

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils 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 2010

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

Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS

2 answers: each maximum mark 50.

	A01a	A01b
IA	21-24	24-26
IB	18-20	22-23
II	16-17	19-21
III	14-15	16-18
IV	12-13	13-15
V	9-11	11-12
VI	4-8	6-10
VII	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.

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
Total mark for each question = 50	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: - 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
Level IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">21-24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context • Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected • The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links. <p style="text-align: center;">24-26</p>
Level IB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence • Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology • Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly <p style="text-align: center;">18-20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations • Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context. • 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. <p style="text-align: center;">22-23</p>
Level II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic • Generally accurate use of historical terminology • Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear <p style="text-align: center;">16-17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic • Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description • The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages. <p style="text-align: center;">19-21</p>

<p>Level III</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy • Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used • Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated <p style="text-align: center;">14-15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context • Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events OR answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin. • Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues • Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">16-18</p>
<p>Level IV</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant. • Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">12-13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory. • Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context. • Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained OR answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis. • Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>
<p>Level V</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also • Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use • 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 <p style="text-align: center;">9-11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic • General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context • Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation OR there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions • There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>

<p>Level VI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy • Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation <p style="text-align: center;">4-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little understanding of key concepts • Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements • Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary • The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief <p style="text-align: center;">6-10</p>
<p>Level VII</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge • Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence <p style="text-align: center;">0-3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts or historical developments. • No valid explanations • Typically very brief and very descriptive answer <p style="text-align: center;">0-5</p>

Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609**The Crusades and Crusader States 1095-1192****1 To what extent was superior military leadership the main reason for the success of the First Crusade?**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may refer to the cooperation that the Crusader princes achieved at key times (eg at Nicaea and Antioch), the generalship of particular leaders (and Bohemond, in particular, may get star treatment here), the overall leadership provided by Adhemar of LePuy, and so on. However, candidates may qualify their discussion of military leadership by referring to the inherent divisions and differences that threatened to jeopardize any success (by discussing, for example, the rivalry between Raymond of Toulouse and Bohemond at Antioch). Such treatment needs to be set in the context of other factors that contribute to any explanation of the First Crusade's success, such as: the divisions and weaknesses of the forces ranged against the Crusade both in Asia Minor and in the Holy Land; the role played by the Emperor Alexius and his aides; the prowess of crusader knights; the unity of religious aim, motivation and sheer determination that was a feature of the crusader army and its rank and file.

2 'The military orders were the main reason for the survival of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is being looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor even if they wish to argue other factors were more significant. In relation to the given factor, candidates may discuss the origins and purposes of the military orders and the increasingly influential role of the two main orders, Templars and Hospitallers, after the 1130s. They may refer to their garrisoning of key castles and their role in various campaigns and crusades. It would be hard to argue that they did not play a significant role, but candidates may well argue that other factors were more significant. They may refer to: the role played by the Kings of Jerusalem and their various qualities; the role played by the barons; the significance of key conquests along the coast early in its life (under Baldwin) which provided both revenue and a link to the west; the (somewhat sporadic) aid from the West; the significance of major expeditions; the divisions amongst its enemies; the support of the other states; the building of castles and hiring of mercenary forces and so on.

3 Assess the consequences of the Third Crusade.

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to identify a range of results and assess them. This can be done by arguing their relative significance and/or analyzing the short or long term impact. Candidates may well focus on the immediate consequences of the Third Crusade and they can score well if there is assessment of the consequences. They may refer to: the achievements of Richard the Lionheart, the impact on Saladin, the failure to take Jerusalem, the taking of Cyprus and Acre, the restoration of Crusading pride as a result of Richard's victories, the securing of the pilgrim route to Jerusalem, the return of the fragment of the True Cross, the securing of a truce between Christians and Muslims and so on. Candidates are likely to make the judgement that although the Crusade failed in its key objective (the taking of Jerusalem), it cannot be judged a complete failure.

The Renaissance from c. 1400-c. 1500**4 Assess the contribution of any two artists to the development of Renaissance art.**

No specific answer is looked for. It is not possible to write a mark scheme that would cover the influence of the range of Renaissance artists. Whatever artists they choose, candidates must seek to evaluate their significance in the development of Renaissance Art. They are likely to choose, therefore, artists that clearly had some influence and place them in the wider context of the development of Renaissance art. They may, for example, choose an artist such as Massaccio who many claim influenced all artists who followed him, pointing to his use of perspective and the realism of his human figures (expressed in purely human terms of everyday experience). They may refer to his influence on artists such as Fra Angelico and Ucello. They may also refer to Leonardo da Vinci and the influence of his close observation of nature, attention to detail, expression and careful composition. The key to an effective answer is likely to be the quality of a candidate's discussion of exemplar material and their ability to set this in the context of the way Renaissance Art developed. Candidates may seek to compare the contribution of their two artists. Such efforts should be credited but it is not a specific requirement of this question.

5 To what extent was the Renaissance in Venice distinctive?

No specific answer is looked for, but 'To what extent?' must be addressed to score highly. Candidates are likely to discuss both what the Venetian Renaissance had in common with developments elsewhere in Italy and what was unique to it. In their discussion of commonality they may refer to the role of classical influences, the role of patronage and guilds and the influence of artists from Florence and elsewhere. However, they should balance this with discussion of the elements that were essentially Venetian. They may point to Venice's relative independence and isolation from other Italian cities and stress its historic links with the Byzantine Empire. They may discuss Venice's increased significance towards the end of the Renaissance and the role of specific artists from Bellini to Veronese, Titian and Tintoretto in producing art of a distinctive character through its use of light and colour and its sensuality. Byzantine influences may be discussed and the role of the Greek community that gathered there, especially after the fall of Byzantium (there may be reference to El Greco in this context).

6 How important was Erasmus in the development of Christian humanism?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates are likely to argue that Erasmus was the key figure in the development of Christian humanism, but to be convincing candidates must not only deal with Erasmus but also the other influences which led to its development. In discussing the significance of Erasmus, candidates may discuss Erasmus' concern to reconcile new learning with Christianity and his concern to free Christianity from those things which obscured or clouded its truth and purity. They may discuss the significance of his editions of the New Testament and Church fathers, and his more popular satirical works such as his *Adages*, *Familiar Colloquies* and *In Praise of Folly*. They may also discuss his influence on others such as Thomas More and John Colet. Such discussion may be set in the context of other influences on the development of Christian humanism such as the development of Italian humanism (with its emphasis on studying Latin and Greek), the influence of the Brethren of the Common Life and the *Devotio Moderna*, and the work of other individuals such as John Reuchlin and Colet.

Exploration and Discovery c. 1445-c. 1545**7 Assess the reasons why Europeans embarked on voyages of discovery in this period.**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to analyse a range of reasons and assess their significance and/or linkages to score well. Candidates may focus on motivation and discuss some of: the desire to find an alternative route to the spice islands (candidates may address the issue of why at this time?); the desire to find gold (candidates may address the issue of why at this time?); the search for Prester John and other Christian kingdoms; and, the desire for fame and reputation. Candidates may also discuss other reasons such as the context of Ottoman expansion, the Renaissance, the development of relevant technology such as ocean-going shipping such as the caravel and the patronage of princes and nobles. Candidates should support their discussion of reasons with effective explanation and reference to apposite exemplar material.

8 Assess the importance of any two individuals to the development of overseas empires in this period.

No specific answer is looked for. It is not possible to write a mark scheme that would cover the influence of the range of individuals involved in overseas exploration and empire-building. Whatever individuals they choose, candidates must seek to evaluate their importance in the development of empire. That said candidates are likely to focus on the more significant individuals such as Columbus, Cortes, Pizarro, and da Gama. In relation to the last candidates may stress his importance to the development of the Portuguese Empire in India and the spice islands, pointing to his expedition to Calicut and his exploitation of mutual hostility amongst local rulers and the superiority of European firepower. Candidates may see his importance as that of a trail-blazer rather than a systematic conqueror. Candidates may also discuss Cortes' conquest of Mexico between 1519 and 1521 and assess his significance by the extent and thoroughness of his remarkable achievement with just 600 men, sixteen horses, a few small cannon and thirteen muskets in defeating the Aztecs and establishing Spanish control. Candidates may seek to compare the contribution of their two individuals. Such efforts should be credited but it is not a specific requirement of this question.

9 'The impact of Spain on Mexico and Peru was entirely harmful in this period.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may well argue that the impact on Mexico and Peru was negative, pointing to the destruction of native civilizations and cultures and the imposition of Spanish and Catholic ways of life. They may also point to the deliberate exploitation of these colonies in the interests of Castile (not least through the extraction of their gold and silver) and the forced labour required of native populations on the settlers' *encomiendas*. Further they may discuss the demographic impact of the arrival of Europeans with their diseases against which natives had little resistance. Candidates may balance such analysis with discussion of possible positives. Mexico and Peru were colonized and settlers wanted to develop their economies and wealth: cash crops like sugar and cotton were developed as were various cereals; European cattle, sheep and horses were introduced and thrived. The Spanish brought with them their systems of government and administration.

Spain 1469-1556**10 Assess the reasons why Isabella was able to consolidate her rule of Castile by 1479.**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may discuss both the winning of the civil war and the measures taken after its conclusion to secure Isabella's position in Castile. In relation to the Civil War candidates may refer to some of the following: securing of the Treasury at Segovia, confirmation of privileges of loyal nobles, attempts to buy support, fortification of key points, conclusion of a truce with the Moors of Granada, peace with Louis XI, the birth of a son, Ferdinand's accession to the throne of Aragon and the use of propaganda. However, they will probably see the Battle of Toro and the subsequent Treaty of Alcaçovas as key. In relation to the consolidation of rule more generally candidates may well discuss the monarchs peripatetic style of rule, measures towards the nobility (threats, pressure, action against key nobles like the Duke of Cadiz, and bribery), the revival of the *Santa Hermandad*, the use of *corregidores*, more efficient collection of taxes and the use of *letrados*.

11 To what extent did Ferdinand and Isabella unify Spain?

No specific answer is looked for. This issue will be familiar to many candidates. Most will probably argue that the claims for unification are relatively slim. Candidates are likely to discuss some of the following in developing their analysis: the separate institutions of Castile and Aragon (they may, for example, point to the failed attempts by Ferdinand to introduce the *Hermandad* into Aragon), the ability of Aragon to maintain its *fueros*, the focus of the monarch's attention on Castile, the separate laws, coinage, economies, the exclusion of Aragon from the New World, unification was not an aim of Ferdinand and Isabella, and so on. On the other hand, candidates may discuss the notion of a Spanish foreign policy and the 'Spanish' nature of some religious policy (the Inquisition's authority ran across Spain). But even in these areas candidates may point to differences (for example, Spain's interest in Italy was derived from Aragon).

12 How successfully had Charles I dealt with the problems he faced by 1524?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify problems and evaluate Charles' success in dealing with them by 1524. Success may be evaluated against the historical context, aims and/or results of policies. Candidates are likely to discuss some or all of the following: the *Comuneros* and *Germania* revolts; the tensions between towns and grandees; the power of the nobility; the problem of raising money via the Cortes of Castile, Aragon and other provinces; the privileges of the same; the appointment of ministers; Charles' delay in arriving and his subsequent absence; his other ambitions and commitments (and the use of Spanish resources to pursue them) and so on. Candidates may well argue that after initial difficulties (that created or exacerbated problems) by 1524 Charles had overcome many, but not all. The revolts had been overcome (albeit at great cost in the case of the *Comuneros*), Charles had appointed more Spanish officials, Charles worked with the Cortes to raise taxes, the nobility were excluded from central government but allowed to govern the countryside, a Council of Finance was created, *corregidores* were re-established, and so forth. Candidates may well argue that Charles's success was incomplete as he had to make concessions and the key action was his return to Spain in 1521.

Charles V: International Relations and the Holy Roman Empire 1519-59**13 Assess the reasons why Charles V failed to crush Lutheranism by 1529.**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates will need to identify and analyse a range of reasons and evaluate their relative significance and/or the linkages between them to score well. Candidates may discuss some of the following reasons: Charles' absences; the significance of events surrounding the Diet of Worms; the role of the princes (especially Frederick of Saxony); the social and religious context in which Luther's ideas were spread; the significance of humanism; the printing press; the appeal of Luther's ideas amongst the peasantry and in the cities; the role of von Hutten and so on. Candidates may argue that, despite his desire to crush Lutheranism, Charles V was unable to give the religious crisis in the Empire his close attention (because of absence and other problems) and could not act without the support of the princes. The role of Frederick of Saxony in protecting Luther in the early years may well be emphasized.

14 'Religious conflict enabled the princes to increase their power during the reign of Charles V.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may argue for or against the view given. Candidates may discuss the relative power of princes vis à vis the Emperor and point, for example, to the circumstances of the Emperor's election, his acceptance of their privileges and the lack of a standing army with which to enforce his will. They may also argue that Charles V's other commitments made it difficult for him to assert his authority within the Empire and this effectively meant the princes were able to at least hold on to their influence. On the other hand, candidates may argue that these circumstances combined with the problems arising from the spread of Lutheranism enabled them to increase their effective power in the Empire. Certainly Charles could not take action against the Lutherans without the support of the princes (as is demonstrated by the events surrounding the Diet of Augsburg in 1529). However, they may argue that Charles did have one opportunity to assert his authority and weaken the power of the princes and discuss the events surrounding the defeat of the Schmalkaldic League in 1547. On the other hand, they may suggest that the completeness of this victory alienated all the princes and in the end forced him to compromise once more and accept, in the end, the fact of his weak authority and the power of the princes within their own lands.

15 'France was a greater threat to Charles V than the Ottoman Empire.' How far do you agree?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to assess and compare the threats posed by both powers. In relation to the Ottoman threat candidates may point to both the security of the Holy Roman Empire, Austria and Hungary and to security of the Western Mediterranean and Italy. They may discuss the victories of Barbarossa and the Barbary pirates and the advance of the Turks into Hungary and towards Vienna. Both threatened Charles' interests directly (by attacking his possessions) and indirectly (by threatening his communications in the Mediterranean and by distracting him from dealing with other problems such as France and the Reformation). In relation to France candidates may point to the direct threat to northern Spain, the Netherlands, Germany and Charles' interests in Italy. They may make similar points about the impact the Habsburg-Valois conflict had on Charles' ability to deal with other problems. Candidates may also point to the interlinking of these two threats and their occasional attempts to work together against Charles.

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556-1609**16 How successful was Philip II's domestic policy in Spain ?**

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates may address success in relation to the problems Philip faced, what he was trying to achieve and what the results of his policies were. Candidates may discuss some of the following areas: government and administration; relations with the nobility; faction; relations with Castile and the other provinces; finance; religion. In relation to the first, candidates may discuss Philip's style of government and the degree of efficiency/effectiveness in the administration (use of Councils, conflicts, role of the Grand Junta, role of secretaries and key personnel, like Perez). Candidates may discuss Philip's need to cooperate with local nobility and clergy and the role of faction at court. Candidates may also discuss the impact of Philip's centralized system and the exclusion felt by the provinces, a factor in the Aragonese revolt. They may also spend some time discussing the weaknesses of financial administration and the policies adopted to deal with growing expenditure and debt. In relation to the Church and religion, candidates may discuss Philip's counter-Reformation credentials, backing of the Inquisition and policies towards the *moriscos* and heresy.

17 How important was religion in causing revolt in the Netherlands to 1572?

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal adequately with the role of religion even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant in explaining the outbreak of revolt. In relation to religion candidates may refer to the spread of Protestantism into the Netherlands in the 1550s, Philip's desire to enforce anti-heresy laws, the attempt to impose new bishoprics, the work of the hedge-preachers, the iconoclastic fury of 1566. It was this last that arguably led Philip to decide to use force in the Netherlands. However, candidates may argue that although religion had a role to play, it was other factors that led to revolt. They may discuss the incompatibility of Philip's desire to centralize control and impose uniformity on provinces and nobility jealous of their privileges and status. There may be discussion of the role of William the Silent. They may also refer to the economic and social problems that were also a factor in the mid 60s and the impact of Alva's presence and policies ('Council of Blood', execution of Egmont and Hoorn, and the imposition of the Tenth Penny).

18 Assess the reasons why Spain was unable to crush the revolt of the Netherlands in the 1570s and 1580s.

No specific answer is looked for. Candidates need to identify and analyse a number of reasons and evaluate their relative significance and/or the linkages between them. Candidates may discuss some of the following: the significance of the Sea Beggars, Alva's actions, the geography of Holland and Zeeland; popular resentment of Spain; the role of William of Orange, army mutinies (Spanish Fury) and shortage of funds; the Union of Utrecht; the roles of England and France; Philip's diversion of resources to deal with other issues (eg Spanish Armada) and his intervention in France. Candidates may argue that the key reasons lay in the different demands made on Philip across Europe and the problems of finance and supply for Spanish forces in the Netherlands on the one hand, and the significance of Dutch particularism, geography and increasingly religion on the other.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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 2010

