

# **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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS  
2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

|            | <b>A01a</b> | <b>A01b</b> |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>IA</b>  | 21-24       | 24-26       |
| <b>IB</b>  | 18-20       | 22-23       |
| <b>II</b>  | 16-17       | 19-21       |
| <b>III</b> | 14-15       | 16-18       |
| <b>IV</b>  | 12-13       | 13-15       |
| <b>V</b>   | 9-11        | 11-12       |
| <b>VI</b>  | 4-8         | 6-10        |
| <b>VII</b> | 0-3         | 0-5         |

## Notes:

- (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 fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

| <b>AOs</b>                               | <b>AO1a</b>   | <b>AO1b</b>  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Total mark for each question = 50</b> | Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.   | Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <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>   |
| <b>Level IA</b>                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-24</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected</li> <li>• The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>24-26</b></p>   |
| <b>Level IB</b>                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>18-20</b></p>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>22-23</b></p> |

| AOs              | AO1a  | AO1b  |
|------------------|---|---|
| <b>Level II</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic</li> <li>• Generally accurate use of historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16-17</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description</li> <li>• The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>19-21</b></p>   |
| <b>Level III</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used</li> <li>• Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-15</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context</li> <li>• Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events <b>OR</b> answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin.</li> <li>• Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues</li> <li>• Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16-18</b></p> |
| <b>Level IV</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>12-13</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory.</li> <li>• Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained <b>OR</b> answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis.</li> <li>• Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-15</b></p>  |

| AOs              | AO1a  | AO1b  |
|------------------|---|---|
| <b>Level V</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also</li> <li>• Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use</li> <li>• Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-11</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic</li> <li>• General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation <b>OR</b> there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions</li> <li>• There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p> |
| <b>Level VI</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4-8</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little understanding of key concepts</li> <li>• Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements</li> <li>• Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary</li> <li>• The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-10</b></p>   |
| <b>Level VII</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge</li> <li>• Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-3</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of key concepts or historical developments.</li> <li>• No valid explanations</li> <li>• Typically very brief and very descriptive answer</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-5</b></p>   |

| Question | Answer   | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 1        | <p>The key to high level answers will be a willingness to address the issue of 'how' stable. Candidates should be aware that the question covers all of the period of the Study Topic from 1035 to 1066 and therefore they may consider the problems and instability that followed the death of Cnut. There are a number of issues that candidates might consider and it is possible that these will include Edward's ability to manage the Godwin family, the frequency or otherwise of unrest and how well it was managed and this might lead to a consideration of how close England came to civil war in 1051-2. There might also be mention of the impact of Norman influence and whether that caused disquiet. Some answers might consider how successfully the Viking threat was handled and the use of Danegeld to help create stability. Other answers might focus on the stability of government and the development of institutions which made England the best governed state in western Europe and this might be linked to the growth of trade and the development of towns which could be used to indicate stability. However, this might be balanced against the looming issue of the succession, particularly as it became apparent that Edward would not produce an heir.</p> | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.</p>  |
| 2        | <p>Candidates may suggest that the major cause of the crisis was Edward's failure to produce an heir. This might then be linked to his failure to designate a clear successor. There might be some consideration as to whether Edward named William as his successor and whether Godwin also agreed to help him gain the throne during his visits to Normandy. This might be balanced against Edward's actions on his death bed when it is claimed he named Godwin as his successor, thus giving Godwin a reason to resist William. Others might argue that regardless of these actions Godwin, as the most powerful earl and a Saxon, was bound to resist William's claim. Some candidates might also make mention of the claim of Hardrada and link this back to the rule of Cnut and Harthcanut. It is also possible that there might be mention of Edgar Aetheling. Some might argue that the absence of clear guidelines to the succession made a crisis more likely, particularly when the king died childless. There could be a consideration of the motives of each of the claimants and how they simply took advantage of a confused situation that followed Edward's death.</p>  | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. Candidates are likely to consider a number of reasons for the crisis, but answers at the higher levels should evaluate the relative importance of the factors and reach a judgement.</p> |

| Question | Answer   | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 3        | <p>Candidates will have studied the reign of Edward the Confessor and therefore it is likely that comparisons with his rule will feature significantly in the answers. However, it should be noted that at AS candidates are not expected to show knowledge of the historiographical debate on the issue, although answers that make use of it to support their argument should be given credit. Candidates may focus on the elements of continuity and change and show some understanding of these elements. It is likely that many answers will focus quite extensively on feudalism, but the highest credit should be given when this is linked to the methods of government. Writs were used and these were a legacy of Anglo-Saxon government, although they were not usually in English and they were used more frequently to enforce William's orders. Sheriffs and shire courts were continued but sheriffs were evidently more important as royal officials. There was a change in the personnel at the top. Normans dominated government and candidates might make reference to the removal of Saxon earls, culminating in the death of Waltheof. The personal rule of the king became more important.</p>   | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At the higher levels candidates should address the question of 'how far' and consider the question of continuity.</p>                                      |
| 4        | <p>There is no requirement for candidates to compare the two periods of Edward's rule, but this could provide an effective answer. Candidates might argue that Edward was not very successful in restoring order in the period between 1461 and 1470 and that this can be seen in his deposition. He found it difficult to control disorder and warfare, partly a legacy of the reign of Henry VI. The Lancastrians were a particular problem, most notably in the north and this made it more difficult for Edward. It might also be suggested that Edward found it difficult because he was dependent upon some of the powerful nobles, such as Warwick. Evidence of his failure can also be seen in Somerset and Percy continuing in rebellion. Some might also suggest that his marriage did little to create order and drove some into opposition. However, it might be noted that Edward did win support from certain groups as he provided a government that was both fair and effective. It might also be suggested that given the growth of 'overmighty subjects' Edward's achievements should not be underestimated. Many might argue that if he was not successful in restoring order in the period of his first rule this is less true of his second period. It might be argued that the death of Henry and his son made it easier for him as there was no obvious figurehead to oppose his rule. In building up royal finances he increased his</p> | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At the higher levels candidates will need to address the question of 'how' and not simply list evidence of success and failure, but reach a judgement.</p> |

| Question |  | Answer  | Marks | Guidance  |
|----------|--|---|-------|---|
|          |  | power and this increased respect for the crown. Some might argue that ultimately Edward was not successful as he failed to ensure a peaceful succession and that this resulted in a continuation of the Wars of the Roses until 1485.   |       |   |
| 5        |  | In considering his abilities candidates might consider his moves to quickly seize power following the death of Edward in 1483 and then the steps taken to crush any opposition, for example with the execution of Hastings who had been important in the previous reign. Despite this being before he was crowned king candidates can be credited for it, but should not be penalised for its exclusion. There might also be mention of the arrest of Rivers and his execution. It is likely that many will consider the involvement of Richard in the alleged murder of the Princes, but this needs to be linked to the issues of able and unlucky. His promotion of a group of favoured confidantes, often from the north, which aroused animosity in the south might also be used to show that he was not always able in handling patronage. This might be balanced against his management and use of parliament. Richard might be considered to be unlucky in his links with the murder of the Princes in the Tower and the allegations that he killed Queen Anne in order to marry Elizabeth of York. Candidates are free to judge whether these accusations against Richard are valid. Some might argue that his treatment of Buckingham also reveals his quality as king. It might be argued that he was unlucky as Lancastrian opposition remained implacable and that they were fortunate to find a champion, with foreign support, in the form of Henry Tudor. Events at Bosworth might also be considered and some might argue Richard was unlucky with the loyalty of some of the nobles. Examiners should be aware that there is a tendency for answers on Richard to be dominated by the Princes in the Tower and answers that focus excessively on this issue should not be over-rewarded. | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of 'how far' and reach a judgement. |

| Question | Answer  | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 6        | <p>It is expected that answers in the higher levels will focus on the issue of 'how' and not simply list the areas where Henry was either successful or unsuccessful and at the lower levels simply describe what he did. Despite his victory at Bosworth, Henry still faced a variety of Yorkist challenges. Some might argue that these were handled successfully and that Henry was able to hand on a secure throne to his son. It might be argued that the decline in rebellion after the defeat of Simnel provides evidence of his success and that Warbeck was never more than a nuisance that Henry was largely able to nullify. Yorkist reliance on pretenders might also be used to suggest that Henry's management was so successful that they had to resort to pretenders. However, this could be balanced against the need to confront Simnel on the battlefield, which could easily have become a repeat of Bosworth, demonstrating the precariousness of his situation. This was also replicated in the later disloyalty of the Stanleys. Some might argue that the King also took decisive steps to deal with the threat. His marriage to Elizabeth of York was a clever move, as was dating his reign from the day before Bosworth. Henry was also clever in imprisoning the Earl of Warwick, son of Clarence, until the conspiracies of others provided an excuse for his execution. It is likely that many answers will spend a large amount of time on Simnel and Warbeck, but the highest marks will be awarded to those who consider how successfully Henry dealt with them. It might be argued that they posed little threat and therefore it was easy for Henry to deal with them, but others might suggest that they provided focus for the plots of others in both England and overseas. This could then lead to a discussion of how well Henry handled this and there might be reference to foreign agreements, such as Ayton or Etaples. Some might argue that Henry's tactics were successful as he was able to take firm military action when needed, but also recognised when diplomatic methods were needed and was able to control a potentially factious nobility.</p> | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer  | Marks | Guidance  |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 7        | <p>There are a wide range of areas that candidates might consider, but it is not expected that they will cover all aspects, what matters is the quality of analysis. Candidates might discuss his financial measures and suggest that he was successful at first, perhaps stressing the introduction of the subsidy. However, despite the large sums that were raised candidates could suggest that the latter was a failure with regard to the resistance offered to Amicable Grant and subsequent unrest. There might be consideration of his legal reforms and candidates might point to the increased availability of justice and the increase in the number of cases, examining the Court of Requests and Star Chamber. However, some might suggest that there were limits because the courts were unable to handle the increase in business. Some answers might examine his social reforms; if this area is examined it might include his policies towards enclosures and attempts to deal with engrossing. As Papal Legate some might consider his reforms of the church and whether they dealt with the problems; this might include the closure of some monasteries and the opening of schools. There could also be a relevant discussion of his attempts to control the nobility and the success of measures such as the Eltham Ordinances. There might be some who argue that he antagonised the nobility and created an anti-Wolsey faction that ultimately resulted in his downfall. Some candidates might take a more long term view and consider the long term success or otherwise of his policies, looking at their impact after 1530. This approach is acceptable, but candidates who do not must not be penalised.</p> | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. However, at the higher levels candidates should address the issue of 'how' successful and not simply list his successes and failures.</p> |
| 8        | <p>Some answers might start by focusing on the aims in this period and conclude that they reflected the wishes of the king. Henry was still keen to be seen as an influential monarch alongside Francis and Charles; he still had ambitions to assert his claim to the French throne, although how serious is a matter of conjecture. There might be consideration of his aims towards Scotland; was it simply to secure the border or did he have dreams of uniting the two kingdoms? Was his desire for military glory and victory the major concern and therefore was Henry simply looking for success in his final years? In assessing the degree of success much will depend upon what are seen as his aims and priorities. It might be noted that in achieving glory, Henry was the only monarch of the leading powers to achieve a substantial military victory with the capture of</p>  | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question set. At the higher levels candidates should focus on 'how far' and not simply list any evidence of either success or failure.</p>         |

| Question | Answer  | Marks | Guidance  |
|----------|---|-------|---|
|          | <p>Boulogne; although this was costly and was not built upon. It did allow Henry to achieve glory and demonstrate his military prowess. A similar argument could be put forward for Scotland with the victory at Solway Moss. However, some might argue that if he wanted to unite the two nations it failed as the 'rough wooing' only succeeded in driving the Scots closer to France, and the renunciation of the Treaty of Greenwich. This might be balanced against securing the northern border and weakening the Scottish monarchy so that it was no longer a serious threat. The financial implications might be considered, but some may argue that this would have been of little consequence to Henry.</p>   |       |   |
| 9        | <p>There are a number of problems that might be discussed and candidates are not expected to consider all issues, what matters is the quality of analysis. Candidates might begin by identifying the problems that Mary's government faced; these might include economic and social issues, the financial inheritance, faction and opposition to her marriage. Some candidates might consider the religious problems, but this is not to be expected as it is not part of this study unit, however credit should be given when it is considered, provided it is not to the exclusion of everything else. The problem of poor harvests and disease might figure among some answers and candidates might suggest that there was little that Mary's government could do about these problems; some might suggest that they were symbolic of the failings of the government and others might argue that the government cannot have failed completely as the problems did not lead to mass unrest. Financially the situation was poor, although Northumberland had ended debasement and candidates might argue that Mary continued this policy and helped to stabilise the currency, although this could be balanced against the expense of war against France. Faction is sometimes seen as destabilising the government and there might be mention of the struggle between Paget and Gardiner, or of the unwieldy size of the Council, but it can be argued that this had little impact on the effectiveness of government. Opposition to the marriage and subsequent rebellion may figure significantly in many answers and candidates might suggest that the rebellion was stopped and the marriage proceeded. However, against this it could be argued that the rebels came close to entering the City and directly challenging Mary and that a consequence of the rebellion was Philip's decision to spend little time in England resulting in the failure to achieve a Catholic heir.</p> | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At the higher levels candidates should focus on 'how far' and not simply list areas of success and failure.</p> |

| Question | Answer  | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 10       | <p>At the top levels candidates will need to focus on the issue of 'how serious' and reach a supported judgement. At lower levels there is likely to be a list of problems that were and were not serious. There are many possible problems that candidates might consider and it is not expected that they will deal with them all, what matters is the quality of analysis. Examiners should also note that historiography is not a requirement of AS, but candidates who use it to support their argument should be rewarded, but care must be taken not over-reward those who simply describe the views of historians. At the higher levels candidates will provide precise examples and avoid sweeping generalisations about issues such as absenteeism and pluralism. Candidates may consider issues such as absenteeism, pluralism, complaints about the behaviour of the clergy, corruption in monasteries, the wealth of the church, cases such as Hunne, Fish and the lack of an educated clergy. Discussion of these issues may be balanced by an awareness of the popularity of the late medieval church shown in the lack of complaints, the scale of donations shown in wills and the church building. Candidates might also suggest that the church had appeal because it fulfilled the needs of parishioners, both in rural and urban areas through links with the agricultural cycle and catholic literature. There may be some awareness that many of the complaints were limited and that some of the examples have been exaggerated or are not typical of the period.</p> | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.</p>  |
| 11       | <p>Candidates might consider issues such as the impact of the changes on the mass of the population, noting that the early changes would have made little difference to religious life. Better answers might go on to argue that once change was noticeable it did lead to large-scale opposition in the form of the Pilgrimage of Grace and therefore suggest that the government was less effective. Some might consider how effectively the government handled the rising. It could be argued that the fear of the Treason law silenced any potential opposition and therefore the government was effective. Cromwell's management of parliament might also be seen as a factor. This could lead to a discussion of Cromwell's ability to get the political nation on-side and the prospect of rewards from the dissolution reduced potential opposition even further. It could be argued that the piecemeal nature of the changes meant that nobody realised the direction the changes were taking and therefore opposition was very difficult. Some candidates might argue that</p>  |       | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At the higher levels candidates must do more than simply provide a list of reasons of how they dealt with opposition, but must evaluate their relative importance and reach a balanced judgement. There are many reasons that candidates might consider and it is not expected that they will discuss them all, what matters is the quality of analysis.</p> |

| Question | Answer   | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|--|-------|--|
|          | <p>many thought that once Henry had his divorce and heir there would be a return to the Catholic fold and therefore the changes would be short-lived. It might therefore be argued that in creating this illusion the government was effective. Candidates might consider how effective they were in handling the high profile cases such as Fisher and More or the Carthusian monks. It might be argued that they were effective as it prevented further opposition or it might be argued that such high-profile cases damaged Henry's reputation.</p>  |       |  |
| 12       | <p>At the higher levels candidates should focus on 'how much' and not simply list evidence of support or opposition for the settlement. There are a variety of approaches that might be taken for this question and examiners need to be flexible in their approach. Some might argue that the success of the Marian reformation would suggest that there would be opposition and this might be supported by reference to the difficulty Elizabeth faced in getting measures through the Lords and the need to imprison some. Potential for opposition might also be commented on with Elizabeth's decision to take the title 'Supreme Governor' in order to placate more conservative forces. Candidates might argue that the moderate nature of the settlement would placate all but extremists, but this could be balanced against the expectations of the returning 'Marian exiles' and their desire for a more radical and protestant settlement. Some might argue that the more conservative nature of the settlement did reconcile more moderate Catholics and examples from the settlement might be used to support this line. This approach could also be reinforced by reference to some of Elizabeth's own actions during the first year, although it might be suggested that this was purely for foreign consumption. Some candidates might examine the features of the settlement in more detail and argue from that as to whether it would appeal to many given the religious nature of the country at the time; however in taking this approach much will depend upon their view of the religious complexion of England in 1558. Some might suggest that as Elizabeth was seen as 'Deborah' there was disappointment for protestants as she did not establish a fully reformed church. Others might suggest that although there was little positive support for the settlement many were pleased by Mary's death and were therefore willing to acquiesce in the settlement.</p> | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer  | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 13       | <p>At the higher levels candidates should focus on the question of 'how successful' and not simply list examples of success and failure. Candidates might start by identifying the problems that Elizabeth faced and then go on to assess how successfully she dealt with them. There are a range of issues that candidates might consider, but what matters is the quality of analysis. Candidates might consider the religious problem and argue that given the divided state of the nation Elizabeth did remarkably well to keep outward religious harmony with the settlement, others might suggest that she disappointed both protestants and Catholics by the moderate nature of the settlement. It is likely that the issue of her legitimacy will feature in many answers and given the possible challenges to her position she was successful as she was able to avoid rebellion and unrest and secure the throne. This might be linked to foreign relations. England was at war with France and Elizabeth successfully ended that, even if it meant recognising the loss of Calais; the war had been a drain on resources. Under Mary, England had been a close ally of Spain and Elizabeth was able to keep relations with Spain friendly at the start of the period. This was particularly successful as it made it less likely that France would invade in support of Mary Stuart. Elizabeth was also careful not to dismiss Philip's marriage proposal too quickly. It might also be argued that Elizabeth dealt successfully with relations with Scotland, which could have been difficult given the 'Auld Alliance' and claim of Mary Stuart. Under pressure from her councillors she supported the Protestant Lords and this began the decline of French influence in the kingdom and would help to secure the northern border. Candidates might also consider the issue of faction and the composition of the Council. Under Mary this had become large, but Elizabeth reduced its size and made it more efficient, but at the same time included known Catholics, like Norfolk, provided they remained loyal. Some might also consider the financial inheritance, which was improved with the ending of the war.</p> | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer   | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 14       | <p>At the higher levels candidates will need to address the issue of 'how far' and not simply list examples of where parliament did or did not increase its role and influence. Examiners should also note that historiography is not a requirement at AS, however where it is used to support an argument it should be credited, but candidates who do not mention the Neale/Elton debate should not be penalised. Examiners should also be careful not to over-reward candidates who simply describe the debate. At the higher levels candidates might make a distinction between the Lords and Commons. Candidates might note that despite the more regular calling of parliament and their apparently increasing role, Elizabeth decided when to summon, prorogue and dissolve parliament and this in itself was a limiting factor. Candidates may make reference to a variety of issues, particularly religion, succession, freedom of speech and monopolies in considering whether parliament increased its role and influence. Some might argue that in nearly all instances it was the queen's will that triumphed and suggest that this shows no increase in their role and influence. This might be taken further by candidates who argue that in sending Wentworth to the Tower parliament was disciplining itself, aware of Elizabeth's reaction. Attempts to gain freedom of speech or attack Elizabeth's prerogative ended in failure. Discussion of the succession and marriage was always curtailed and Elizabeth remained in control. Some might argue that the latter period saw parliament increase its role in the Monopolies debate, but this can be balanced by the Golden Speech, showing how Elizabeth was able to regain the initiative, even in her later years. Parliament was unable to link supply to the redress of grievances, again suggesting a lack of influence. However, it might be argued that they did increase their influence as a sounding board for government policies and their involvement in a wide range of new social measures in the later part of the period suggests a new role. Some might also suggest that most of their time was spent dealing with local issues suggesting a lack of influence or that many of the debates were stage managed by Privy Councillors to try to get their way, again suggesting a lack of influence.</p> | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer  | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|---|-------|--|
| 15       | <p>At the higher levels candidates should evaluate the relative importance of the causes and reach a balanced judgement, not simply provide a list of factors that caused the problems. There are many factors that candidates might consider and it is not expected that they will consider all, what matters is the quality of the analysis. There may be consideration of the Marian inheritance and the cost of the war with France. The rising cost of warfare might also be considered in relation to both the long war with Spain and the cost of controlling and governing Ireland. The rising cost of warfare might also be linked to the problem of inflation, which was particularly acute during Elizabeth's reign and had a serious impact on crown income. The taxation system was outdated and new assessments were not undertaken and this meant that the Crown income suffered even more from the problem of inflation. Reliance on parliament for extraordinary income was not desirable and Elizabeth was sometimes reluctant to summon them, resulting in dependence upon ordinary income. There had been a decline in ordinary income as crown lands had been sold off to finance war and inflation reduced the real value of the income. Attempts to raise money through schemes such Monopolies were unpopular and might be seen as another limiting factor. Customs had provided a significant source of income, but with war and the decline in the Antwerp market this was also in decline.</p> | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.   |
| 16       | <p>Some might argue that, like his predecessors, James believed that foreign policy was an essential part of the royal prerogative whereas critics came to resist the claim, especially as Parliament had to fund the policy. The practicality of the policy proved unpopular. The marriage appeared to be bringing England even closer to Catholic powers at the time Protestantism, appeared to be under severe threat in the early years of the Thirty Years War. Parliament wanted James to be more supportive of Protestant powers and the marriage appeared to go against everything they wanted. Some answers may place the marriage in a wider context as many regarded Spain as the arch-enemy. James initially tried to maintain a balance; for example, marrying his daughter, Elizabeth, to Frederick of the Palatinate and making an agreement with the German Protestant Princes. However, for many in parliament his policy did not go far enough and they wanted England to actively intervene in the Thirty Years War. They saw Protestantism as under threat and believed that James should help to</p>   | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At the higher levels candidates should evaluate the factors and reach a judgement about their relative importance, rather than simply list the reasons. |

| Question |  | Answer   | Marks | Guidance   |
|----------|--|--|-------|--|
|          |  | defend it. The marriage of Charles became an important diplomatic tool, but it also revealed further conflict. Some may place this example in the wider context of conflict between James and his parliaments and argue that it was symptomatic of worsening relations.  |       |  |
| 17       |  | At the higher levels candidates should address the issue of 'how far' and not simply list evidence of unpopularity and popularity. The selection of issues that candidates discuss are likely to be varied. They may consider issues such as his religious policies and the work of Laud, arguing that the changes appeared to be taking England in a Catholic direction and that this caused opposition from a significant puritan group. This might also be linked to developments within Scotland, particularly the introduction of the Prayer Book which resulted in the Bishops' War. There might also be consideration of the policy of Thorough and the opposition it created and this could result in reference to the work of Wentworth/Strafford and his work in Ireland. It is possible that candidates will focus on the issue of taxation and where this is considered there may be mention of Ship Money. This example could be used to show that at first Personal Rule was quite successful as the sums raised were significant, but they declined over time. Candidates might also mention the unpopularity of Forest Law and Distraint of Knighthood as ways of raising funds. The breakdown of Personal Rule may be used to show that it became increasingly unsuccessful and this could be linked to the need for revenue. | 50    | No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. |

| Question | Answer  | Marks | Guidance  |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 18       | <p>When parliament was initially summoned in 1640 there was very little prospect of civil war. Some may argue that rather than preventing war it was parliament which actually caused it. During the period 1640-2, parliamentary opposition to Charles became more extreme and this helped to create support for Charles. The radicals within parliament seized the initiative and did not follow a policy of conciliation. They were not satisfied by the execution of Stafford, concessions over prerogative issues such as un-parliamentary taxes and the abolition of the Courts of Star Chamber and High Commission. Parliament continued to pursue aggressive policies, seen in the Grand Remonstrance. Candidates might consider the role of Pym in all of this and his close link with, and the role played by, the London mob. However, this might be balanced against Charles' failure to win trust which pushed parliament further down a radical route. Charles continued to negotiate with foreign catholic powers, continued to negotiate with Scotland and attempted to arrest the Five Members. Actions such as these created distrust, which could not be overcome and were exploited by the more radical elements to demand even greater safeguards. Candidates might argue that it was the creation of a royalist party in this period, caused by the radical measures of parliament that convinced many that Charles was the defender of tradition and custom, whilst parliament was innovative and radical that meant they could not prevent war.</p> | 50    | <p>No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question. At the higher levels candidates should not simply list the reasons but should evaluate their relative importance and reach a judgement.</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](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 2012

