

History B

Advanced GCE A2 H508

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H108

Mark Schemes for the Units

June 2009

HX08/MS/R/09

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, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 syllabuses 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 2009

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

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History (H508)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H108)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
F981 Historical Explanation - British History	1
F982 Historical Explanation - Non British History	11
F983 Using Historical Evidence - British History	21
F984 Using Historical Evidence - Non British History	39
Grade Thresholds	55

F981 Historical Explanation - British History

Generic Mark Scheme for Unit F981

Maximum mark: 50

Each question is marked out of 25.

Allocation of marks within the Unit:

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 1	41-50 marks
Level 2	31-40 marks
Level 3	21-30 marks
Level 4	11-20 marks
Level 5	1-10 marks
Level 6	0 marks

The same generic mark scheme is used for both questions:

	Marks	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 1	21-25	Complex judgements supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Explicit and effective use of two or more modes of explanation • Developed analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events • A wide range of relevant and accurate knowledge • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Accurate and effective communication. Effective and coherent structure
Level 2	16-20	Sound judgements supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some explicit use of at least one mode of explanation • Some analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events; or sound explanation of more than one key feature • A range of mostly relevant and accurate knowledge • Mostly accurate use of appropriate historical terminology • Mostly accurate and clear communication. Generally coherent structure

	Marks	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 3	11-15	<p>Partly sound judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some reasonable explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events but also some assertion, description or narrative • Mostly relevant knowledge, some accurate knowledge • A limited range of historical terminology • Mostly satisfactory communication. Some coherent structure
Level 4	6-10	<p>Weak judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general, but mostly weak, understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some limited explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic; mostly assertion, description or narrative • Limited relevant knowledge, some inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • Little use of historical terminology • Some satisfactory communication, some weak communication. Limited and unclear structure
Level 5	1-5	<p>Irrelevant or no judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance • Assertion, description or narrative of at least one key feature and characteristic • Mostly inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • No, or inaccurate, use of historical terminology • Poor communication, poor or non-existent structure
Level 6	0	<p>No judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance • Inaccurate or assertion, description or narrative • Inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • No use of historical terminology • Very poor communication/ Incoherent structure.

Lancastrians and Yorkists 1437-85**1 The personal rule of Henry VI to 1450****(a) Why did rivalries between groups of nobles become so important during the personal rule of Henry VI?**

L1 The longstanding conflict between Beaufort and York, established in France and maintained after 1450, was a key long-term factor in making political life unstable for the king. To this one can add the short-term crisis provoked by Henry's sudden and unexpected mental breakdown. There need not have been chaos in subsequent years, but there was a perception that strong government was now impossible.

L3 York was ambitious for himself and his family. He even seems to have taken contemporary chroniclers and observers by surprise with the extent of his lust for power, which extended to the crown and the establishment of a dynasty.

L5 Henry had a domineering wife called Margaret of Anjou. She was very unpopular and made everything worse.

(b) Why did the personality of Henry VI cause difficulties up to 1450?

L1 John Blacman's account makes royal piety more than clear, but was piety alone a qualification for kingship? An inability to stand up to his wife, evident for example in the surrender of Maine in 1446, provided evidence to some contemporaries of a man unfitted to rule.

L3 Henry was no soldier, unlike his father. He lacked interest in war and lost the confidence of his nobles by not leading his armies in person in France. This was his most important failing over the long period of his upbringing and protectorate.

L5 Henry did not have much of a personality and what he had was weak.

2 Edward IV's Second Reign 1471-83**(a) How can the restoration of royal authority by Edward IV in the period from 1471 to 1483 be best explained?**

L1 Edward was wise enough to allow his friends and kinsmen like Stanley and Rivers considerably autonomy locally and regionally. Nevertheless Edward was keen to cultivate and build up the crown estates and had a tough policy on patronage which help explain why he amassed revenue and kept important lands and positions in his own hands.

L3 The new monarchy saw the replacement of old-style feudal barons with a professional and commercial class possessing different values. These men had an interest in stability and helped Edward bring order after chaos.

L5 Edward was a strong king and took no messing. He was a much better king than Henry VI.

(b) Why did France, Burgundy and Scotland pose a threat to the kingdom of Edward IV?

L1 It is essential to see, therefore, the dynastic and commercial rivalries between these countries. Burgundy and France were at loggerheads for some of Edward's reign which actually served to minimise the actual and perceived threat to England; Scotland under James II was in some ways a more nagging and persistent military threat to Edward's control over a long period of time.

L3 France and Burgundy were places of exile for Edward's opponents, and this explains why they were such a threat. Scotland was much less of a problem, being weak. But Burgundy and Louis of France were strong opponents and were prepared to interfere in England's business and act as a home for enemies.

L5 They were all a little bit far away, but not too far away, and quite easy to get to and back from.

Tudor Finale: The Reign of Elizabeth 1**3 The struggle with Spain****(a) Why did Philip II want to overthrow Elizabeth? [25]**

L1 One way to answer this question is to look carefully at Philip's intentions. The existence of a troublesome Protestant island so close to the Spanish Netherlands was one issue, and I have already referred to the actions of English 'pirates' against Spanish shipping. Putting these two points together gives us a clear motivation on Philip's part to secure the overthrow of Elizabeth. To this one can add the direct actions of the Queen herself. Not content with tacit support for enemies of Spain, Elizabeth openly supported the efforts of Dutch rebels. Philip must have seen this as provocation.

L3 The fact was that Elizabeth was a Protestant Queen and Philip was a Catholic. This was the state of affairs in Europe at the time. Philip was a strong and devout Catholic and saw the Protestants as heretics. Elizabeth had to be got rid of for this reason.

L5 There could only be one ruler. Elizabeth was a woman, and they were weak. Philip was strong, and wanted to control England.

(b) Why was the Spanish Armada defeated? [25]

L1 It requires a combination of factors to understand why the Spanish fleet was defeated. Of the points I have already outlined, the most important was the role of the English commanders under Howard of Effingham. They had a clear strategy, aided by their knowledge of home waters. To put this down to luck or bad weather is to do the English an injustice. In turn, this strategy was part of a long-term plan to design faster ships equipped with the latest technology in gunnery which made the English rate of fire more frequent and reliable.

L3 One factor was the weather. When the Spanish ships were trying to anchor near Calais they were hit by a storm which dispersed them. This event was fatal. The ships were scattered and had to sail the long way round Britain back to Spain, which many of them couldn't manage..

L5 In the end it all came down to a game of bowls. Drake finished his game and went out and defeated Spain.

4 The growth and treatment of poverty in Elizabethan England**(a) Why was poverty a problem in Elizabethan England? [25]**

L1 Longer-term factors contributed to the rise of poverty, most evident in towns and cities. Inflation resulted from increased demand from a rising population. This was hard to understand at the time, let alone to plan for. On top of this there were immediate triggers which made the situation worse for Elizabeth and her ministers, namely cloth industry unemployment and severe food shortages.

L3 Poverty was a problem in Elizabethan England because of enclosure. People were being thrown off their land by landlords enclosing fields which had been common land, and they had nowhere to go, so they drifted to London or other cities and tried to beg there.

L5 Some beggars were called the deserving poor because they deserved to be helped. Other beggars were undeserving and they didn't deserve to be helped at all.

(b) Why were local and central government anxious to suppress vagrancy? [25]

L1 Both the Privy Council and local Justices of the Peace were anxious to stamp out vagrancy. Dark of skin and mysterious in their ways, vagabonds were specially feared by those with property or possessions – and such fears were not unfounded, as vagabonds grouped themselves into gangs to prey on local inhabitants. Consequently, punishments for vagrancy were severe. The reaction of the authorities can itself be explained by reference to the absence of any kind of regular police force, making it difficult to track the movements of vagrants; or the fear of plots and conspiracy, in which vagrants could be willingly recruited to swell the ranks of the disaffected

L3 The authorities were particularly anxious to suppress vagrancy because of their criminal habits and the lack of any effective means of catching them as they moved from one part of the country to another. Consequently, the only real deterrent was to punish savagely the ones who were caught.

L5 People punished vagabonds to protect their property. They didn't want these people knocking at their door all the time.

Liberal Sunset – The Rise and Fall of ‘New Liberalism’ 1890-1922**5 The Liberal reforms: 1906-14****(a) Why did the House of Lords reject the Budget of 1909? [25]**

L1 The Conservative majority in the Lords saw Lloyd George's Budget as an attack on their wealth and way of life. The action of the Lords was without parliamentary precedent. What they could not see – or chose to ignore – was that the Liberal Government had to find money to pay for two major developments – rearmament and national insurance. In the background were threats to aristocratic privilege and landed interest; in the middle ground a political party that seemed to have lost its sense of purpose; and in the foreground a Welsh terrier that was more than a match for any of them and willing to initiate class war if need be to drive his Budget through.

L3 The ‘People's Budget’ proposed tax increases which would have directly hit members of the House of Lords and their class. They thought that this was unfair on them and voted against it, so there had to be an election.

L5 Lloyd George made the Conservatives very angry and they wanted to get back at him. They rejected the Budget and didn't care what happened next.

(b) Why was a constitutional crisis narrowly averted in 1914?

L1 I would say that to explain this we need to look most carefully at the actions of Asquith himself. Prime Minister Asquith wanted of course to pursue Liberal policies but was committed to introduce a Third Home Rule Bill because he relied on the support of 82 Irish Nationalist MPs. This Act would become law, under the terms of the Parliament Act, in 1914. Even when confronted by the actions of Carson and the Ulster Unionists and opposition from Conservatives, Asquith stood firm. At the last minute he was prepared to offer a six year exclusion for Ulster from the Act, another sign of his statesmanship, which the King recognised and supported.

L3 The Liberals faced all kinds of challenges to their rule from strikers, suffragettes and the Irish. It was all building up into a big crisis, but they managed to avoid a meltdown by talking to the Irish a lot and promising them Home Rule, although Sinn Fein didn't want it.

L5 World War 1 broke out in 1914 and this was why there was no more crisis – they had more important business to worry about, defeating Germany.

6 New Liberalism: The 1906 General Election**(a) Why did the Boer War affect attitudes in Britain towards imperialism? [25]**

L1 It is interesting to see how attitudes to the Boer War changed. The initial outrage which greeted the actions of the Boers and the jingoism which Britain experienced gave way to disillusionment. The existence of 'concentration camps', when these became widely known, and what Campbell-Bannerman called 'methods of barbarism', helped changed the attitudes of some Britons. Related to this is the idea that it was simply difficult to secure military victories at such a distance, and that the cost of such campaigns meant that less money was available to spend on helping poverty at home.

L3 The press was a vital factor in the change of attitudes towards imperialism because it was the newspapers that found out about the concentration camps (state of affairs) and of course when the press found out the stories were exaggerated but the British public didn't see the war as heroic any more

L5 Britain lost and we never like losing so attitudes towards imperialism changed a lot because of this

(b) How is the result of the General Election of 1906 best explained? [25]

L1 Of all the causes, the most important was Tariff Reform because, whilst other actions resulted in unpopular policies, this split the Tory party in two, ushering in almost 20 years of Liberal domination. Tariff Reform, urged on by the talented but fatally misguided Joseph Chamberlain, left the Conservative leader Balfour in a dilemma which he was at first unwilling but then unable to resolve. Whatever might seem best economically did not seem best politically, and this dilemma fatally wounded the Conservatives over several years. Chinese labour, trade union grievances arising from Taff Vale were all significant, as I have already shown, but elections are decided by the economy ultimately.

L3 The Liberals won the 1906 election because people thought they could sort out the problems of poverty and poor health etc. 'New Liberal' ideas were proving popular and many wanted to give Lloyd George and Churchill a chance to carry out their ideas.

L5 The election was a flying victory because there was an absence of Conservative people who could not bring themselves to vote Liberal but didn't want to vote Conservative either

The End of Consensus: Britain 1945-1990**7 The Macmillan years 1957-64: consensus confirmed****(a) Why did Macmillan decide to carry out the so-called 'Night of the Long Knives' in July 1962? [25]**

L1 The unprecedented political massacre of 1962 can be explained by a variety of factors. Starting from the event itself, Macmillan felt that there was Cabinet disloyalty and that there was intrigue against him. This is doubtful, but it's what Macmillan believed. The reassertion of political leadership was direct and forceful. Moving outwards, the economic crisis of 1961-2 contributed to the need for a reshuffle: a wage freeze was deeply unpopular, and sterling was under threat. Moving outwards further, the wider context is one of a government feeling increasingly shackled by its ties to the USA and its foreign policy.

L3 Macmillan dismissed seven Cabinet ministers all at one go because he wanted to be seen to be back in control of the Conservatives and of the government. He was a complex man who was not as confident as he seemed to people. He had doubts about those around him and wanted loyal ministers in his team.

L5 Macmillan did this because he could. He was in charge as Prime Minister and if he wanted to sack people then he would.

(b) Why did Macmillan resign in October 1963? [25]

L1 Macmillan's good intentions were at the mercy of events. Macmillan's decision to resign was caused, ostensibly by ill health but in fact the 'writing had been on the wall' for some time. From the reassertion of Macmillan's leadership in the savage cabinet re-shuffle of 1962; the government had experienced a series of unmitigated disasters – the Vassal and Profumo scandals, Philby's defection and Rachman's exposure – that inevitably associated it with sleaze and corruption. Therefore, it was this accumulation of problems – all of which were beyond his ability to prevent – that forced him to resign.

L3 The Profumo scandal made him resign. Profumo's affair with Christine Keeler was disastrous. Macmillan lied to the Commons, claiming that the relationship had long been over. When the lie was exposed, Macmillan had no option but to resign.

L5 You can't be Prime Minister if your MPs are having affairs with call girls. Macmillan was in charge of all this and he had to go.

8 The Thatcher Revolution 1979-83: the end of consensus**(a) Why did 'Thatcherism' become popular between 1979 and 1983? [25]**

L1 When Thatcher won the 1979 Election, the medium-term economic objective, influenced by the monetarism of Milton Friedman, was to defeat inflation by strict control of the money supply and, once the purgative had worked, to release enterprise and growth through tax cuts, deregulation and privatization – meeting trade union opposition head-on if necessary. This was popular with the many who had voted Tory for the first time ever in 1979 – it was what they wanted her to do. The strategy worked and was popular, but at a terrible cost of 3 million unemployed at its height.

L3 The 'Winter of Discontent' and failed Labour policies were still fresh in people's minds during these years, and the public was prepared to give Mrs Thatcher and Mr Howe time for her new policies on trade unions and the economy to work.

L5 The 'Iron Lady' was as tough as any man, and people loved her because she was a woman in a man's world.

(b) Why was there civil unrest in the early 1980s? [25]

L1 From its inception, Thatcher's first government set itself on a collision course with traditional methods of consensus politics. Geoffrey Howe's actions in his first budget – including severe cuts in government spending, a 14% bank rate and massive tax cuts on the highest incomes - was generally regarded as the most unpopular since the war. Even tighter monetary controls in successive budgets resulted in a rise in unemployment at a rate of 100,000 job losses a month. Intensified by the cross-currents of racial tension and a hot summer, discontent finally exploded on the streets of Brixton and Toxteth in April and July 1981.

L3 Events ran out of the control even of Mrs Thatcher in the cities. Groups started to set fire to banks and other buildings in Liverpool and Brixton because there were so many unemployed, especially among the young.

L5 Demonstrations against Thatcher turned into riots and looting. The National Westminster Bank in Toxteth was burnt down and they had to build a new one.

F982 Historical Explanation - Non British History

Generic Mark Scheme for Unit F982

Maximum mark: 50

Each question is marked out of 25.

Allocation of marks within the Unit:

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 1	41-50 marks
Level 2	31-40 marks
Level 3	21-30 marks
Level 4	11-20 marks
Level 5	1-10 marks
Level 6	0 marks

The same generic mark scheme is used for both questions:

	Marks	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding
Level 1	21-25	Complex judgements supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Explicit and effective use of two or more modes of explanation • Developed analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events • A wide range of relevant and accurate knowledge • Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology • Accurate and effective communication. Effective and coherent structure
Level 2	16-20	Sound judgements supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some explicit use of at least one mode of explanation • Some analysis of interactions between, or prioritisation of, key features and characteristics such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events; or sound explanation of more than one key feature • A range of mostly relevant and accurate knowledge • Mostly accurate use of appropriate historical terminology • Mostly accurate and clear communication. Generally coherent structure
Level 3	11-15	Partly sound judgements supported by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some reasonable explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic such as ideas, beliefs, actions and events but also some assertion, description or narrative • Mostly relevant knowledge, some accurate knowledge • A limited range of historical terminology • Mostly satisfactory communication. Some coherent structure
Level 4	6-10	<p>Weak judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general, but mostly weak, understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence and significance • Some limited explanation of at least one key feature and characteristic; mostly assertion, description or narrative • Limited relevant knowledge, some inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • Little use of historical terminology • Some satisfactory communication, some weak communication. Limited and unclear structure
Level 5	1-5	<p>Irrelevant or no judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance • Assertion, description or narrative of at least one key feature and characteristic • Mostly inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • No, or inaccurate, use of historical terminology • Poor communication, poor or non-existent structure
Level 6	0	<p>No judgements supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding of key concepts such as causation, consequence, and significance • Inaccurate or assertion, description or narrative • Inaccurate and irrelevant knowledge • No use of historical terminology • Very poor communication/ Incoherent structure.

Charlemagne**1 Court and Government****(a) Why was it difficult for Charlemagne to rule his Frankish lands? [25]**

L1 The Frankish kingdoms expanded so rapidly and on such a scale that it would have taxed the abilities of any medieval ruler to administer them successfully. To this one can add the constraints of custom which meant that Charlemagne's sons had to be given responsibilities, even if they were not up to the job, effectively.

L3 Personal rule was Charlemagne's style, and he never faced up to the limitations which this imposed, in particular in border areas where he could not be everywhere at once and where the likes of Tassilo of Bavaria would simply wait until he was far away to provoke further troubles.

L5 France was big. There were wars all the time and good government was just impossible I would say.

(b) Why did Charlemagne fail to make satisfactory arrangements for his succession? [25]

L1 Perhaps Charlemagne did as much as any man could. He could scarcely be blamed for the loss of two of his sons, prematurely, leaving only Louis to inherit. The coronation of Louis as co-Emperor harked back to traditional Roman practice and was the most sensible thing which could have been done. We have to look at the position through Charlemagne's eyes and not in hindsight

L3 Charlemagne was a prisoner of custom. Partible inheritance was the norm and there was no escaping the need to make provision for three sons, even at the cost of dividing and weakening the integrity of an empire so painfully won and maintained.

L5 Charlemagne should have kept his Empire together and left it all to one man, whichever was the strongest son.

2 The Imperial Coronation**(a) Why did Pope Leo III crown Charlemagne as Emperor in 800? [25]**

L1 It is difficult to see into the mindset of Charlemagne and Leo in 800 and the two best sources for the event don't agree, but most historians accept that Charlemagne was taken by surprise and had not intended to become Emperor. Leo saw Charlemagne's main role as protector of the papal territories in Italy.

L3 The Pope wanted to enforce his control over the Roman church and did not care about giving offence to the Byzantine Empire. He wanted to maintain his lands and wanted Charlemagne as the protector of Rome.

L5 Leo thought that making Charlemagne Emperor would be the ideal Christmas present for him.

(b) Why did the imperial coronation in 800 affect Charlemagne's relations with other rulers? [25]

L1 To many Franks the title of Emperor was personal to Charlemagne and was not attached to his kingdoms. However to the Byzantine Empire it was different: there was a direct and immediate threat to the Empire's possessions in Venice allied to a long-standing rivalry about the true inheritance to the glories of Rome. Constantinople had been deeply offended by this presumptuous act by a potential diplomatic and marriage ally.

L3 Many saw events in 800 as yet another step in Charlemagne's ambitions to rule Christendom. He sought glory and was prepared to trample over history to secure it, offending the Byzantine Empire in the pursuit of his own glory

L5 Other rulers were jealous of Charlemagne and did not think he should have been made emperor like this.

Luther and the German Reformation 1517-47**3 The Responses of Lay Authorities to Luther****(a) Why was Luther summoned to the Diet of Worms in 1521? [25]**

L1 The most important reason why Luther was summoned was because of the relationship between the Emperor and his Elector of the Empire, namely Frederick. This potentially awkward relationship needed to be tested by actions so that the limits to the authority could be tested. Were notions of Imperial rule pragmatic? This ties in with the self interest of Frederick the Wise in looking after academic dispute in 'his' university.

L3 Charles V wanted to demonstrate his power and prove that, although inexperienced, he could rule with authority. He would not stand for trouble in his own kingdoms, which were vast, so he had to act quickly and stop any troublemakers before their ideas could take hold.

L5 Luther had to be stopped, by any means possible. He was a troublemaker who was against the Catholic Church. He had to go to the Diet or else.

(b) How is the limited success of attempts by the Emperor Charles V to suppress Lutheranism best explained?

L1 There were longstanding difficulties which would have made it difficult for any Emperor to suppress heresy or religious opposition. The sheer size of the Empire and poor communications within it, and its diversity of languages and cultures, made effective rule difficult. More immediately, local princes were willing to overlook the Edict of Worms and turn a blind eye to the rapid spread of Luther's ideas, for their own political gain.

L3 Charles was only 19 and very inexperienced. He was rarely in Germany but spent much time travelling, often in Italy and Spain. He allowed Lutheranism to get out of hand too quickly and was negligent in my opinion.

L5 Luther was popular with peasants and popular with the middle classes. It was only the nobles and posh people who didn't like him.

4 Luther and Other Reformers**(a) How is Luther's impact on other religious reformers best explained?**

L1 From the various explanations I have discussed, the most persuasive is that of the 'positive' attractions of the new faith, with its emphasis on scriptural authority and a vernacular Mass and Bible. Negative 'push' factors link in with this but were less significant in many of the German provinces, especially those where the worst abuses of the Catholic Church were much less in evidence.

L3 The role of young, energetic preachers and writers tells us why Luther's views were so popular so quickly among so many. There was even competition between them because they looked up to Luther so much and wanted to spread his ideas. His courage and energy were examples for them to follow

L5 Most reformers were keen to spread Luther's ideas so that they could get something out of it. Preferably money and power.

(b) Why did Protestant reformers fail to achieve unity by 1547?

L1 'Eat, this is my body': in just a few words we have the capacity for so much disagreement. For such intellectuals and theologians, it all came down to the interpretation of Scriptures, and anything else was secondary. Running it a close second is the rivalry between German Protestant rulers which in turn spread to the Swiss cantons. Politics and religion were intertwined.

L3 Many Protestant rulers did not want to risk war with the Emperor who was still their overlord. They therefore found it difficult to consider political and military alliances with those rulers who were prepared to resort to arms to defend their faith and political interests.

L5 These reformers did not like each other. They could not agree about anything, even what to call themselves.

Robespierre and the French Revolution 1774-95**5 The Regeneration of France 1789-1791**

(a) How are the policies of the National Assembly from 1789 to 1791 best explained? [25]

L1 Only at an ideas level can the National Constituent Assembly's work really be understood. If liberty, equality and fraternity ever meant anything during the French Revolution it was during these two years when old institutions and certainties were swept away in a flood-tide of Enlightenment thinking.

L3 Moderation was the keynote, and for most deputies their motive was reform and not revolution for its own sake. The Church, aristocracy and the Crown could all remain provided that they changed themselves from within or accepted the changes the Assembly was thrusting upon them

L5 Now the people were in charge and wanted changes. They didn't kill the king, yet, but they gave him some nasty shocks.

(b) How is the increasing influence of political clubs and societies in Paris in the period from 1789 to 1791 best explained? [25]

L1 To look at the rise of revolutionary discontent it is necessary to look at the geography of Paris itself, and the nests of tiny streets and squares where meetings could almost spontaneously occur without the authorities knowing. Close to the University, ideas spread naturally, with workers cheek-by-jowl with lawyers trained in the art of public speaking.

L3 The National Constituent Assembly had run out of steam and ideas. The only way that the Cordeliers and the Jacobins could make their voices heard was if other voices were silent or ineffective, and this is what happened.

L5 Clubs in Paris have always been brilliant and back then it was no exception.

6 Foreign and Domestic Conflict

(a) How did France turn military defeats in the foreign war into military triumphs? [25]

L1 No single factor therefore explains why, astonishingly, the near-certainty of defeat became the prospect of success. Decisive drastic actions are at the centre of my explanation, in the form of the levee en masse. Putting half a million French soldiers into the field in 1793 was crucial. But by itself this might not have worked had it not been for the disunity between France's enemy, especially Prussia and Austria

L3 At last in 1793 the French had generals and leaders who did not desert, or who managed to keep their troops loyal to them. One of these was a young Napoleon Bonaparte, who helped recapture Toulon

L5 The French suddenly started to be lucky and to win some battles at last after losing a lot before.

(b) Why were several parts of provincial France hostile to the actions of the revolutionary government in the period up to 1795? [25]

L1 Conscription therefore proved the last straw in the Vendee, where support for the work and ideas of the Convention had never been popular in the first place. The prospect of fighting and dying for ideals you rejected tipped many citizens into open and bloody revolt.

L3 The provinces hated the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, interference from Paris in their daily lives and also conscription. They wanted a more decentralised France.

L5 France was a big country and it was natural for people in different parts of it to have different ideas to each other.

Russia in Turmoil 1900-21**7 1917: The October Revolution****(a) Why did Lenin urge a Bolshevik rising in October 1917? [25]**

L1 Since the failure of the July Days, Lenin had been in exile in Finland and the Bolshevik leadership hopelessly split on the key issue of how to manoeuvre the party to benefit from the transfer of power from Provisional Government to Constituent Assembly. In response to clear moves by Kamenev and others to share power with other socialist parties of the Soviet, Lenin screamed from exile of the need to seize power by an armed rising. Lenin forced through the need for action before the Soviet Congress, on the grounds that Kerensky was organizing military action against them. This suggests that Lenin was more interested in securing his own grasp on power than in acting on behalf of the Soviet, or for the benefit of the socialist Left in general.

L3 Lenin scribbled an angry speech against the Bolshevik leaders, in which he denounced them as 'miserable traitors to the cause'. For Lenin, the opportunity had presented itself and their hesitation was inexcusable.

L5 It was the best time for a rising. Lenin knew this and just had to convince the others, as you do.

(b) How is the success of the Bolshevik rising of October 1917 best explained? [25]

L1 Lenin and the Bolsheviks had achieved success by a dramatic combination of factors. They all knew their Marxist theory. To this can be linked their actions. Lenin's judgment of the moment – and his ability to persuade others of it – was impeccable; Trotsky's securing of the military victory brilliant; and Kerensky's failure to anticipate tragic.

L3 The plan was for Bolshevik forces to take effective control of a number of key locations in Petrograd. On 21 October Trotsky and the Bolsheviks took control of the Petrograd garrison: it was the first act of the rising. Two days later Trotsky extended his grip by taking control of the Peter and Paul Fortress.

L5 Lenin was in charge and he made it all happen. There was a rising and the communists took control, just as he said they would.

8 1917-21: The consolidation of Bolshevik power**(a) Why did the Bolshevik government sign the treaty of Brest Litovsk?**

L1 Trotsky was against signing the treaty and favoured instead a 'revolutionary war' that would rally Bolshevik supporters against the German invader and promote international revolution (on classic Marxist lines). Lenin, as practical as ever, argued that the treaty had to be signed to enable the Bolshevik government to consolidate the revolution in Russia and build up its army for the future. These differences led to repeated delays in signing the treaty, until the Kaiser forced the issue by ordering his armies to resume their advance into Russia. With Petrograd itself now threatened, Lenin finally won the argument.

L3 The Bolsheviks tried hard to delay signing the treaty. Germany would not hold back and invaded again. The Communists had no alternative but to sign even though they didn't want to lose so much land and resources.

L5 The Bolsheviks were in charge and they had the right to sign the treaty or not, so they did.

(b) Why did the Red Army win the Civil War?

L1 The most important advantage enjoyed by the Reds was the central distribution of their armies – they might be defeated by individual White commanders, but never by a co-ordinated effort by the two together. This also simplified the question of supply – the Red system able to use a centralized rail network, that of the Whites subject to local ambush or theft on its long journeys from the East or South. This in turn produced endemic corruption amongst White officials and administrators, in contrast to the efficiency of Red systems set up by Trotsky.

L3 The reaction of the Bolsheviks was ruthless and determined. In an amazingly short time, Trotsky created a Red Army of over 300,000 men. Behind them, the Cheka made sure that nobody in Bolshevik-held territories co-operated with the Whites.

L5 Trotsky went around to see the Red Army on a train and told them they must win.

F983 Using Historical Evidence - British History

Units F961-F964, F981-F984

Examiners should refer to OCR's *Instructions for Examiners* for more detailed guidance.

1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

All candidates must meet the Assessment Objectives set for History by the QCA. These Objectives are expressed and weighted separately and marks must be allocated against the AOs targeted by the assessment.

Examiners should seek the advice of Team Leaders about unusual approaches to a question.

3 GENERIC MARK GRID

The generic grids are the most important guide for examiners and apply to all answers.

Mark each answer individually. Do not be swayed by impressions gained from marking other answers in the script or other candidates from the same Centre or scripts from another Centre.

Examiners will remember that they are assessing AS Level (not A Level), usually the work of 17 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably four other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

4 QUESTION-SPECIFIC MARK SCHEMES

Question-specific mark schemes are secondary, supporting the Generics. They do not specify the 'correct' answer required for individual questions. Rather, they indicate possible points that candidates might make. They offer a broad guide to what may be encountered. Examiners must use their judgement but, **if in doubt about a particular answer, they must consult their TL. The most important principle for examiners is the primacy of the Generics.**

Answers need not be long to merit high marks. Reward answers that are direct but concise. Reward selection of relevant material and appropriate comment rather than paraphrases. Quotations should only be rewarded if used to substantiate relevant points made in the candidate's own words.

5 POSITIVE MARKING

Examiners must be positive in marking what is written, without being influenced too much by omissions. Marks must represent what a candidate has accomplished, not what her/she has failed to do. Even the most successful answers may have omissions which could have been rectified had more time been allowed. **Examiners must not 'penalise'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (e.g. for accuracy and relevance).

Question-specific mark schemes alone indicate any omissions that will affect marks awarded or any ceilings to be applied. Mark positively by rewarding what has been written. When things go wrong, it is usually because an undue severity creeps in when omissions and errors are looked for (marking negatively).

6 USE OF THE FULL RAW MARK RANGE

Examiners use the full mark range to reward work appropriately, to enable candidates to be ranked in order of merit and avoid bunching, and to ensure that raw marks convert appropriately to UMS after grading. This is an invitation neither to be generous at the top nor to under-mark at the bottom.

7 MARKING SCRIPTS

All marks must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'ReI' written in the margin indicates there is some significant irrelevance;
- 'N' or 'D' in the margin indicates an excessively narrative or descriptive section;
- Occasional brief notes in the margin should indicate sound points or knowledge;
- Ticks are of little value, and can seriously mislead. They should be avoided.

Each page should indicate that it has been read. Good practice will avoid a sequence of pages with nothing but ticks (or crosses).

A brief comment summarising the main qualities of an answer should be written at the end, together with the Levels and the mark. The best way to do that is to quote briefly from the appropriate Level descriptors.

The Mark Levels and the appropriate numerical mark should be recorded at the end of each answer (e.g. Level IV – 45) for each AO target. The total marks for answers should be ringed in the right-hand margin at the end of each question. All marks for sub-questions should be recorded un-ringed in the right-hand margin. They should be repeated at the end and the total shown as a ringed mark in the right-hand margin at the end of the question (e.g. $5 + 15 + 45 = 65$, with 65 in a circle).

Do not alter a mark other than by crossing it out, inserting the correct mark and initialling it.

Comments on scripts

The comment at the end of an answer should reflect its qualities as defined by the Mark Levels so quote from them. Comments help you to arrive at a fair mark and indicate to senior examiners how your mind has been working. Marks and comments must be substantiated unequivocally from scripts.

Examiners should use a professional, business-like and straightforward style. Always use:

- reference to the assessment objectives and/or Mark Bands;
- reference to creditable points and major gaps which affect assessment;
- reference to 'the answer' or the third person, not 'You...'

Always avoid:

- derogatory terms e.g. 'rubbish', 'shoddy', even though examiners may consider such terms to be justified;
- humour, interjections or jokes;

Ignore poor handwriting. If it is illegible, send the script to your TL. Candidates must not be marked down.

It may be appropriate to make general comments about matters such as:

- use of time and/or length of answers;
- presentation and use of language;
- rubric infringements;

Do **not** make:

- comments on how you perceive teaching may have been carried out;
- reference to answers by other candidates, e.g. 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, e.g. 'should have revised more fully';

9 RUBRIC INFRINGEMENTS AND INCLUSIONS FROM CENTRES

If a candidate answers more questions than the specified number, all answers must be marked. The highest marks for the number of questions allowed must be used to constitute the script's total mark. The marks of the surplus answers should then be reduced to 0 and an explanation written on the script's front page.

If a candidate fails to answer sufficient questions, write an explanatory note on the front of the script. If several candidates from one Centre infringe rubrics, the PE and Subject Officer should be informed.

Centres are responsible for requesting special consideration for individual candidates. Such cases are dealt with directly between the Centre and OCR. Requests for special treatment sent with scripts must be ignored in your marking and forwarded directly to OCR.

Notes such as 'Out of time' written on scripts (by invigilators or candidates) must be ignored.

10 OVERALL

Mark consistently, periodically refreshing yourself via the standardisation scripts and the Generics.

Pace your marking, follow a regular timetable and avoiding the need to mark many scripts in limited time or when fatigued. If difficulties arise, inform your TL at once so alternative arrangements can be made.

Return mark sheets and scripts promptly. Failure to do so will jeopardise the issuing of results.

Contact OCR with admin problems and your TL on marking issues. Examiners must never contact a Centre.

**Our secondary educational system is built around external assessment.
Students, parents, teachers, FE and employers all depend on volunteers to mark the exams.**

Thank you very much for being an examiner.

Generic Mark Scheme for Unit 3 Question 1(a), 2(a), 3(a), 4(a)

Maximum mark: 35

Allocation of marks within the Unit: AO1: 15; AO2: 20 (AO2a: 10; AO2b: 10).

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding	AO2a Sources	AO2b Interpretations
Level 1	13-15	9-10	9-10
Level 2	10-12	7-8	7-8
Level 3	7-9	5-6	5-6
Level 4	4-6	3-4	3-4
Level 5	1-3	1-2	1-2
Level 6	0	0	0

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Interpretation of sources	AO2b: Historical interpretations
Level 1	<p>Uses sound knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to evaluate sources. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is coherent. Writing is legible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>	<p>Evaluates sources of evidence in their historical context: makes sophisticated inferences from the sources, makes an informed use of the provenance of the sources and cross-references the sources to reach a reasoned and supported conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<p>Shows a sound understanding that interpretations are dependant on the available evidence and how it is interpreted. Suggests and justifies, through a sophisticated use of sources and knowledge, an amended or alternative interpretation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>
Level 2	<p>Uses knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to make inferences from sources. Uses historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is clear. Writing is legible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>	<p>Evaluates evidence from sources in their historical context: makes inferences from the sources, makes an informed use of the provenance of the sources or cross-references the sources to reach a supported conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<p>Shows an understanding that interpretations are dependant on the evidence that is inferred from sources. Uses interpretations of the sources to support and challenge the interpretation and reaches an overall conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>
Level 3	<p>Uses some knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to go beyond face value reading of sources. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument lacks some clarity.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-9</p>	<p>Makes inferences from the sources and cross-references the sources to reach a conclusion. Some simple evaluation. References to the provenance of the sources are not developed in context.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<p>Shows some understanding that interpretations are dependant on sources of evidence. Uses evidence inferred from sources to test the interpretation by showing how they support and disagree with it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Interpretation of sources	AO2b: Historical interpretations
Level 4	Uses knowledge of the period to evaluate sources for bias, suggest missing information. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Structure of writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level. 4-6	Makes simple inferences from the sources. Makes claims of bias, exaggeration and lack of typicality. Cross-references information from sources. 3-4	Uses evidence inferred from the sources to test the interpretation by showing either how they support it or disagree with it. 3-4
Level 5	Knowledge is used to expand on the information contained in the sources. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level. 1-3	Uses sources in isolation. Extracts relevant information from sources at face value. 1-2	Matches information in the sources to show how the interpretation is right and/or wrong. 1-2
Level 6	No additional knowledge is provided. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent. 0	No use is made of the sources. Misunderstands sources. 0	No successful matching of information or evidence to the interpretation. 0

Generic Mark Scheme for Unit 3, Question 1(b), 2(b), 3(b), 4(b).

Maximum mark: 15

Allocation of marks within the Unit: AO1: 5; AO2: 10 (AO2a: 10; AO2b: 0).

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding	AO2a Sources	AO2b Interpretations
Level 1	5	9-10	0
Level 2	4	7-8	0
Level 3	3	5-6	0
Level 4	2	3-4	0
Level 5	1	1-2	0
Level 6	0	0	0

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Analysis of sources
Level 1	<p>Good and detailed knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of the period and changes and developments across the period, used to support analysis of sources.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p>	<p>Explains, with examples from most of the sources that the value of sources depends on the purpose of the historian, the questions being asked, different interpretations of the sources and judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain both the value and the problems associated with using these sources. Candidates will also show knowledge of the range of sources used for studying this period.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>
Level 2	<p>Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the main characteristics of the period and the main changes and developments across the period used to support analysis of the sources.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p>Explains, with examples from some of the sources that the value of sources depends on most of the following issues: the purpose of the historian, the questions being asked, different interpretations of the sources and judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain both the value and the problems associated with using these sources even if one side of the explanation is stronger than the other. Candidates will show awareness of some of the types of sources used for studying this period.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Analysis of sources
Level 3	Some knowledge and understanding of some of the main characteristics of the period and some of the main changes and developments across the period. This is sometimes used to support the analysis of the sources. 3	Explains, with examples from some of the sources that the value of sources depends on judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain either the value of the sources or the problems associated with using these sources. Candidates will show some awareness of some of the types of sources used for studying this period. 5-6
Level 4	Some knowledge of the period occasionally used to support the analysis of the sources. 2	Identifies ways in which these sources are of use to an historian and identifies some problems associated with them. Relevant parts of the sources are also identified. 3-4
Level 5	Some knowledge of the period but not used to support the analysis of the sources. 1	Fails to use the sources but explains some valid issues associated with historical sources generally. 1-2
Level 6	Little knowledge of the period – not used to support the analysis of the sources 0	Fails to use the sources but identifies some valid issues associated with historical sources generally 0

1 The Impact and Consequences of the Black Death in England up to the 1420s

Read the interpretation and Sources 1-7

Interpretation: The Black Death caused economic chaos in England.

- (a) **Explain how far sources 1-7 support this interpretation. You may, if you wish amend the interpretation or suggest a different interpretation. If you wish to do this you must use the sources to support the changes you make.**

Remember not to simply take the sources at face value. Use your own knowledge of the period to interpret and evaluate them. [35]

- (b) **Explain how these sources are both useful and raise problems and issues for a historian using them.** [15]

Knowledge and Understanding

The exact number of deaths and the impact the plague had is open to debate.

Evidence from Sources that can support hypothesis

Source 1: partial support, government officials are dying and unable to complete administrative tasks for the crown.

Source 2: the process by which death led to land being left un-worked.

Source 3: the impact on both towns and rural communities.

Source 4: the impact of labour shortages.

Source 5: the impact on one part of the agricultural economy, the death of animals and deflation of prices.

Source 6: poverty amongst peasant communities.

Source 7: the poll tax, a government reaction to the economic impact of the Black Death and a popular response to said.

Evidence that can be used to challenge hypothesis:

Source 1 the crown still insisted that the apparatus of the state function and took action when royal official were not fulfilling their obligations.

Source 4: the plague causing a readjustment of the economy rather than chaos.

Evaluation of Sources

Government documents were common in this period, see 1, and their veracity could be discussed in combination with chronicle sources – such as 3 or 4. Source 3 may over estimate the death rate and could be cross referenced with 1, 2, 4 & 5. 3, 4 & 5 are similar ‘types’ of sources and their compositional styles could be cross referenced with the government documents. 6 is a poem & 7 a popular jingle, two very different types of sources for discussion alongside the others in the set.

Judgement

The evidence is mixed and a balanced response is needed. The case for chaos is an obvious one given the death toll – although interpretation of the sources and conclusions at the exact percentage of the death rate is open to debate. Factors such as labour shortage, etc can be argued to stem from this. So too with an extension of this interpretation social collapse. This can be viewed across the period using sources 6 & 7. However, candidates might present the evidence in a different light arguing that the Black Death was not the sole cause of the chaos and that the 14th century was a time of upheaval for other reasons. Also, chaos could be interpreted as opportunity for the different social groups concerned. Candidates might point to the ease with which the population recovered. Finally, there is an apocalyptic religious dimension to much of the evidence that might be considered.

Question 1 (b)

Uses of the Sources:

Chronicles such as Sources 3 and 5 and histories such as Source 4 are useful in providing accounts that draw on contemporary impressions of events, even though in the case of chronicles they are often compiled later. For example, Source 3 shows the widespread impact across Europe, giving the impression of a mortality that killed a large number of people; even though other records make it clear that the proportion that died was not as great as is suggested here, there is evidence of the psychological impact as well as evidence of the impact on religious communities where the plague may have spread more readily because of the communal lifestyle.

Central government records (e.g. Source 1) are useful for providing evidence of the impact of the Black Death on government administration such as tax collection in this instance, while local records such as Source 2 can be used to provide evidence of what happened in particular localities, or to build up a picture of the range of impacts on different localities. Besides this, the mechanisms by which tax was collected can be deduced from Source 1, and the type of agriculture practised can be deduced from Source 2.

Literature such as Source 6 provides evidence give a more impressionistic account from which can be deduced the psychological impact of the plague along with the grievances of the poor in a more general sense (high rents, frequent hunger and so on).

Issues in relation to the Sources:

The typicality of particular examples described in Sources 1, 2 and 4, together with the acceptability of generalisations such as those in Sources 3, 4 and 5 may be discussed; candidates may suggest how the figures or 'statistics' in these Sources were arrived at and what deductions may usefully be drawn from them. Candidates may show an awareness of the data that is available and extrapolations that historians may draw from it.

Problems with the Sources:

The lack of accounts from ordinary people – even those such as Source 6 which purport to describe the plight of the poor are produced by educated people, while criticisms such as those in Source 4 are entirely from the perspective of the wealthy/employers.

Source 7 describes the problems of the poor, but there is a danger that the historian may ascribe modern reactions to hardship onto medieval people. The report appears factual, yet we cannot know what the experience of plague and its impact were like for medieval people. The contrast in what was reported at the time set against the evidence of what happened in the later 14th century implies that contemporary reports of the results of the plague were exaggerated.

2 Rebellions were not a serious threat to Tudor governments

Examples of arguments, evidence and source evaluations that may be included in responses:

Knowledge and Understanding

Candidates may use their wider knowledge of what could constitute a threat to a Tudor government in terms of a challenge to the crown itself, or to the crown's policies or ministers or simply to law and order ie government control. At different times any of these might constitute a serious threat, for example a challenge to government policy in the mid-Tudor period might be more serious than in a more stable period. Equally a rebellion might be perceived as serious at the time, although historians or indeed contemporaries after the event might regard it in a less serious light. Candidates may refer to the context of any of the rebellions to which the sources relate in reaching their conclusions, for example using their knowledge of the ultimate success or failure of the rebellion, but should not allow their judgement to rest on wider knowledge of other rebellions not referred to directly in the sources.

Evidence from Sources that can support the interpretation:

Source 1: The chronicler states that the king was able to relieve the city of Exeter, despite the large number of rebels. The fact that the leader was only a blacksmith, rather than someone of higher rank also suggests that though numerous, the rebels were not likely to pose a major threat.

Source 2: Those who were asked to pay tax would have been prepared to do so if the normal legal channels had been followed.

Source 3: the numbers rebelling in some counties were very small.

Source 4: The demands did not directly challenge the government: many concerned local grievances about enclosures and prices eg 1 and 5. The demand in 15 was not unreasonable.

Source 5: The rebels were trying to protect their interests, and did not voice their demands in terms of a threat to the Queen or her government.

Source 7: The Earl of Essex's rebellion does not appear to have been very serious, with little support and the earl executed having declared his loyalty to the Queen.

Evidence that can be used to challenge the interpretation

Source 1: The numbers cited, and the fear expressed by the citizens of Exeter, suggest that this uprising was serious. Since the tax was to pay for war, it was a serious matter if there was widespread refusal to pay. Candidates may be aware of the location of Exeter which suggests that although the rebels had travelled out of Cornwall, they had not gone very far towards London.

Source 2: Widespread refusal to pay tax was potentially very serious for a Tudor government: if the monarch could not collect tax then he would certainly have the ability to exercise his powers restricted.

Source 3: The numbers listed are substantial, especially in the context of the less heavily populated northern counties. There was clearly strong feeling across the north against the king's religious policies as well as other matters raised in the Articles by the pilgrims.

Source 4: The demands were serious in that they challenged the economic position of those in the upper ranks of society and represented widespread discontent during a period of economic hardship when the government appeared to be showing sympathy for the commons. Hence the problem was two-fold: the commons expected more than the government could give and the gentry felt under threat, having insufficient support from the government. Since religious policy was the prerogative of the crown, ordinary people presented a challenge to government in making religious demands.

Source 5: It was the monarch's prerogative to choose his/her spouse, so a rebellion challenging this right was potentially serious. Besides this, the rebels came close to London and were fairly numerous.

Source 6: The dubious loyalty of locals called upon to help suppress the rebellion of the Northern Earls was potentially very serious and was recognised as such by the Privy Council. There was a large element of luck in the collapse of the alliance of the Northern Earls with those at court, for example Norfolk's hesitation. That Catholics across a wider area were not prepared to join the rebellion was also fortunate.

Source 7: Rebellion by a leading courtier, politician and military leader was potentially very serious. Essex had already defied the queen on a number of occasions and historians such as Haigh regard this as symptomatic of the Queen's declining control of faction in her later years.

Evaluation of Sources

For example: Source 1 was written with the advantage of hindsight, aware that the rebellion was suppressed, so may play down the extent of the danger. The demands made by Ket were mostly economic, and should be judged in the context of the serious economic slump and bad harvests of the 1540s. They could also be set in the context of the other rebellions in the year 1549. Besides this, candidates may consider that Ket's rebellion and Somerset's responsibility for, and handling of it was one of the causes of his downfall. It should be noted that the success of the rebels reported in Source 5 is based on rumour. Source 6 is written by an apparently frightened official, perhaps in anticipation of problems better explained beforehand than after the event. Adams's chronicle (Source 7) is very sympathetic to Essex, noting that he died loyal to his queen and that she mourned his death. This could be evaluated in the context of a long-running quarrel between queen and earl in which he was repeatedly excluded from the centre of power, and he disobeyed her several times.

Judgement: this should relate to the issue in the interpretation provided. Candidates may assess what a serious threat might amount to, identifying different kinds of challenge to government in the incidents described in the sources. These include uprisings against those in authority locally, protests about government policy and incidents indicating a disaffected group amongst the ruling elite. The extent of seriousness could relate to numbers and/or status of those involved as well as the ability of the government to disperse or punish the rebels. Candidates should seek to produce a generalisation that takes into account the evidence deduced from the sources, evaluated in the context of their wider knowledge.

(b) Issues that could be raised include:

- The sources relate to a wide range of incidents that had differing causes and levels of support in terms of numbers and status of rebels.
- The sources are mostly written with a degree of hindsight, in the knowledge that the regime survived (more or less).
- The danger perceived by Sir Ralph Sadler (source 6) may be more typical of the reaction of the authorities when faced with a rebellion.
- All but one of the sources is from the side that prevailed in the dispute or is neutral.
- The reaction of the government went beyond actually dealing with the rebels: the sources do not take into account changes in personnel in government or their relative strength or changes in policy introduced to avoid future trouble.
- The sources may not reflect a typical picture of the seriousness of rebellion, particularly as it was perceived at the time as they only refer to a limited range of rebellions.

Uses of the Sources:

Chronicles provide a useful compilation of contemporary views of events. For example Source 2 shows the reaction of the clergy and probably gives a genuine account of their views as chronicles were often compiled by people from clerical backgrounds. Equally the placing of the blame on Wolsey shows a genuine contemporary reaction to a politician who was unpopular with members of the elite because of his relatively humble background and the degree of influence he held over the king.

Letters addressed to the Privy Council by officials in the localities, such as Source 6, provide useful evidence of the methods used by the Council to understand what was going on in more remote parts of the realm.

3 Radicalism, Popular Politics and Control 1780-1880s

Interpretation: The ruling classes had little to fear from the working classes and radicals in the period 1780 to the 1880s.

Knowledge and understanding

Eg Candidates may use their knowledge to develop/explain the evidence in the sources that support/challenge the hypothesis eg Source 1 - knowledge of food riots fear of hoarding or of exporting grain leading to scarcity and high prices, their nature and even understanding of Thompson's 'moral economy' could be used to explain; Source 2 - knowledge of the context and purpose of Peterloo; knowledge of the campaign for parliamentary reform for Source 3; Source 4 - knowledge of the roles played by Lovett and O'Connor in Chartism and their disagreement over methods (the debate between moral force and physical force); Source 5 - explanation of reference to 'physical force' and general strike; knowledge of the purpose and nature of New Model Unions; knowledge of the nature, aims and methods of New Unionism.

Candidates may use their knowledge to check the claims being made in the sources eg knowledge of the conduct of most food riots could be used to confirm Source 1; knowledge of the events of Peterloo could be used to confirm some points but to question the overall impression given in Source 2; knowledge of the Bristol riots and other events to support reform could be used to confirm what is described in Source 3; knowledge of O'Connor could be used to confirm and question Source 4; knowledge of Chartism could be used to question the account of Chartism in Source 5 especially the references to no organisation and leaders; knowledge of New Model Trade Unions could be used to confirm the details in Source 6 especially with reference to organisation; knowledge of New Unionism could be used to check what is said in Source 7.

Candidates may use their knowledge to make an informed use of the provenance of the sources eg the Duke of Buckingham in Source 2 obviously biased against the demonstrators because of his class, position; in Source 3 Prentice's position as a radical perhaps means his description of the rioting can be accepted; knowledge of the rivalry and disagreements between Lovett and O'Connor can be used to consider Source 4; Sir Charles Napier's position and experience clearly colours his diary entries; the fact that Source 7 was written by tow of the strikers is clearly a factor although they do criticise the union.

Candidates may question the typicality of the material in the sources as a whole including the omission of sources before 1800, the omission of other relevant incidents eg the Luddites, Swing, Rebecca, Cooperative Movement and what these tell us about organisation and leadership; the omission of anything about the organised and peaceful nature of the crowd at Peterloo in Source 2, the omission of anything about the extent of Chartist organisation in Sources 4 and 5, the typicality of the arrangements described in Source 6 and the events in Source 7.

Candidates may use their knowledge of radicalism across the period to compare their knowledge of patterns of leadership and organisation over time with that suggested by the sources.

Evidence from sources that can support the interpretation

Eg Source 2 - use of language such as 'sedition and turbulence', quality of Hunt's leadership criticised - suggests he is corrupt, lack of organisation implied by the use of force by the crowd

Source 3 - the language used such as 'the mob' and the events described suggest little organisation or leadership

Source 4 - Lovett's criticisms of O'Connor imply poor leadership

Source 5 - describes poor organisation and leadership

Source 7 suggests poor organisation and leadership because of the lack of funds and the lack of support for the strikers.

Evidence from the sources that can be used to challenge the interpretation

Eg Source 1 - phrases such as 'greatest order' reference to leaders, the fact that they seem to have clear, agreed and limited aims, they act as a group and negotiate as a group

Source 2 - some organisation and leadership implied by the planning and size and references to 'military marchings' and Hunt is mentioned as the leader

Source 4 - Lovett presents himself as a good leader and some organisation implied by mention of the Star and the Land Scheme

Source 6 demonstrates good organisation and implies good leadership

Source 7 suggests good organisation and leadership by the scale of the strike and other unions joining.

Evidence for/against change over time

The sources suggest a general lack of good leadership except at the beginning and at the end but there is no clear pattern. The most that can be said is that it varied from event to event and organisation to organisation.

Evaluation

Source 1 uses the heading 'Riot' but then describes something different? The account of Peterloo in Source 2 can be questioned because of the author and the fact he was not there. His 'family documents' are likely to provide a biased account, Source 3 could be taken as accurate as it is a radical and supporter of reform admitting what happened and he clearly does not approve of the events, in Source 4 Lovett clearly has a purpose - use of language is suggestive, Source 5 presents events from a narrow military perspective, much of Source 6 appears to be factual but the speaker does have a purpose - to present the union in the most respectable light possible, the authors were strikers and yet are not afraid to criticise the unions.

Judgement

Eg There is evidence for both sides of the argument as there is scope to interpret and use some of the sources in different ways. There is also some evidence for a more qualified interpretation as there are some examples of good leadership but these are not to be found throughout the sources. There is scope therefore to amend the interpretation or suggest a new one eg the quality of the leadership varied enormously. There is also scope to reach different judgements about leadership.

Question 3 (b)

Uses of the Sources:

Sources from the perspective of the employers such as Sources 6 and 7 give useful insights into the concerns of the wealthy and the way in which they were shared via newspapers.

The cartoons can be used to show the style of drawing of the period as well as commonly understood symbolism associated with revolution, for example the revolutionary cap and the guillotine shown in Source 3 and referred to in Source 1.

Issues in relation to the Sources:

The need to understand the imagery associated with the French Revolution (e.g. Source 3) and to have an appreciation of the different ways in which the ruling elite responded to the revolution – the fear in Source 3 might be contrasted with earlier more positive reactions before c1793.

The need to understand the changing context in terms of continental events referenced in Sources 1, 3 and 4; the position of trade unions and the economic climate for example in relation to Sources 6 and 7.

Problems with the Sources:

The attribution for working class pamphlets. Sources 1 and 4 are (necessarily) anonymous and hence it may be unclear whether the views expressed are those of the poor or of others who are trying to influence them.

Source 2 may show the real concerns of MPs in 1817, but it does not necessarily reflect the extent to which there was a danger of revolution as opposed to uprising. Examples such as Pentrich may be used to indicate the limitations of revolutionary understanding amongst ordinary people and hence the exaggerated, but nonetheless real, concerns of the ruling elite.

4 The impact of war on British society and politics since 1900

Focus: The impact of war on civil liberties.

Interpretation: Since 1914, restrictions on civil liberties have been beneficial.

Knowledge and Understanding

Candidates will be expected to interpret sources in context. This might involve knowledge of ways in which the responsibilities and powers of government increased during WW1. There were measures such as the Defence of the Realm Act, the Munitions Act - both involving intrusions on civil liberties and extensive negotiations with the trade unions, as suggested in SS1-3; control of the press – censorship, propaganda, manipulation of public opinion (S4); political developments during the war that aimed to translate wartime methods into a permanent model for social welfare – housing, welfare state, nationalization of industry etc - and its implementation by the postwar Labour government.(S5); conditions and events that led to internment without trial in Northern Ireland conflict in 1971 (S6); and background events that constitute the so-called 'War on Terror'(S7). The theme throughout is that the continuing price we pay for national security is limitations on personal liberty.

Evidence from Sources that can be used to support the interpretation

S1: the source is ambiguous and can be used to support or challenge the interpretation. Phrases such as 'people, for the first time, became active citizens', or 'they were required to serve the state instead of pursuing exclusively their own affairs' can be used to suggest a more vigorous relationship between citizens and the state.

S2-4: evidence in support of the interpretation concerns the advantages purchased in exchange of loss of personal or even collective freedom. For example, the revolution in munitions production arguably allowed the war to be won and 'higher freedoms' to be preserved; control of the freedom to drink had a dramatically positive effect on the nation's health; and censorship of the press prevented the spread of defeatism in the dark days of 1915-16, or 1940-41.

S5: provides evidence that successful methods of organizing society and the economy during wartime could be copied in peacetime with similar results - learning from mistakes made in 1918.

S6-7: both sources are ostensibly hostile to the interpretation, but the actions described in each can be justified – partially at least – when interpreted in the context of escalating terror and violence on British streets. The both beg the question of how much individual liberty needs to be sacrificed for the 'higher objective' of national security.

Evidence that can be used to challenge interpretation

S1: the main thrust of the source is pessimistic – regretting the intrusion of the state and the trampling on a number of simple, natural freedoms – eg the right to have a drink. This marks the beginning of a theme, taken up in S5, of the development of an intrusive, overweening state during most of the 20th Century – accelerated by the need to organize society to fight two world wars. The image is of a gradual erosion of personal liberty in wartime in the face of an ever-expanding state.

SS2-4: provides equally compelling evidence that the extent of government interference in civil liberties in wartime was unreasonable (and counter-productive in the case of S4). Some candidates may note that the 'liquor' figures for 1919 and 1920 begin to rise again – suggesting, perhaps a more 'natural' state of affairs.

S5: The extent to which S5 supports the interpretation may be challenged on grounds of nature and tone, which are forward-referencing and hortatory respectively. In other words, some candidates, interpreting the source in context, may comment that the reality fell short of the aspiration in some respects.

S6: it is the fact of the song itself that is the telling piece of evidence. Clearly the sentiment is one-sided but the song is a powerful example of the reaction caused by the policy of internment.

Reference to Cromwell is also evidence of the power of collective memory as a means of resisting government action (candidates may refer to wall paintings / battle of Boyne etc to further illustrate the point).

S7: again, the intrusion on civil liberties can be stressed, with the added element of counter-productiveness (and x-referenced to S4, S6).

Evaluation of Sources

S2: as a Socialist newspaper, *Forward* is clearly 'positioned' in defence of trade unionist 'martyrs' in Glasgow. In S4, *The Daily Mirror* takes a similar line, but turns it against its rival, *The Daily Worker*, which it brands as 'Stalinist'. By cross-referencing between S1 and S4, candidates may develop an interesting discussion about the predicament of various shades of left-wing opinion in respect of what is generally perceived as the 'national interest'.

S3: the data can be taken as reliable, since they were issued by the Central Control Board, so candidates will need to comment on the limitations of the source as evidence – eg the length of the time frame (what is to be taken as 'normal?'), the assumption that suicide rates are drink-related, the impact of liquor restrictions on the happiness of the people etc.

S5: is useful as evidence that the wartime government was planning for peacetime recovery well before the war was over. However, it may be questioned on grounds of type and tone – as mentioned above, or on the grounds that Balogh, as a Labour adviser may have closed his mind to other possibilities approaches to national reconstruction.

S6: the source is obviously biased but useful in representing one kind of resistance – passionate and powerful - to the power of the state. Hence this kind of action by the state – though immediately effective - is ultimately counter-productive. This line of reasoning may be supported contextually by reference to Bloody Sunday, or to Amnesty International's condemnation of methods of internment used by the British Government.

S7: the reliability of the source has to be questioned as a newspaper article – expression of opinion - essentially unaccountable, subject to editorial line etc.

Candidates are also likely to comment on the limitations of the sources as a set = eg by identifying a range of omissions:

- DORA and the introduction of conscription in WW1,
- evacuation in WW2,
- the post-war effects of a 'command economy' based on national planning
- the growth of surveillance and espionage during the Cold War
- the significance of developments in media coverage of both the Gulf and Iraq wars.

Judgement

The interpretation suggests that restricting civil liberties has been beneficial. Candidates may question and amend this by raising issues such as 'beneficial' for whom - the government? members of the public? the country as a whole? and/or different times at which restrictions may have been more or less beneficial e.g. beneficial during war; times of national emergency (and they may discuss whether 'terrorist' threats such as those posed by the IRA or 7th July bombers constitute national emergency); 'normal' times. They will then need to justify their conclusions on these or other issues they raise using evidence derived from the sources interpreted in the context of their knowledge.

4 (b)

Uses of the Sources:

Newspapers reflect not only the views of the editor/owner but also those of the readership: for example compare and contrast views in Sources 2, 4 and 7.

Source 5 provides evidence of the priorities of the Labour Party – in the context of Labour's landslide victory in the 1945 election the Source is useful in showing what the majority wanted after the Second World War.

Issues in relation to the Sources:

Statistics only provide figures: it is up to the historian to draw conclusions from them. Candidates should provide examples from Source 3.

The differing nature of conflicts, including the total war of the two world wars and the reactions to terrorism, mean that different kinds of measures have been introduced and have produced different levels of acceptance.

This may be linked to issues of typicality of the views expressed, for example citing socialist reactions to the Munitions Act in Source 2 in the context of industrial unrest during World War I.

The need to know the context is another issue: the banning of the Daily Worker (Source 4) predates the German invasion of the USSR – would this have happened after June 1941?

The definition of 'Irish' in Source 6 is an exclusive one.

Problems with the Sources:

The statistics in Source 3 may not show sufficient years to be able to draw valid conclusions about patterns of change relating to government control of alcohol. There may be other factors affecting the statistics including level of police vigilance in relation to both conviction for drunkenness and detection of suicides; wage and employment levels; patriotism leading to greater abstinence.

The Sources as a set are largely focused on war-time restrictions on civil liberties.

F984 Using Historical Evidence - Non British History

Units F961-F964, F981-F984

Examiners should refer to OCR's *Instructions for Examiners* for more detailed guidance.

1 THE ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

All candidates must meet the Assessment Objectives set for History by the QCA. These Objectives are expressed and weighted separately and marks must be allocated against the AOs targeted by the assessment.

Examiners should seek the advice of Team Leaders about unusual approaches to a question.

3 GENERIC MARK GRID

The generic grids are the most important guide for examiners and apply to all answers.

Mark each answer individually. Do not be swayed by impressions gained from marking other answers in the script or other candidates from the same Centre or scripts from another Centre.

Examiners will remember that they are assessing AS Level (not A Level), usually the work of 17 year-old candidates who have studied the Unit for only about 8 weeks in conjunction with probably four other subjects, and who have only a limited time to write their answers.

4 QUESTION-SPECIFIC MARK SCHEMES

Question-specific mark schemes are secondary, supporting the Generics. They do not specify the 'correct' answer required for individual questions. Rather, they indicate possible points that candidates might make. They offer a broad guide to what may be encountered. Examiners must use their judgement but, **if in doubt about a particular answer, they must consult their TL. The most important principle for examiners is the primacy of the Generics.**

Answers need not be long to merit high marks. Reward answers that are direct but concise. Reward selection of relevant material and appropriate comment rather than paraphrases. Quotations should only be rewarded if used to substantiate relevant points made in the candidate's own words.

5 POSITIVE MARKING

Examiners must be positive in marking what is written, without being influenced too much by omissions. Marks must represent what a candidate has accomplished, not what her/she has failed to do. Even the most successful answers may have omissions which could have been rectified had more time been allowed. **Examiners must not 'penalise'** (ie. subtract marks from what answers are otherwise worth). Candidates penalise themselves by failing to gain marks (e.g. for accuracy and relevance).

Question-specific mark schemes alone indicate any omissions that will affect marks awarded or any ceilings to be applied. Mark positively by rewarding what has been written. When things go wrong, it is usually because an undue severity creeps in when omissions and errors are looked for (marking negatively).

6 USE OF THE FULL RAW MARK RANGE

Examiners use the full mark range to reward work appropriately, to enable candidates to be ranked in order of merit and avoid bunching, and to ensure that raw marks convert appropriately to UMS after grading. This is an invitation neither to be generous at the top nor to under-mark at the bottom.

7 MARKING SCRIPTS

All marks must be whole numbers. The following conventions should be used:

- Significant errors should be crossed out;
- 'ReI' written in the margin indicates there is some significant irrelevance;
- 'N' or 'D' in the margin indicates an excessively narrative or descriptive section;
- Occasional brief notes in the margin should indicate sound points or knowledge;
- Ticks are of little value, and can seriously mislead. They should be avoided.

Each page should indicate that it has been read. Good practice will avoid a sequence of pages with nothing but ticks (or crosses).

A brief comment summarising the main qualities of an answer should be written at the end, together with the Levels and the mark. The best way to do that is to quote briefly from the appropriate Level descriptors.

The Mark Levels and the appropriate numerical mark should be recorded at the end of each answer (e.g. Level IV – 45) for each AO target. The total marks for answers should be ringed in the right-hand margin at the end of each question. All marks for sub-questions should be recorded un-ringed in the right-hand margin. They should be repeated at the end and the total shown as a ringed mark in the right-hand margin at the end of the question (e.g. 5 + 15 + 45 = 65, with 65 in a circle).

Do not alter a mark other than by crossing it out, inserting the correct mark and initialling it.

Comments on scripts

The comment at the end of an answer should reflect its qualities as defined by the Mark Levels so quote from them. Comments help you to arrive at a fair mark and indicate to senior examiners how your mind has been working. Marks and comments must be substantiated unequivocally from scripts.

Examiners should use a professional, business-like and straightforward style. Always use:

- reference to the assessment objectives and/or Mark Bands;
- reference to creditable points and major gaps which affect assessment;
- reference to 'the answer' or the third person, not 'You...'

Always avoid:

- derogatory terms e.g. 'rubbish', 'shoddy', even though examiners may consider such terms to be justified;
- humour, interjections or jokes;

Ignore poor handwriting. If it is illegible, send the script to your TL. Candidates must not be marked down.

It may be appropriate to make general comments about matters such as:

- use of time and/or length of answers;
- presentation and use of language;
- rubric infringements;

Do **not** make:

- comments on how you perceive teaching may have been carried out;
- reference to answers by other candidates, e.g. 'not as good as XX's answer';
- comments on the candidate's preparation or potential, e.g. 'should have revised more fully';

9 RUBRIC INFRINGEMENTS AND INCLUSIONS FROM CENTRES

If a candidate answers more questions than the specified number, all answers must be marked. The highest marks for the number of questions allowed must be used to constitute the script's total mark. The marks of the surplus answers should then be reduced to 0 and an explanation written on the script's front page.

If a candidate fails to answer sufficient questions, write an explanatory note on the front of the script. If several candidates from one Centre infringe rubrics, the PE and Subject Officer should be informed.

Centres are responsible for requesting special consideration for individual candidates. Such cases are dealt with directly between the Centre and OCR. Requests for special treatment sent with scripts must be ignored in your marking and forwarded directly to OCR.

Notes such as 'Out of time' written on scripts (by invigilators or candidates) must be ignored.

10 OVERALL

Mark consistently, periodically refreshing yourself via the standardisation scripts and the Generics.

Pace your marking, follow a regular timetable and avoiding the need to mark many scripts in limited time or when fatigued. If difficulties arise, inform your TL at once so alternative arrangements can be made.

Return mark sheets and scripts promptly. Failure to do so will jeopardise the issuing of results.

Contact OCR with admin problems and your TL on marking issues. Examiners must never contact a Centre.

Our secondary educational system is built around external assessment. Students, parents, teachers, FE and employers all depend on volunteers to mark the exams.

Thank you very much for being an examiner.

Generic Mark Scheme for F984 Question 1(a), 2(a), 3(a), 4(a)

Maximum mark: 35

Allocation of marks within the Unit: AO1: 15; AO2: 20 (AO2a: 10; AO2b: 10).

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding	AO2a Sources	AO2b Interpretations
Level 1	13-15	9-10	9-10
Level 2	10-12	7-8	7-8
Level 3	7-9	5-6	5-6
Level 4	4-6	3-4	3-4
Level 5	1-3	1-2	1-2
Level 6	0	0	0

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Interpretation of sources	AO2b: Historical interpretations
Level 1	<p>Uses sound knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to evaluate sources. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is coherent. Writing is legible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">13-15</p>	<p>Evaluates sources of evidence in their historical context: makes sophisticated inferences from the sources, makes an informed use of the provenance of the sources and cross-references the sources to reach a reasoned and supported conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<p>Shows a sound understanding that interpretations are dependant on the available evidence and how it is interpreted. Suggests and justifies, through a sophisticated use of sources and knowledge, an amended or alternative interpretation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>
Level 2	<p>Uses knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to make inferences from sources. Uses historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is clear. Writing is legible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>	<p>Evaluates evidence from sources in their historical context: makes inferences from the sources, makes an informed use of the provenance of the sources or cross-references the sources to reach a supported conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<p>Shows an understanding that interpretations are dependant on the evidence that is inferred from sources. Uses interpretations of the sources to support and challenge the interpretation and reaches an overall conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>
Level 3	<p>Uses some knowledge and understanding of changes and developments across the period to go beyond face value reading of sources. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument lacks some clarity.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-9</p>	<p>Makes inferences from the sources and cross-references the sources to reach a conclusion. Some simple evaluation. References to the provenance of the sources are not developed in context.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<p>Shows some understanding that interpretations are dependant on sources of evidence. Uses evidence inferred from sources to test the interpretation by showing how they support and disagree with it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Interpretation of sources	AO2b: Historical interpretations
Level 4	Uses knowledge of the period to evaluate sources for bias, suggest missing information. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Structure of writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level. 4-6	Makes simple inferences from the sources. Makes claims of bias, exaggeration and lack of typicality. Cross-references information from sources. 3-4	Uses evidence inferred from the sources to test the interpretation by showing either how they support it or disagree with it. 3-4
Level 5	Knowledge is used to expand on the information contained in the sources. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level. 1-3	Uses sources in isolation. Extracts relevant information from sources at face value. 1-2	Matches information in the sources to show how the interpretation is right and/or wrong. 1-2
Level 6	No additional knowledge is provided. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent. 0	No use is made of the sources. Misunderstands sources. 0	No successful matching of information or evidence to the interpretation. 0

Generic Mark Scheme for F984, Question 1(b), 2(b), 3(b), 4(b).

Maximum mark: 15

Allocation of marks within the Unit: AO1: 5; AO2: 10 (AO2a: 10; AO2b: 0).

	AO1 Knowledge and Understanding	AO2a Sources	AO2b Interpretations
Level 1	5	9-10	0
Level 2	4	7-8	0
Level 3	3	5-6	0
Level 4	2	3-4	0
Level 5	1	1-2	0
Level 6	0	0	0

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Analysis of sources
Level 1	<p>Good and detailed knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of the period and changes and developments across the period, used to support analysis of sources.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">5</p>	<p>Explains, with examples from most of the sources, that the value of sources depends on the purpose of the historian, the questions being asked, different interpretations of the sources and judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain both the value and the problems associated with using these sources. Candidates will also show knowledge of the range of sources used for studying this period.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>
Level 2	<p>Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the main characteristics of the period and the main changes and developments across the period used to support analysis of the sources.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p>Explains, with examples from some of the sources that the value of sources depends on most of the following issues: the purpose of the historian, the questions being asked, different interpretations of the sources and judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain both the value and the problems associated with using these sources even if one side of the explanation is stronger than the other. Candidates will show awareness of some of the types of sources used for studying this period.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2a: Analysis of sources
Level 3	Some knowledge and understanding of some of the main characteristics of the period and some of the main changes and developments across the period. This is sometimes used to support the analysis of the sources. 3	Explains, with examples from some of the sources that the value of sources depends on judgements about the typicality, purpose and reliability of the sources. Candidates will explain either the value of the sources or the problems associated with using these sources. Candidates will show some awareness of some of the types of sources used for studying this period. 5-6
Level 4	Some knowledge of the period occasionally used to support the analysis of the sources. 2	Identifies ways in which these sources are of use to an historian and identifies some problems associated with them. Relevant parts of the sources are also identified. 3-4
Level 5	Some knowledge of the period but not used to support the analysis of the sources. 1	Fails to use the sources but explains some valid issues associated with historical sources generally. 1-2
Level 6	Little knowledge of the period – not used to support the analysis of the sources 0	Fails to use the sources but identifies some valid issues associated with historical sources generally 0

1 The Vikings in Europe 790s-1066

Interpretation: The Vikings were successful because of the ferocity of their warriors in battle.

- (a) Explain how far sources 1-7 support this interpretation. You may, if you wish amend the interpretation or suggest a different interpretation. If you wish to do this you must use the sources to support the changes you make. [35]**

Remember not to simply take the sources at face value. Use your own knowledge of the period to interpret and evaluate them.

- (b) Explain how these sources are both useful and raise problems and issues for a historian using them. [15]**

Examples or arguments, evidence and source evaluations that may be included in responses:

Knowledge and Understanding

The sources can be used to evaluate the scale of Viking warfare and its details. For example, source 1 has naval warfare and lack of resistance on the Seine. The individual prowess of warriors can be discussed, for example sources 6 & 7 Other factors such as leadership, the incompetence, lack of fighting prowess & political disunity of their enemies can be discussed and challenged. Candidates might discuss Vikings as settlers and traders. A good answer will balance factors.

Evidence from Sources that can support hypothesis:

Source 1: the large numbers of ships - and as a consequence fighting men. Strategic mobility of waterborne raiders. The military reputation of the Vikings causes capitulation.

Source 3: the size of the raiding fleet.

Source 5: the size of the 'ship-army', the terror inspired by the Viking army.

Source 6: the widespread devastation created by a Viking invasion.

Source 7: an extreme example of a Viking warrior – a berserk.

Evidence that can be used to challenge hypothesis:

Source 1: the Vikings are beaten by the Saxons, the sources always exaggerate numbers.

Source 2: the incompetence of the opposition.

Source 3: the sources always exaggerate Viking numbers, note the rhetorical turn of phrase.

Source 4: the Vikings could be stopped by preparation and strong fortifications.

Source 5: the strategic mobility of the Vikings, their leadership

Source 6: the Vikings were well led.

Evaluation of Sources

Considerable cross refereeing can be made regarding numbers and the use of water to provide transport &, hence, strategic mobility. Also the Vikings fail in more than one of the sources. The veracity of ecclesiastical sources needs attention, as does the use of a saga as a source with all of its heroic poetic qualities.

Judgement:

The evidence is mixed, and the candidates need to weight it up. The size of Viking armies and navies is often exaggerated as is the military successes of the north men. The ecclesiastical sources have a religious incentive to exaggerate the threat of the Vikings. The Vikings were undoubtedly formidable in land battles and candidates could deploy artistic and archaeological evidence in support of the sources, but they were also successful because they were daring explorers, traders and settlers.

1(b)

Uses of the Sources:

Sources 1, 2, 4, 5 & 6 are all useful in providing the perspective of ecclesiastical figures in relation to the Vikings. They provide different views, showing changes in attitudes towards the Vikings, perhaps after they were converted to Christianity. Sagas reflect the values of the Vikings and are therefore useful for historians investigating their cultural values and traditions. Examples should be given from Source 7.

Issues in relation to the Sources:

The different countries from which the Sources originate and to which they make reference makes it difficult to generalise: contextual knowledge may be used to show different rates or patterns of invasion, settlement, different purposes to Viking expansion etc. Chronicles appear to report direct speech, but this is a convention (candidates should cite Source 3) and not a direct transcription of actual words spoken. Chronicles reflect the views and prejudices of the writer, as for example in the criticism of Charles the Bald in Source 2. They are not the objective accounts they appear at first reading to be.

Problems with the Sources:

Most of the Sources are written by people who feared the Vikings and saw them as enemies. Only Source 7 is clearly a Viking source. This is reflected in the actions described, such as the emphasis on destruction of churches in Source 2 and on the barbarism described in Source 5. These descriptions give a restricted view of the actions of the Vikings in their initial raids in contrast to later settling. Sagas do not necessarily recount real historical events. Examples of this should be given using Source 7 as a starting point.

2 The Italian Renaissance c1420-c1550

Focus: The development of the Renaissance?

Hypothesis: The development of the Italian Renaissance was caused by commercial factors.

Knowledge and Understanding

In order to interpret the sources, candidates will need to know something of the political economic and geographical context that provided the setting for the Italian Renaissance. In particular, they should be aware of the trading and banking traditions of Venice and Florence, and, of course, the historical and religious significance of Rome (S1, S2, S7). Knowledge of individual patrons – in particular the Medici – will be an advantage (S3 and S4), as will knowledge of the critical role of Venetian printing in spreading the new learning and advances in painting and architecture across Europe – in both directions (S5). Finally, candidates need to know how the focal point of the so-called ‘High Renaissance’ shifted to Rome at the end of the Quattrocento – and with it the towering figures of Raphael, Leonardo and Michelangelo. This also reflects the enduring importance of religion as both a motive for patronage (S4) and an inspiration for individual artists (S7).

Evidence from the sources that can be used to support hypothesis

S1: there is references in the source to Italy’s advantageous position for trade and commerce and as a general ‘cross roads’ in the central Mediterranean.

In S2, Rucellai confirms the commercial wealth of Florence and of its wealthiest citizens, and this can be confirmed by cross-reference to S3 and S4, both of which offer proof of the extent of Cosimo’s wealth and the purpose and direction of his patronage.

S5 provides evidence of the wealth of Venice in general but of the development of printing in the city in particular – the success of which is suggested by the emblems of dolphin and anchor.

S6 and S7: Support depends on knowledge of competition for building projects, such as Santa Maria del Fiore and the centre of Rome. It can also be found as an inference from the ‘travels’ of the great artists mentioned in each source, which suggests that they did well from patronage and their various commissions.

Evidence that can be used to challenge hypothesis

S1: the source also provides evidence of alternative forces of energy – the influx of literature from ancient Greek texts following the Ottoman capture of Constantinople (together with a hint that Venice, in particular, was as much influenced by Byzantium as by Rome).

S2 and S3: these sources suggest alternative motives for Florentine patronage of the arts. There is a hint in S2 that Cosimo’s generosity was motivated more by the prospect of political control than by aesthetic appreciation. Similarly, there is strong evidence in S3 of a troubled conscience as the mainspring of decision to fund extensions to San Marco.

S5: Suggests importance of printing for disseminating information about the ‘new learning’ across Europe – and consequently a more potent – and speedier - cause of growth than the financial support of individual benefactors.

S6: Suggests that the achievements of the Renaissance owed as much to the collective genius of individual artists as it did to commercial patronage.

S7: By the early 16th Century, the epicenter of the Renaissance had shifted from Florence to Rome and sources of patronage from merchants to popes - in particular to Leo X and Julius II, both of whom were interesting in restoring Rome to its former glory and celebrating their own papal achievements.

Evaluation of Sources

S2: Rucellai, a merchant himself, is effusive (and certainly biased) in his praise of the merchant adventurers and bankers who have created the wealth of Florence. Cross reference to S4 tells us that he was a wealthy man in his own right, so may not have been trying to flatter Cosimo.

S3 and S4: S3 can also be cross-referenced to S4 as means of demonstrating the extraordinary wealth of the Medici. S4 is clearly limited in what it can tell us about contemporary beliefs and attitudes. S3, on the other hand, may tell us more than the author intended. Da Bisticci was a close friend of Cosimo, so presumably intended to show him in a good light, but in doing so reveals less than honourable motives from the richest of all patrons - from which we may safely generalize. So the source may be unreliable but still useful in exposing the true motives of many rich patrons of the arts.

S6: The record is anonymous but produced by a Florentine official of some sort, so unlikely to be balanced in its assessment of the achievements of individual artists – or of the city as a whole. However, it is useful in suggesting the benefits accruing from a fortuitous collection of contemporaries, all of whom exhibited signs of genius in their own fields – so challenging the interpretation.

S7: Raphael's letter may be over-stated and sycophantic but it is useful in reflecting the cultural resurgence of Rome and decline of Florence by the early 16th Century. Some candidates may comment on how careful Raphael has to be in his choice of words – since the revival he is advocating is of the architecture of a pagan past!).

Judgment

Candidates can make good use of their contextual knowledge and Sources 1-4 to provide ample support for the interpretation, and of Sources 5-7 to suggest alternative causes of development. This may lead to a more balanced interpretation eg one that identifies commercial patronage as the 'main factor', whilst allowing for other influences, such as the contributions of individual artists, or of technological advances such as printing.

2 (b)

Uses of the Sources

The Sources can be used to show the attitudes and beliefs of Italian merchants such as Rucellai and Cosimo de' Medici. They also show the esteem in which artists were held either through direct descriptions of them or through the way in which Raphael felt able to address the Pope. The Sources are useful in showing some of the range of Italian cities in which the Renaissance flourished, and the range of influence on the arts and literature.

Issues in relation to the Sources:

The tax returns in Source 4 only reflect tax on property rather than wealth generated through trade which Sources such as 1 and 2 suggest was important in generating wealth. The contemporary Sources do not match Source 1 in acknowledging the influence of intellectual stimuli from Byzantium, citing instead native Italian influences in the form of patronage and artists. Apart from Raphael's reference to the ancients in Source 7 there is little to suggest the importance of classical civilisations in influencing the Renaissance.

Problems with the Sources:

The typicality of the patronage of the Rucellai and Medici families may be questioned by cross-referencing Sources 2 and 3 with evidence in Source 4 suggesting that these families were particularly wealthy and therefore may not have been typical. Candidates may use their knowledge of patronage of particular chapels etc. to point out that many of the ten individuals in Source 4 did patronise major artistic achievements.

3 European Nationalism 1815-1914: Germany and Italy

Interpretation: Great men were of crucial importance in nineteenth century Germany and Italy.

Knowledge and understanding

Eg Candidates may use their knowledge to develop/explain the evidence in the sources that support/challenge the interpretation. Knowledge could be used to explain the context of 1815-1820 in relation to German nationalist hopes in Source 1 - the impact of French rule, Metternich, the nature and purpose of the German Confederation, the growing student movements, the Carlsbad Decrees. Knowledge of the situation in Italy in 1848 could be used to explain the choices the Pope faced and the references to war with the Austrians in Source 2. In Source 3 knowledge of the events will enable candidates to explain references to Rome being 'overcome by brute force' and to the Roman Republic and to explain what Mazzini was hoping to achieve. In Source 4 knowledge of the events leading up to the war with Austria can be used to explain the source and in particular the importance of the Ems telegram. In Source 5 knowledge of the achievement of German unification and the role of Bismarck after 1871 could be used to explain the painting and why he was being given a more central role. There are various points in Source 6 that could be explained: the reference to Garibaldi being a dictator, his rule of Naples and Sicily and the claim that he was better suited the battlefield than to Parliament. In Source 7 knowledge of the circumstances of Bismarck's resignation can be used to interpret the message.

Candidates may use their knowledge to check the claims being made in the sources Eg Knowledge of the period could be used to question the claims made in Source 1 - was nationalism in Germany this strong? Knowledge of the situation in Italy in 1848 could be used to explore how Source 2 represents a change of mind for the Pope - why had he been known as the liberal Pope and why did nationalists rest their hopes on him? In Source 3 knowledge can be used to check the claims made by Mazzini - was he being realistic? Knowledge can be used to check Bismarck's claims about his role in engineering the war with Austria in Source 4.

In Source 5 knowledge of Bismarck's role in unification could be used to consider how far he deserved the central position. In Source 6 knowledge could be used to check claims made about Garibaldi - was he a dictator, was he better suited to the battlefield than to Parliament?

Candidates may use their knowledge to make an informed use of the provenance of the sources eg the youthful enthusiasm of the student in Source 1 can be considered especially in relation to the student movements at the time and the purpose of this source. In Source 2 the situation and motives of the Pope can be considered while in Source 3 Mazzini's purpose is crucial in that particular context. In Source 4 it is necessary to ask what Bismarck is up to writing this account in the 1890s - is he trying to show himself as the master planner?

Source 5 provides an opportunity to explore the reasons for changing the painting particularly in the context of Bismarck's role in Germany after 1871. The closeness of Crispi to Garibaldi is clearly a factor to be considered but also Garibaldi criticisms of those who ruled Italy after unification need to be taken into account.

Candidates may question the typicality of the material in the sources as a whole including the omission of sources before 1848 for Italy and the lack of sources about 1848 for Germany. The absence of Cavour must also be mentioned as well as the absence of factors such as the Zollverein.

Candidates may use their knowledge of the role of individuals and other factors in Germany and Italy across the period to compare with the pattern suggested by the sources. The patterns considered could be across time and between Germany and Italy - are their patterns different?

Evidence from sources that can support the interpretation

Eg Source 2 - there is a suggestion that much was expected from Pius IX - so a possible role for great men is suggested, but Pius refuses.

Source 3 - this source suggests that Mazzini was playing an important role in the nationalist movement (the establishment of the Roman Republic) but the importance of his contribution is limited by his defeat. Perhaps his role as a great man is represented by his ideals and rhetoric and the emotional contribution he made to the development of nationalist feelings.

Source 4 - at face value this source clearly supports Bismarck's role as a great man, a master planner who made a crucial contribution to the achievement of unification.

Source 5 - the fact that a new version of the painting was demanded giving Bismarck more prominence suggests his important role in the achievement of unification.

Source 6 - there is plenty of evidence here of Garibaldi being a great man and making a great contribution - but there are qualifications.

Evidence from the sources that can be used to challenge the interpretation

Eg Source 1 - this source suggests the role of broader forces such as nationalism. Great men are not mentioned - although the early date of the source might explain why.

Source 2 - the refusal of Pius IX to take a leading role with the nationalist movement means that he did not play a major contribution as a great man but the possibility is still there.

Source 3 - Mazzini's defeat and the fall of the Roman Republic suggest the role was not a crucial one.

Source 4 - questions need to be asked about how far this is Bismarck in the 1890s manufacturing an image for himself as a great man who planned and brought about unification.

Source 5 - this source could be read as an attempt to create an image for Bismarck as a great man making a great contribution - but this could be seen as being manufactured for other purposes and not reality

Source 6 - this source makes qualifications about Garibaldi's greatness and the importance of his contribution - he was not a politician and the implication is that he had little to offer Italy after unification was won on the battlefield.

Source 7 - this source suggests Bismarck was not indispensable.

Evidence for/against change over time

The sources suggest an uneven picture as regards the role of great men. There are contributions from great men from 1848 and they appear to become more important in the years just before the achievement of unification. However there are qualifications to be made the claims made for all the great men.

Evaluation

Source 1 provides an idealistic view of the importance of nationalism in 1820 - probably due to youthful enthusiasm. It does not mention great men (because of the early date?) and sees the people as the important factor - but exaggerates the importance of this and nationalist sentiment. Given the context of Source 2 and the previous behaviour of Pius IX it is not clear if these are his real sentiments but he had by this stage decided not to throw in his lot with the nationalists. The fact that he changes his policies and refuses to support the nationalists at the crucial movement can be used to suggest he was not a great man - but he does influence events. In Source 3 Mazzini is making a desperate appeal for support. His hopes are unrealistic but he did make some contribution to developments towards unification. By 1867 Mazzini's influence has faded. However, some of his

criticisms of Garibaldi still need to be considered. Source 4 also needs to be used carefully as this could be seen as an attempt by Bismarck to create the image of himself as the master planner.

Source 5 needs to be considered in terms of the purpose of changing the position and prominence of Bismarck. Did the change reflect his true role or was it an attempt to manufacture a particular version of events for political reasons. Does it try to create a myth of the 'Great Man'. In Source 6 Crispi's position as Garibaldi's secretary needs to be considered especially in relation to his praise of Garibaldi - this suggests Garibaldi's contribution was crucial. However, he also makes important qualifications about Garibaldi's role although he was criticised by Garibaldi when the latter criticised post-unification government of Italy.

Judgement

Eg There is evidence for both sides of the argument as there is scope to interpret and use some of the sources in different ways. There is evidence for a more qualified interpretation as there are some sources that do suggest there are important drawbacks in using some of these sources as evidence of the importance of great men. In fact it would be possible to defend an interpretation that questions any significant role for great men - although there is an absence of other factors in these sources.

3(b)

Use of the Sources:

Sources such as 1-5 show the aspirations of the nationalists. (Candidates will need to provide examples from the Sources.) A comparison of Sources 4 and 5 reveals aims and mood in 1848/1871 and between a representative institution and a monarchical one. The Sources are useful for comparing the nature of the appeal to nationalism in Italy and Germany. (Candidates should compare specific points from individual Sources to illustrate this point.)

Issues in relation to the Sources:

The Sources give official views and the views of leaders. There is no indication other than in Source 6 of public views, and even then the view is British rather than German or Italian. The Sources date from periods of particular activity – mainly wars – rather than across the period as a whole.

Problems with the Sources:

Candidates may refer to the purposes of the Sources, as these colour the way in which the writers refer to nationalism. For example, in Source 1 Mazzini expresses his despair at the lack of nationalism in Italy; candidates may contrast this with other writings by Mazzini where he calls on Italians to be nationalistic. Bismarck's memoirs (Source 7) date from after he was dismissed from office and may therefore be more critical of the dynastic allegiances in Germany. Source 6 is a commentary from an outsider, reflecting the British establishment view that Germany was controlled by the Prussian monarchy.

Source 5 aims to unite the German people and hence explains Wilhelm I's assumption of the imperial title in these terms. This may not reflect Wilhelm and his government's main aims in taking the title or indeed in uniting Germany politically.

4 Economic factors were the main reason for white Americans' attitudes towards African Americans.

Examples of arguments, evidence and source evaluations that may be included in responses:

Knowledge and Understanding

For example: Candidates may use their knowledge of the KKK to evaluate Source 1's claims about the purposes of the 'organization' described. They may use their understanding of the Southern economy after the Civil War to interpret the comments of Ray Stannard Baker in Source 2. They may use their wider knowledge of whites' attitudes to African Americans in interpreting and evaluating Source 3. They may set the account in Source 4 in the context of educational standards and employment prejudice towards African Americans during the period as a whole. They may use their understanding of the changes brought about by Federal Government in the 1950s and 1960s, and the context of the Cold War, to interpret and evaluate Sources 5 and 6.

Evidence from Sources that can support the interpretation

Source 1: The self-protection cited as the *raison d'être* of the 'organization' includes, by implication, protection of material property (presumably real estate) as the members were property holders.

Source 2: White hatred of African Americans was greatest among poor whites whose jobs would be threatened if African Americans gained equal rights. However, the wealthier white also responded to African Americans in terms of their wealth and success: some were hostile to African American success while others were positive in their response.

Source 3: Rank 6 lists a number of economic issues that white people regarded as of concern to African Americans.

Source 4: Whites clearly did not view African Americans as potential professionals, suggesting that even a sympathetic white man had expectations that would prevent prosperity for the African American.

Source 6: references to class system and ghettos imply that there is economic inequality that Kennedy wishes to eliminate.

Evidence that can be used to challenge the interpretation

Source 1: The main reason given for the 'organisation' is protection of women from rape and of children from 'outrages'. This suggests that the main reason for the white activity was linked to fear of the African American as sexual predator.

Source 2: There is a distinction between attitudes in different social classes, suggesting that richer southerners valued the labour of African Americans, and that the best of them did not object to African Americans becoming prosperous.

Source 3: suggests that white people thought African Americans were more concerned about social issues than economic ones, implying that discriminatory treatment against African Americans was more concerned to prevent social integration than to allow economic equality.

Source 4: The teacher has a clear sense of the African American's 'place' in society, but the comments seem to go beyond the economic consideration that a lawyer could be wealthy and successful in society; candidates may read a great deal into the tone of the teacher's comments.

Source 5: 'Change of heart' : love or justice, is rejected as a motive for the Supreme Court decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, while the context of the Cold War is cited as the true reason.

Source 6: Kennedy is clearly speaking in the context of the Cold War, but also refers to a range of ways in which African Americans are 'unequal', including a reference to Social

Darwinism (master race – a Nazi concept), second class citizens/caste (Jim Crow). This implies a sense of biological superiority as the motivation behind inequality, which may itself take an economic form.

Evaluation of Sources

For example: Source 1 may distort the nature and aims of the 'organisation' to which it refers: as a former Confederate General, the speaker is clearly no impartial. This should lead candidates to question the veracity of his claims in the context of their knowledge of the KKK.

Sources 4 and 5 were written by African Americans who have risen above the prejudices shown towards them. Their experiences may distort their views. The reasons for writing may lead to selective use of evidence to illustrate a point.

Source 6 should be evaluated in the context of what it is, who is speaking, and when.

Candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of the demonstrations in Alabama that form the precise context, but may be aware of Kennedy's role in the Cold War and his role and intervention in the Civil Rights Movement. They may question his motives, since he was slow to introduce the legislation he promised when he needed African American support in his electoral campaign.

Judgement: this should relate to the issue in the interpretation provided, that is, the motivation of whites in relation to African American Civil Rights. Candidates may, for example, deduce a change over time –earlier sources refer more to economic factors, while the image created of America seems to predominate in the last two sources. They may amend the hypothesis by distinguishing between different geographical areas of the US, or according to the wealth levels of the whites concerned.

(b) Issues that could be raised include:

The typicality of the views in this set of Sources – using their wider knowledge candidates may claim that this selection of Sources distorts white views.

The use of African American writers – they may not understand the true reason for white views: these Sources reflect African American perceptions of whites.

The use of an interview transcript where the interviewee was on the defensive.

The use of a radio/TV broadcast where the speaker would be more concerned about audience and image than about veracity.

4 (b)

Uses of the Sources:

The Sources reflect the views from both the northern and the southern states, giving a range of views. (Sources 1 and 2 describe the situation in the south, while the ideas in Source 3 are more generally applicable to the whole USA.) There are both white and African American views of what was happening; for example candidates may contrast the sentiments expressed in Sources 6 and 7.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History (H508)
 Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H108)
 June 2009 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F981	Raw	50	42	36	30	24	19	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F982	Raw	50	38	33	28	23	18	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F983	Raw	50	36	32	28	25	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F984	Raw	50	40	35	30	26	22	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H108	200	160	140	120	100	80	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H108	12.3	32.9	54.9	74.5	89.7	100.0	1271

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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 2009

