

History B

Advanced GCE

Unit **F985**: Historical Controversies

Mark Scheme for June 2011

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2011

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

Mark a Generic Mark scheme for part (a) questions:
Allocation within Unit: AO1: 30; AO2b: 30.

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2b: Historical interpretations
Level 5	<p>Relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated and consistently used as part of a thorough analysis of the interpretation. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is coherent. Writing is legible.</p> <p>13-15</p>	<p>Demonstrates a sound understanding of the interpretation by explaining how the approach/method of the historian has led to this interpretation being written. This must be supported by detailed reference to the extract. At the top of the level answers will refer to alternative approaches/methods. Thereby demonstrates a clear synoptic understanding of how historians engage with evidence to produce interpretations of the past.</p> <p>13-15</p>
Level 4	<p>Relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated and used to analyse the interpretation. Uses historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is clear. Writing is legible.</p> <p>10-12</p>	<p>Demonstrates some understanding of the main characteristics of the interpretation by explaining at least one approach or method used by the historian. Some understanding of the approach/method must be demonstrated and the explanation must be supported by reference to the extract. At the top of the level answers will demonstrate a wider understanding of the approach/method. Thereby demonstrates a synoptic understanding of how an historian has engaged with evidence to produce an interpretation of the past.</p> <p>10-12</p>
Level 3	<p>Relevant and largely accurate knowledge demonstrated and used to explain the interpretation. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument lacks some clarity.</p> <p>7-9</p>	<p>Demonstrates a sound understanding of the interpretation as a whole by explaining it as an interpretation. Approaches or methods may be identified but they will not be explained through reference to the extract. Thereby demonstrates a generalised synoptic understanding of how historians generate an interpretation of the past.</p> <p>7-9</p>
Level 2	<p>Some relevant knowledge demonstrated. However this knowledge is used to develop the references to historical content rather than being used to explain the interpretation. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Structure of writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level.</p> <p>4-6</p>	<p>Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the interpretation by explaining several features of it. Thereby demonstrates some synoptic understanding of the methods of the historian.</p> <p>4-6</p>

Level 1	Some knowledge demonstrated but largely irrelevant to the interpretation. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level. 1-3	Shows understanding that the extract is an interpretation and describes/summarises its main points. Thereby demonstrates a limited synoptic understanding of the methods of the historian. 1-3
Level 0	No additional knowledge is provided. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent. 0	Shows no understanding of the interpretation in the extract. A characteristic of these answers may be that they consist of little more than paraphrasing of the extract. Thereby demonstrates no synoptic understanding of the methods of the historian. 0

Generic mark scheme for part (b) questions

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2b: Historical interpretations
Level 5	<p>Relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated and consistently used to assess both the advantages and disadvantages of the approach/method. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is coherent. Writing is legible.</p> <p>13-15</p>	<p>Demonstrates reasonable understanding both of how the approach/method has contributed to our understanding and of the disadvantages/shortcoming of the approach/method. Answers at this level will involve some assessment of the approach/method. Answers at the top of the level will do this by comparing with other approaches or methods. Thereby demonstrates a synoptic understanding of how historians engage with evidence to produce an interpretation of the past.</p> <p>13-15</p>
Level 4	<p>Relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated and used to assess either the advantages or the disadvantages of the approach/method. Uses historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is clear. Writing is legible.</p> <p>10-12</p>	<p>Demonstrates reasonable understanding either of how the approach/method has contributed to our understanding or of the disadvantages/shortcomings of the approach/method. Answers at this level will involve some assessment. Better answers will do this by comparing with other approaches or methods. Thereby demonstrates a synoptic understanding of how an historian has engaged with evidence to produce an interpretation of the past.</p> <p>10-12</p>
Level 3	<p>Relevant and largely accurate knowledge demonstrated and used to explain the method/approach. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument lacks some clarity.</p> <p>7-9</p>	<p>Demonstrates good understanding of an historical approach/method. There will be some attempt to explain its advantages and/or disadvantages. Thereby demonstrates a generalised synoptic understanding of how historians generate an interpretation of the past.</p> <p>7-9</p>

<p>Level 2</p>	<p>Some relevant knowledge demonstrated. However this knowledge is used to develop the references to historical content rather than being used to explain the method/approach. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Structure of writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level.</p> <p>4-6</p>	<p>Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of some of the main features of an historical approach/method. Advantages or disadvantages of the approach/method may be asserted but will not be explained. Thereby demonstrates some synoptic understanding of the approach/methods of the historian.</p> <p>4-6</p>
<p>Level 1</p>	<p>Some knowledge demonstrated but largely irrelevant to the approach/method. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level.</p> <p>1-3</p>	<p>Describes some features of an historical approach/method. Some knowledge of the approach/method demonstrated but little understanding. Thereby demonstrates a limited synoptic understanding of the approach/methods of the historian</p> <p>1-3</p>
<p>Level 0</p>	<p>No additional knowledge is provided. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent.</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Demonstrates no understanding of the approach/method. Shows no synoptic understanding of how historians use evidence.</p> <p>0</p>

1 The debate over the impact of the Norman Conquest 1066-1216

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretations, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to support your answer.

Knowledge and Understanding

Knowledge and understanding of the main developments of the Norman Conquest from the mid eleventh to the early thirteenth centuries should be demonstrated. This knowledge should inform the interpretation offered and enable candidates to comment on it intelligently. In particular, students will need to demonstrate familiarity with the reigns of successive Norman kings. Long-term developments across the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries will need to be understood so that candidates can engage with the issues of continuity and change which the extract raises. Candidates will benefit from an understanding of the respective reputations of the Norman kings among their contemporaries and those who have studied them since.

Understanding of interpretations

The extract focuses on the key debate about the importance of long-term developments in kingship, law and politics. Questions of continuity and change also arise in assessing the impact of the Norman Conquest across several centuries – indeed, the whole period under study. The author suggests that the reign of Henry I represents a positive and productive period following the martial excesses of Rufus, one in which foundations of learning and administration were laid which allowed the kingdom to survive the ‘nineteen long winters’ of Stephen relatively intact before Henry II was able to build on these achievements. Although not specifically referred to, the development of the Exchequer, the royal courts and the royal household offer evidence with which to test the assertions in the extract; likewise candidates will be able to assess the extract’s argument that under Stephen ‘the imposing facade...disconcertingly crumbled.’ Whether Henry I was the architect of the continuity and stability which the extract argues for, stretching down to the reign of John, can be assessed critically by candidates. The explanation should be supported by clear references to the extract.

Understanding of approaches/methods

The method used here is to look for long-term patterns of stability and continuity on the one hand and of change on the other; the author is standing back and assessing the entire period under study from the perspective of Henry I’s accession in 1100. It therefore offers a magisterial overview of a long and complex period, and implicit within the argument is a sense that the character and abilities of successive kings shaped and influenced their period of rule decisively. To some extent candidates may therefore pick up on the ‘great men’ view of history being outlined here; it is also an approach which sees as central the development of administration and constitutional freedoms. The author has as an end point the signing of Magna Carta and is tracing a long period of legal governance from the reign of Edward the Confessor.

- (b) In their work on the impact of the Norman Conquest, some historians have used the approach of studying it 'from below'. Explain how this approach has contributed to our understanding of the impact of the Norman Conquest. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings?

Knowledge and understanding

Candidates will need to know and understand the main aspects of the Norman Conquest in terms both of 'great men' theories and ideas about studying history 'from below'. While it is not expected that candidates will offer detailed assessments of each ruler, they should be expected to show knowledge of relevant issues from the twelfth as well as the eleventh centuries in order to offer a breadth of understanding.

Understanding of approaches/methods

Knowledge and understanding of approaches that focus on history 'from below'. Understanding of what is meant by 'history from below', why it has been used, and the sources such an approach focuses on. Understanding of how it differs from other approaches.

Evaluation of approaches/methods

Candidates should be aware of and should explicitly evaluate the virtues and limitations of the 'history from below' arguments in relation to this period. For example, some commentators justify detailed study of monarchy by reference to the hierarchical nature of medieval society. Others assert that the nature and quantity of the surviving evidence is heavily skewed towards rulers, nobles and the Church – developments amplified by the establishment of the key organs of government under Henry I himself, as discussed in this passage.

Nevertheless the dangers of simple characterisations of medieval rulers as 'a fine knight' or as a 'beau clerk' should be explored by candidates: are we taking contemporaries such as Map at face value, and running the risk, for example, of accepting some historians' reverence for learning and documentation at the expense of other, equally valuable approaches? Are we choosing to overlook some difficult but rewarding work, some of it statistical or econometric in nature, which has shed light on medieval living standards, for example? Responses may well assess in critical terms the difficulty of gathering and interpreting reliable and meaningful evidence about peasant lives and 'ordinary people', certainly over longer periods. Likewise the difficulties 'from below' in generalising from the evidence of a particular locality or noble estate may be discussed. Successes in attempting to reconstruct popular medieval *mentalities* may be known to candidates, as might attempts to study popular rebellions in terms of the aims and aspirations of those who took part in them, not simply their leaders. Credit should be given for intelligent and critical commentary which shows engagement with such issues.

2 The debate over Britain's 17th-century crises, 1629-89

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretations, approaches and methods of this historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**

Knowledge and Understanding

Knowledge and understanding of the events leading up to the Civil War and the roles of individuals such as the king and certain MPs. The actions of the king, the queen's circle and of leaders among the MPs such as John Pym. An understanding of the distinction between MPs who took the lead in the Long Parliament and radicals who emerged later such as John Lilburne. Understanding of the difference between the descent into civil war as a process that took place within parliament and the king's circle and the raising of forces, which took place beyond the political sphere.

Knowledge and understanding of the relevant approaches to studying the seventeenth century should be demonstrated and used to support the answer, for example the reaction against long-term social and economic causes as reading too much into developments by assuming causal relationships; the reaction against the teleological approach that identifies long-term structural weaknesses in the constitution and attributes causal significance to these factors.

Understanding of interpretations

Key points – The analysis implies that there is a danger in assuming that contemporaries had the same interests as historians; that is, that they undertook analytical studies of the workings of the constitution, seeing beyond the personal to the theoretical issues. The analysis points out the distinction that should be made between what happened at Westminster – the reactions of the king to the actions of the MPs and vice versa; the interpretations that each side put on each other's actions – and what was going on in the provinces that persuaded men to take sides once the conflict was under way. The explanation of the interpretation should be supported by clear references to the extract. When it came to taking sides, this historian argues that it was the parliamentarians who were the conservatives, thus implying that it was the king who had a radical approach to solving the religious and fiscal problems faced by the Stuart government. The extract argues against Whig and Marxist approaches and states that the war was not intended or planned and could be seen as accidental and being based on misunderstandings of the other side.

Understanding of approaches/methods

This extract employs a revisionist approach. It focuses on events at Westminster, ie the workings of central government, but actively avoids making the assumptions that a Whig historian makes. That is, it does not assume that the parliamentarians were the revolutionaries or radicals simply because they challenged the power of the existing head of state; it does not assume that there are simple or general reasons for the taking of sides that can be applied to all those who sided with either the king or with parliament. It does not assume that people acted with integrity or in line with a set of principles rather than out of self-interest. Thus it denies the possibility of giving an overall explanation of civil war.

The explanation should be supported by clear references to the extract. Better answers should explain how these approaches have led to what is written in the extract, in particular the overall conclusion of the historian ie how far does the approach influence the conclusion that has been reached and the ways in which events and people are described.

The explanation could be developed by comparing this approach to other approaches, for example, the Whig approach which stresses issues of principle and a more self-conscious attack by radical MPs on a king who was trying to maintain his power; for example socio-economic approaches which identify long-term trends as causing the actions of the protagonists.

- (b) Some historians have focused on Britain's seventeenth crises as part of a wider European 'general crisis'. Explain how this has added to our understanding of the seventeenth-century crises. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings. [30]

Knowledge and understanding

Knowledge and understanding of the evidence relating to the general crisis theory as a means of explaining the events of the seventeenth century. Knowledge of some of the other European crises, eg the Frondes, as a basis for comparative analysis.

Understanding of approaches/methods

Knowledge and understanding of approaches that focus on what was similar to and different from problems elsewhere in Europe can add to our understanding of England's crises.

Explanations could include: the benefits of comparative analysis in identifying common points and exceptions. The greater understanding of the workings of government that can be gained by drawing comparisons. The benefits of comparing and contrasting the impact of factors such as population change, warfare, paying for war and religious problems.

Evaluation of approaches/methods

Evaluations could include the problem of comparing and contrasting very different systems of government, societies with different socio-economic factors impacting on them, societies affected by different kinds and degrees of warfare, and countries in which conflicts between groups took very different forms. How useful can these comparisons and/or contrasts be, given the differences between the various areas that experienced crises? Candidates will not be expected to be familiar with all the comparative examples used, but should be able to draw examples from several different locations.

3 Different Interpretations of British Imperialism c.1850-c.1950

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretations, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. [30]

Knowledge and Understanding

Knowledge and understanding of the main events and characteristics of British Imperialism. Knowledge and understanding of different interpretations of British Imperialism, in particular those that consider the ideas of formal and 'informal' empire. This knowledge and understanding should be used to explain the extract. This should include developing the points made in it, and contrasting it with other views about British Imperialism.

Understanding of interpretations

Key points – this interpretation argues that to focus just on the formal empire would be a mistake and would lead to a misunderstanding of Britain's position and power. It argues that there was also an informal empire through settling, trade, finance and cultural forms, that was just as important in spreading Britain's influence. Much of this was based on free trade – the author sees economic factors as important. Free trade also exported 'world bettering'. There is also an argument that around the middle of the century there was little enthusiasm for seizing more colonies. However, there are qualifications made to the importance of the informal empire and towards the end of the century there are factors that make the informal empire less useful. Countries begin to turn to direct control again. Candidates should demonstrate understanding of this interpretation, and use their knowledge to develop/explain it and compare with other interpretations. They should show an understanding of concepts such as formal and informal empire.

Understanding of approaches/methods

Uses case study of Latin America. Little direct reference to primary sources – this is more of an overall survey looking for patterns across time. Does consider economic factors. Does examine concepts (models) and test them. Some comparative analysis.

- (b) In their work on British imperialism some historians have focused on issues of gender. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of British imperialism. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? [30]

Knowledge and Understanding

General knowledge and understanding of the events/characteristics and context of British Imperialism demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding demonstrated of traditional approaches to gender roles and of more recent approaches and interpretations.

Evaluation and Understanding of approaches/methods

Understanding demonstrated of interpretations/approaches/methods that focus on the role of gender in British Imperialism. Understanding of how these approaches have contributed to our understanding of British Imperialism, and of their shortcomings. Explanation of why this would not have been learned from other approaches. Understanding demonstrated that there are other ways of studying British Imperialism. Explanations of shortcomings of these approaches. Comparison with, and explanation of, other approaches, and what has been learned from them.

4 The debate over British Appeasement in the 1930s

- (a) What can you learn from this extract about the interpretations, approaches and methods of the historian? Refer to the extract and your knowledge to explain your answer. **[30]**

Knowledge and Understanding

Knowledge and understanding of the main events and characteristics of appeasement including knowledge and understanding of the broad context, international events at the time, and possible British motives.

Knowledge and understanding of the debate, and differing views, about appeasement and how far it can be understood and even justified. This knowledge and understanding should be used to explain the extract. This should include developing the points made in it, and contrasting it with other views about appeasement. Candidates should also have knowledge of other background factors, and of relevant individuals involved in appeasement.

Understanding of interpretations

Key points – appeasement widely accepted at the time but as a policy it was misconceived. Those involved were well intentioned but misunderstood the situation at the time and made bad mistakes with relation to Hitler and Germany and their intentions. Reasons for believing this explained in some detail. Argues that there was a relationship between Nazi sympathisers and those who supported appeasement – although they were not the same. Appeasement arose, in part, from the attitudes of a particular social class – so there are structuralist factors at work here but the emphasis is on the actions and ideas of a group of powerful men.

Understanding of approaches/methods

Uses the study of one individual to investigate and explain appeasement. Explains it is necessary to try and understand the 'mentalities' of the time. We have to try and understand actions/beliefs that may appear odd to us today. Some use of counter-factual questions about the past.

- (b) In their work on British appeasement some historians have focused on the Hitler's actions and ideology. Explain how this has contributed to our understanding of appeasement. Has this approach any disadvantages or shortcomings? **[30]**

Knowledge and Understanding

General knowledge and understanding of the events/characteristics and context of appeasement demonstrated. Knowledge and understanding of Hitler's motives and of his foreign policy aims and actions. Knowledge and understanding demonstrated of approaches that focus on Hitler and his actions and ideology.

Evaluation and Understanding of approaches/methods

Understanding demonstrated of interpretations/approaches/methods that suggest appeasement was the result of misunderstandings of Hitler's actions, aims and intentions. Understanding that these approaches will be intentionalist in nature. Understanding of how these approaches have contributed to our understanding of appeasement, and of their shortcomings. Understanding demonstrated that there are different views about Hitler's intentions and how effective a more aggressive policy towards Germany would have been. Explanation of why this would not have been learned from other approaches. Explanations of shortcomings of these approaches. Comparison with, and explanation of, other approaches, and what has been learned from them.

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 2011