed by <b>cross reference</b> within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>final sentence. <b>Source D</b> implies that William tried not to be hostile but the English only had themselves to blame. The balance in these Sources may lead candidates to find them more useful in supporting the view. <b>Source C</b> sees the fate of York as fully deserved and candidates may be aware that Hugh's main purpose in writing was to explain the dispute between York and Canterbury. <b>Source E</b> may well be challenged as an idealised account of events and hence less reliable than the other sources and thus not a weighty argument against the view. Hence candidates could be expected to conclude that the Sources do show that William was hostile, but with the corollary that he was largely justified in his attitude.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>		<p>to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but <b>do not apply inflexibly</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the <b>sources to illustrate</b> an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is <b>referencing</b>.</li> <li>• It is <b>not</b> necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <b>Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded</b> – do <b>not</b> mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.</li> <li>• <b>Judgement</b> might accept or refute the view in the question.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The sources have similarities and differences of <b>provenance</b>. Both are speeches from the same House of Lords debate and written by Catholics. However, while one is a temporal Lord the other is Archbishop of York and retains his political position as Chancellor, held under Mary I.</li> <li>The <b>content</b> of the sources is in part <b>similar</b> and reflects Catholic arguments on the potential impact of the Bill. Both Sources fear that heresies will increase – ‘wicked heresies and confused religion’ in <b>Source A</b> and ‘swamped by divisions’ in <b>Source B</b>.</li> <li><b>Knowledge</b> might be added of religious divisions present in 1559, Catholic aims to retain their church and influence and an influx of Protestants returning from Europe after felling to avoid Mary’s persecution.</li> <li>The content is also <b>different</b> because of differences in authorship. While <b>Source A</b> stresses the practical effects of repealing Catholic anti-heresy laws and confusion of religious practices, <b>Source B</b> fears for the legal and international status of rejecting canon law, losing status in general councils (it might be <b>known</b> that the Council of Trent was in session) and rejecting papal guidance.</li> <li>The <b>content</b> of the sources is also different because <b>Source A</b> stresses foreign and domestic threats, such as papal excommunication, invasion by Catholic France or Spain and rebellions, weakness and poverty at home. On the other hand, <b>Source B</b> argues against accepting a woman as Supreme over the Church. An Archbishop would be well-informed about doctrine and would accept these views but might also reflect a more general common view.</li> <li>Both sources have the limitation that they are Catholic members of the House of Lords, but <b>B</b> might be seen to have more strength in representing more general</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The focus must be comparative.</b> Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below.</li> <li><b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is good reason for not doing.</li> <li>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’ (A02)</li> <li>The comparison must be for the <b>key Issue</b> - as evidence for arguments against the 1559 Supremacy Bill. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded.</li> <li>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer.</li> <li>Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation.</li> <li><b>Provenance</b> may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or ‘stock’.</li> <li><b>Stand-alone knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use <b>context</b> to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse.</li> <li>Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.</li> </ul>



Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		views at that time.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Judgements</b>, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. <b>Judgement on the topic</b> rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</li> </ul>
2	b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Sources A, B and C</b> are written by Catholics, so they can be used to support the interpretation. They aim to prevent the introduction of a Protestant settlement by explaining its dangers. However, it has to be remembered that this is in a debate about the Supremacy Bill and own knowledge can evaluate how effective these arguments ultimately were. <b>A and B</b> take an English and <b>C</b> a Spanish perspective. Both <b>A</b> and <b>C</b> suggest that foreign interference might occur unless the Church Settlement makes some concessions to Catholic pressures. <b>Source C</b> adds the danger of such a Settlement for Elizabeth's throne by referring to papal support for Mary Queen of Scots.</li> <li>• <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to develop and explain Elizabeth's concessions to Catholicism in the 1559 Settlement and to confirm her foreign fears. Examples might include the close of the Habsburg Valois wars and potential Franco-Spanish co-operation against Elizabeth. This might be balanced with Mary, Queen of Scots' marriage to the French Dauphin.</li> <li>• <b>Sources A and B</b> warn of popular unrest, 'swamped by divisions' and <b>Source B</b> of loss of legal and international status if a Protestant Settlement of dubious legality is set up. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm the precedent of the Western Rebellion 1549; that the Council of Trent had convened and/or that</li> </ul>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is to <b>assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge the given interpretation</b>. The <b>focus must be on the sources</b>, and use their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</li> <li>• A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but <b>no set conclusion is expected</b>. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is <b>good reason</b> for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</li> <li>• <b>Bolt-on knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Elizabeth was made aware of the need to legitimise the Church Settlement by Act of Parliament (as in <b>Source D</b>.) These considerations might be linked to the reference in <b>Source C</b> that Elizabeth suggested to Feria that she wished to restore Henry VIII's Anglo-Catholic church of the 1540s, which had allowed good relations with the Emperor. This statement might be evaluated for its reliability using contextual knowledge such as opposition in the House of Lords and the removal and replacement of Catholic bishops with reformers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> suggests Catholic influence on Elizabeth's acceptance of the title Supreme Governor rather than Supreme Head of the Church, which is confirmed in <b>Source E</b>. However, this view of female rule was more generally accepted at the time, so may not represent specifically Catholic pressure.</li> <li>• <b>Sources D</b> and <b>E</b> both could be used to suggest that there were more Catholic influences than many reformers wanted or approved of.</li> <li>• <b>For the alternative view, Sources A, B</b> and especially <b>C</b> imply that Protestant influences on Elizabeth are stronger – especially in parliament, from 'rogues returning from Germany'. Feria, in <b>C</b> also hints that the queen herself has Protestant tendencies. Knowledge might be used to develop this point – e.g. Elizabeth's behaviour during Mary I's reign.</li> <li>• <b>Sources C, D</b> and <b>E</b> suggest triumphs for the returning Protestants in parliament which might be expanded using <b>knowledge</b>: the 1559 Prayer Book and Act of Uniformity, removal of the Catholic bishops and of the Mass. As Marian exiles, some of these Protestants will have experienced reformed church systems without bishops. <b>Source D</b> and parts of <b>Sources C</b> and <b>E</b> take a positive view of Protestant influences on the</li> </ul>		<p><b>unbalanced</b>. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It follows that <b>knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source</b> (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01.</li> <li>• <b>Evaluation</b> of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.</li> <li>• Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below.</li> <li>• To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the <b>sources need to be grouped</b> according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. <b>Check that a grouping makes sense</b> – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made.</li> <li>• <b>A judgement based on the sources</b> is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing <b>or on the topic rather than the sources</b>. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered.</li> <li>• Be impressed by <b>cross reference</b> within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, some candidates may use the sources to support a third argument. The second part of <b>Source E</b> and part of <b>Source D</b> suggest that Catholic influences are still strong at court and in the parishes, encouraged by Elizabeth's Injunctions allowing Catholic ornaments in church services. <b>Knowledge</b> of the 'middle-road' policy (<i>'via media'</i>) adopted by Elizabeth might be developed to confirm that she chose to balance the influences of Catholics and Protestants to lessen foreign and domestic threats and maintain stability.</li> <li>• As far as <b>provenance</b> the minority puritan view in <b>Source E</b> might be balanced with the rather apathetic views of the Catholic majority in contrast to those of the Catholic authors of <b>Source A, B and C</b> who were less typically representative. The view of Jewel in <b>Source D</b>, who himself became a Bishop shortly afterwards, shows that he is able to adopt a more conciliatory approach in regards to Elizabeth's 'via media'. The rather outraged tone adopted in <b>Sources A, B and C</b> contrasts with the more measured and objective style of <b>Sources D and E</b>.</li> </ul>		<p>to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but <b>do not apply inflexibly</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the <b>sources to illustrate</b> an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is <b>referencing</b>.</li> <li>• It is <b>not</b> necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.</li> <li>• Candidates <b>do not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <b>Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded</b> – do <b>not</b> mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.</li> <li>• <b>Judgement</b> might accept or refute the view that the grouped sources agree that Catholic influence on the Church Settlement was stronger.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	a	<p>At face value, the contents of the Sources seem <b>similar</b> in attitude as both suggest ways to resolve the disagreements between King and Parliament. They both suggest religious and political reform. In <b>Source B</b> the King offers to end innovations in the courts, government and church, and likewise in <b>Source E</b> Parliament agrees to religious and political reform. However, <b>knowledge</b> of the gulf between the two sides might be used to qualify this apparent point of agreement. The <b>context</b> of the sources is very different and selected events might inform source evaluation. In <b>Source B</b> the King specifies that he will not concede episcopal power in the House of Lords as it had been in Elizabeth I's time. <b>Knowledge</b> of Strafford's and Laud's impeachment in November and December 1640 might suggest that the King would not countenance the kind of government or Church reform envisaged in <b>Source E</b>.</p> <p>Similarly, <b>the Sources agree</b> on the need to solve financial problems. <b>Source B</b> is dated not long after Charles had called the Long Parliament to deal with his continuing bankruptcy after the Bishops' Wars and the failure of the Short Parliament. In <b>Source B</b> the King offers to give up aspects of his revenue judged 'illegal or grievous to the public'. However, it may be known that his offer to end ship money had not persuaded the Short Parliament to grant him supply, leading to its dismissal after 3 weeks. In <b>Source E</b> Parliament appears willing to grant the King a constant increase in revenue. The context of <b>Source E</b> is after passing of the Triennial Act, dismantling of the prerogative courts and Strafford's very recent execution. The Irish Rebellion had broken out and the King had rejected the Grand Remonstrance. The King's failed attempt to arrest the Five Members and the passing of the Militia Ordinance had increased</p>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The focus must be comparative.</b> Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is good reason for not doing.</li> <li>• No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02)</li> <li>• The comparison must be for the <b>key Issue</b> –</li> <li>• If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded.</li> <li>• The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer.</li> <li>• Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation.</li> <li>• <b>Provenance</b> may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'.</li> <li>• <b>Stand-alone knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use <b>context</b> to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse.</li> <li>• Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Parliament's confidence, but produced two opposing sides.</p> <p>In discussing <b>provenance</b>, the tone and nature of the Sources reveal clear <b>differences</b> in attitude. <b>Source B</b> implies that the King still considers he retains the power of consent. However, <b>Source E</b> reflects Parliament's practical power to remove councillors, withhold supply, reform religion and control the army. It might be suggested in evaluation that neither side was prepared to make the concessions the other side desired. As a persuasive speech by the King to the House of Lords, <b>Source B</b> has the <b>purpose</b> of reassuring the bishops, who would have been amongst his audience. Here the King offers to reform government and the law courts as they existed in Elizabeth's time, implying defence of the 'ancient constitution'. However, in evaluation, some may mention Charles's untrustworthiness. <b>Source E</b>, in contrast, has the <b>purpose</b> of imposing change. The King could not have accepted the Nineteen Propositions without handing power to Parliament. Thus it might be felt that by the time of <b>Source E</b>, it was too late to resolve disagreements and that two opposing sides had emerged, willing to fight to defend their cause. <b>Source E</b> is likely to be seen as more factual and reliable than <b>Source B</b> because it is a statement rather than a persuasive speech. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Judgements</b>, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. <b>Judgement on the topic</b> rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3 b	<p>The Sources are likely to be grouped by interpretation. <b>Sources B and E support the interpretation</b> that Parliament's desire for power prevented agreement with the King. The content of <b>Source B</b> is useful, as it claims that Parliament has tried to alter the government out of malice, have withheld revenue and aims to remove the political power of the bishops. This view is unsurprising as the <b>provenance</b> of the speech is Charles I himself and his House of Lords audience includes the bishops. His purpose is to defend them and rally their support after Parliament's impeachment of Laud in the previous month. <b>Sources D and E</b> might be cross-referenced to support this argument. Both suggest that Commons MPs are attempting to increase the power of Parliament (<b>Source D</b>), but these charges may be seen as unreliable, for example 'subverting the rights of Parliament'. <b>Knowledge</b> of the failed attempt to arrest the Five Members might be seen as the King himself subverting Parliamentary privileges. The King suggests that they aim to supplant the King's power with their own arbitrary laws and government, which is likely to be evaluated as an overstatement in light of <b>Source E</b>, presented to the King by the House of Commons. His tone is angry and his language emotive, such as 'tyrannical', 'denounced', 'alienate', 'subvert', 'traitorously', and he claims that Parliament has invited a foreign power to invade England. However, in this extract from the Nineteen Propositions, Parliament supports the claim by demanding the power to approve the Royal Council, reform the church system and control the militia as conditions on which royal revenue will be supplied. <b>Knowledge</b>, such as the Triennial Act, the Militia Ordinance, removal of the prerogative courts and the recent execution of Strafford might be used to confirm Parliament's increased power. There might be cross-reference of 'denouncing the king' and alienating the</p>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is to <b>assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge the given interpretation</b>. The <b>focus must be on the sources</b>, and use their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</li> <li>• A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but <b>no set conclusion is expected</b>. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is <b>good reason</b> for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</li> <li>• <b>Bolt-on knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is <b>unbalanced</b>. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</li> <li>• It follows that <b>knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source</b> (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01.</li> <li>• <b>Evaluation</b> of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>affections of his people' in <b>Source D</b>, with the views of a moderate MP in <b>Source C</b>. He also states that lies had been told about the king and that he had been referred to as an outsider at the time of the Grand Remonstrance. However, the provenance of <b>Sources C</b> and <b>D</b> brings their reliability into question. The author of <b>Source C</b> is later a royalist, though it might be noted that, at the time of this speech, his even-handedness is shown by his willingness to balance criticism of the King's evil councillors and religious policies, with his criticism of the Remonstrance. Some may infer that his comment 'I hope not' suggests that he feared that parliament hoped to establish its own power. The introduction to <b>Source D</b> suggests that the King had been pushed into his over-reaction and his unwise attempt to arrest the Five Members.</p> <p>The counter-argument, that parliament merely sought reform and the removal of 'evil counsellors', is supported by <b>Sources A</b> and to an extent <b>B</b>. In <b>A</b>, Pym is speaking in the early days of the Long Parliament, so shows a more moderate approach than that of <b>Source E</b>, when events such as the Irish Rebellion and the attempted arrest of the Five Members had soured relations with the King. He is careful to suggest that Strafford is the main obstacle to an agreement with the King, and there is a sense of loyalty rather than an implication that Parliament seeks power. However, the legislation of the Long Parliament might be cited in evaluation of this Source. It might also be cross-referenced with <b>Sources D</b> and <b>E</b>, where loyalty to the king and his power is being challenged. In the case of <b>E</b>, the obstacle mentioned in <b>A</b> has been removed by the execution of Strafford, yet the demands continue. The King's speech, in <b>Source B</b>, is accommodating of moderate reform suggesting that many of Parliament's demands are justified, which is confirmed by cross-</p>		<p>limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below.</li> <li>• To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the <b>sources need to be grouped</b> according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. <b>Check that a grouping makes sense</b> – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made.</li> <li>• <b>A judgement based on the sources</b> is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing <b>or on the topic rather than the sources</b>. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered.</li> <li>• Be impressed by <b>cross reference</b> within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but <b>do not apply inflexibly</b>.</li> <li>• If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the <b>sources to illustrate</b> an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is <b>referencing</b>.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>reference with Dering's speech in <b>Source C</b>.</p> <p>The alternative argument, that the King was to blame for the failure to reach an agreement with Parliament, rests mainly on the charges laid in <b>Source D</b> and the failed attempt to arrest the Five Members in contravention of parliamentary privilege. It may be inferred that the King was waging war on the MPs rather than his claim that they were doing so against him. <b>Sources A, B and D</b> provide evidence of the King's errors and his unwillingness to accept more than minor change. When it came to the church or the militia, the two sides were poles apart. It might be suggested that his <b>purpose</b> in <b>Source B</b> was to obtain revenue by making concessions he might not be trusted to honour. His character is likely to be viewed negatively in support of this view. This view is likely to be accepted in preference to the interpretation in the question, but the main requirement is that judgement should be based on a balanced consideration of the grouped sources and their views.</p> <p>A supported overall <b>judgement</b> is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of knowledge and Source limitations. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is <b>not</b> necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <b>Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded</b> – do <b>not</b> mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.</li> <li>• <b>Judgement</b> might accept or refute the view in the question.</li> </ul>



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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

