

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F964/01**: European and World History Enquiries.
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1073–1555

Mark Scheme for January 2012

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, OCR Nationals, 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 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	A01a and b	AO2a
1	13-14	15-16
2	11-12	13-14
3	9-10	10-12
4	7-8	8-9
5	5-6	6-7
6	3-4	3-5
7	0-2	0-2

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; – the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a 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	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. • Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. • Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p style="text-align: center;">13-16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. • Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. • There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">28-34</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. • Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. • Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">9-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. • May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. • An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p style="text-align: center;">21-27</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. • Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. • Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p style="text-align: center;">5-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. • There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. • There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">14-20</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>The Sources are similar in content in that both agree that the crusaders were ready to endure a great deal of suffering in the divine cause, weakened by hunger in both sources. In both cases they received assistance from above and hence enjoyed success. Both Sources make it clear that the Turks were numerous and attacked strongly so the need for assistance from God was considerable.</p> <p>The Sources also differ in that A, Godfrey of Bouillon et al, refers to the discovery of the Holy Lance, which encouraged the crusaders, while in D, Guibert of Nogent, it is their 3 day fast and confession which brings about a change. A is more precise about the impact of the encouragement they received from God, suggesting an almost miraculous outcome, while D specifically states they had no hope of personal gain. This is perhaps implied by A since their sufferings were so great that only doing God's work could make it worthwhile.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both writers are informed about events, although for A it is first hand evidence. The purpose of Source A is to tell the pope what is happening and so the divine intervention is likely to be emphasised. Equally, the leaders will not be slow in pointing out what they have achieved, although they are more reluctant to detail their privations, implying they believed their difficulties were acceptable in so great a cause. Source D makes rather more of the miseries that the Franks faced, possibly to the point of exaggeration, since Guibert is writing about them, but he too is very ready to commend their religious commitment. His purpose is to show their exploits in the context of a holy war, taking the Old Testament conflicts as their model, where privation and suffering often led to a victorious outcome.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence, taking into consideration purpose and audience. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Three of the Sources take the view that Bohemond was a key to the capture of Antioch. These are Sources B, Raymond of Aguilers, C, the Gesta, and E, the modern historian. Sources A, Godfrey and his friends, and D, Guibert, differ in their view.</p> <p>The supporting view that Bohemond made all the difference is clear. In Source B his foresight allowed a hugely superior Turkish force to be defeated, in C he is praised for his rapid reaction to a crisis, in E his conduct is less commendable as he relies on treachery and is motivated by selfishness rather than piety, but his role is still a crucial one, and, whatever spurred him on, he was able to argue the crusaders round to his strategy.</p> <p>The opposing argument is found in Sources A and D where Bohemond does not get a mention. Divine intervention and the steadfastness of the crusading forces are seen as the main factors. The leaders of the crusade writing to the pope in Source A are not likely to give the credit to anyone other than themselves, or God. Moreover, they were not always sympathetic to Bohemond, a Norman from southern Italy, who had joined the crusade to better himself. Another hostile view of Bohemond is found in Anna Comnena, the daughter of the Byzantine emperor, who depicts him as greedy and dishonest, devoted only to his own interests, partly because she felt Antioch had been promised to Alexius whereas Bohemond was expecting to be given it and candidates may use their contextual knowledge of Anna's version to make this point. Guibert of Nogent in Source D does give Bohemond some credit in his account, but he is more concerned with the Franks. Arguably Source C shows that Robert Girard actually carried out the vital move, although he was ordered to do so by Bohemond.</p> <p>Regarding the provenance and context, Source C is written by a soldier in Bohemond's service and so is bound to be favourable to him, but Source B is supportive, although Raymond was generally reluctant to praise the duplicitous Bohemond and Source E, while making clear Bohemond's mixed motives, does suggest that a stalemate position was resolved by his ingenuity. Raymond of St Gilles was ill during the siege and this allowed Bohemond to seize the initiative. Source A is by the leaders of the crusade, who might have felt resentment about Bohemond's role and so failed to mention him. Source D has a similar tone, stressing the role of God, rather than man and so possibly contributing less usefully to the discussion. Candidates might conclude that Bohemond had much to gain and little to lose and so fought a determined campaign at Antioch and was deservedly successful.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>A supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The Sources have similarities. The attitude of both authors is uncompromising and both claim to be determined - Luther not to recant, and Charles V to take action against him. Such unbending attitudes had prevented earlier attempts to solve the crisis. Both claim to act in God's name - Charles to defend 'the honour of God' in Source C, and Luther 'the Word of God' in Source B. Charles claims to act for the salvation of souls, and knowledge might be used to link this to Luther's attack on indulgences. In Source B, Luther states that he is bound by conscience and cannot act against it, while the Emperor, in Source C, is resolved to stake his 'blood, life and soul' as well as his inheritance. Both mention the damage which compromise might cause. In Source B Luther's view is clear that 'it is not safe nor honest to act against one's conscience' and in Source C, Charles refers to the disgrace and damage to religion and the reputation of Germany which lack of action would cause. Hence the need to silence Luther using the full weight of the gathered dignitaries of the Empire at a Diet.</p> <p>The Sources express different attitudes towards the Church. In Source C, Charles sees the Church as 'Christendom', worthy of defence as the accumulated wisdom of a thousand years. Luther, in Source B is defiant and has no respect for Pope or councils as they have 'often erred and contradicted themselves', so he defends the scriptures rather than a corrupt Church. Comments on provenance and context should be integrated to aid the comparison. Luther is, as Charles puts it in Source C, 'a single monk', ignoring his vast support, whereas Charles bears the authority of defending the Church as elected Holy Roman Emperor, and inherited responsibility and reputation as the grandson of the 'Catholic Kings' of Spain - 'all my dominions and possessions'. Hence his fear of disgrace, but also his purpose in referring to the 'noble and renowned German nation' to gain the Electoral support necessary for his condemnation of Luther. The audience of both Sources is the Electors of the Holy Roman Empire, but whereas Source B is a spoken address to the Emperor, in front of all the princes and Electors, Source C is a written statement to them. The tone reflects this difference, for in Source B Luther calls Charles directly 'your serene Majesty', whereas in Source C Charles refers to Luther as 'impudent' and 'a notorious heretic'. He has no means of reply to this written condemnation. The context of the 1520 papal excommunication of Luther and Frederick of Saxony's request that he be heard in Germany might be used to inform the comparison, as might Luther's religious ideas if selected pertinently and linked clearly.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The sources can be read/analysed in different ways and as part of their judgement candidates will need to appreciate this.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources may be grouped by their differing views. Sources A and D support the interpretation, giving examples of Charles's honourable character and willingness to listen. Sources B and E present a firmer approach, based on honour in the form of reputation. In contrast, Source B implies that Luther's courageous defiance was a major reason, while Sources C, D and E suggest that Luther's wide support hampered Charles' action.</p> <p>The supporting view is in Sources A and D. Aleander in Source A admits that the papal authorities planned to silence Luther at the Diet by restricting his comments to a simple 'Yes' or 'No', but Charles V had honourably allowed Luther time to consider and respond at length, gaining support for his views and reputation. Source D points out the safe-conduct Charles granted to Luther in travelling to and from Worms. Some candidates might use knowledge to evaluate this honourable action considering such promises had not always been honoured - for example Jan Huss had been burned as a heretic despite the grant of a safe-conduct to the Council of Constance in 1415. This might be linked to Luther's reference to councils erring in Source B and to Catholic claims that Luther had Hussite views. In Source D Charles is said to have respected the views of the Electors in delaying his condemnation of Luther. Charles also listened to those Electors who requested Luther be warned privately so he might escape from Worms under the safe-conduct and reach a refuge within twenty days. Knowledge and provenance might be used to evaluate the reliability of Source D, written just after Luther's safe-conduct had expired, e.g. Luther's kidnap and hiding at the Wartburg. In light of its audience, an Italian-born historian, the Spanish secretary might be enhancing Charles' reputation in context of Frederick the Wise defying the imperial ban. Equally, the danger of unrest or even civil war due to Luther's popularity might have led to Charles' action and the source might be reliable. This point is implied in Sources A: the 'immense crowd', D: his Electoral support and E: printers and buyers of his books.</p> <p>Knowledge might be used to develop the weak position of the Emperor within the H.R.E. in comparison with many princes, and Charles V's youth and inexperience.</p> <p>Another view is that Luther's strength and courage made it impossible to silence him. Source B show the courage of Luther in defying the political authorities, gaining him support for his courage and religious certainty against enemies who tried to stage</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>manage his hearing. The Catholic authorities may have miscalculated in hoping that Luther would either not come to Worms or recant publicly through fear or persuasion. The provenance of this source is, however, unreliable and Aleander in Source A, equally unreliable, calls him a 'fool' so his heroism may have been exaggerated in B which is a reconstruction after the event. Aleander's tone is disparaging whereas Luther's is defiant, perhaps because he knew he had powerful support from Frederick of Saxony and popular support because of the printing press and national feeling in Germany. In contrast, the tone of Charles V's statement and Edict outlawing and banning Luther from the Empire have a firm, authoritative tone. However, this might be seen as unreliable, as the timing of Source E after Luther's supporters left Worms, confirms Source D where princely power in the Empire is clear.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation that Charles V's honourable character prevented the Emperor from silencing Luther at the Diet of Worms. No specific judgement is expected.</p>		

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

