

## **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F962/01**: European and World History Period Studies  
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1095-1609

# **Mark Scheme for January 2012**

---

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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

© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

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

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

**Notes:**

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

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

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic</li> <li>• Generally accurate use of historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16 – 17</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description</li> <li>• The analysis of factors and/or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>19 – 21</b></p>
<b>Level III</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used</li> <li>• Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14 – 15</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some / uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context</li> <li>• Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events <b>OR</b> answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin.</li> <li>• Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors / issues</li> <li>• Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16 – 18</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level IV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level / accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>12 – 13</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory.</li> <li>• Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Answer may be largely descriptive / narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained <b>OR</b> answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis.</li> <li>• Limited points made about importance / links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13 – 15</b></p>
<b>Level V</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also</li> <li>• Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate / inappropriate use</li> <li>• Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9 – 11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic</li> <li>• General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation <b>OR</b> there may be a relevant but patchy description of events / developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions</li> <li>• There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11 – 12</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level VI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4 – 8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little understanding of key concepts</li> <li>• Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements</li> <li>• Limited explanation will be very brief / fragmentary</li> <li>• The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description / narratives, often brief</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6 – 10</b></p>
<b>Level VII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge</li> <li>• Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0 – 3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of key concepts or historical developments.</li> <li>• No valid explanations</li> <li>• Typically very brief and very descriptive answer</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0 – 5</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>This question seeks to elicit responses which assess the relative significance of the different reasons that people had for joining the First Crusade. There needs to be real assessment for the top bands. Candidates may discuss religious motivation in some detail in relation to both the peasantry and nobility / knights and focus in on the Crusade as an 'armed pilgrimage' and the plenary indulgence that Pope Urban II promised crusaders. Such discussion may be balanced against other motives such as those that can be inferred from the reports of Urban's sermon at Clermont: revenge for the atrocities committed against eastern Christians by the Turks; aid to Christians in the East; the chance of 'righteous' warfare; the recovery of the Holy Land (and the focus on Jerusalem that emerged as a key factor as the Crusade recruitment campaign got underway). Candidates may also suggest more worldly motives: the prospect of a land of milk and honey, an escape from the hardships of life in western Christendom (this reason may be developed and stressed), the chance to carve out reputations and lands as a result of victory and conquest. No specific answer is being looked for.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question.
2	<p>In relation to the ability of its rulers, candidates may point to the abilities of both Baldwin I and Baldwin II who did much to first establish the Kingdom of Jerusalem and then to hold onto it in the first thirty years of its existence, pointing both to their qualities of military leadership in the battles against the Fatimids and the Seljuks, the ways in which they ran the state, and conducted relations with barons and other princes of the Crusader states. Indeed candidates may point to the ability of all rulers up to and including Baldwin IV. Candidates should also refer to the ways in which Kings of Jerusalem supported and aided other crusader states at key times, especially Antioch. Such discussion needs to be balanced against other factors that help account for the survival of the crusader states. These include the relative disunity of their real and potential enemies, the occasional / limited / sporadic support from the West, the increasingly important role of the military orders, the development of defensive fortifications, the role of the Byzantine Empire in relation to Antioch, local alliances, good fortune and so on. Some candidates may point out that the Jerusalem was in the end unable to save Edessa and itself.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to ensure that they deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>In discussing reasons for the limited success of the Crusade candidates may refer to the disaster that befell Frederick Barbarossa and the disintegration of the German contingent, the parlous position in the Holy Land, the rivalry between Philip of France and Richard Coeur de Lion, the rivalries within the Christian camp at Acre over who should be King of Jerusalem, the insufficiency of the forces available for the task of retaking Jerusalem and the strengths of the opposition and Saladin in particular. Candidates may explain the 'successes' of the Third Crusade by reference to the relative military abilities of the two sides, and the leadership of Richard at Acre and in the march south.</p>	50	<p>No specific answer is sought. This question seeks to elicit responses which assess the relative significance of the different reasons the limited success of the Third Crusade. There needs to be real evaluation of reasons for the top bands.</p>
4	<p>Candidates may discuss a range of reasons including: the political situation of Italy c.1400 (many city states, rivalries etc.), the nature of individual states with their city / urban base and controlling families, guilds etc, relative wealth, the existence of classical remains, the contacts with Constantinople and the Levant (and the exodus of Greek scholars as the Ottomans advanced), the development of humanism and the revival of classical learning. For example, candidates may argue that the relative independence and wealth of city states engendered a rivalry that found expression in art and architecture, that the presence of classical remains provided stimulus for artistic development, and that the interest in learning and classical literature enabled scholars and artists to draw on classical ideas.</p>	50	<p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to assess a range of reasons typically by evaluating relative importance and/or by analyzing linkages between different reasons.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>In relation to the Church (and candidates are likely to focus on the papacy) candidates may discuss some of the following (in no particular order): patronage of Church towards humanists (like Bruni and Bembo) and artists (like Masaccio, Raphael and Michelangelo), sculptors (like Brunelleschi); influence of the Church more generally in shaping the context of Renaissance art/sculpture and writing – the importance of religious themes and scenes (candidates may refer to particular examples such as Leonardo’s ‘Last Supper’, Michelangelo’s ‘Pieta’ etc.); the role of specific popes – such as Julius II’s employment of Bramante and Raphael and Pius II who was himself a humanist scholar, or Nicholas V and Sixtus IV who created and developed the Vatican Library and the popes Leo X and Clement VII who made Rome the centre of the Renaissance. There may be some discussion of the later period where the influence of Rome gave way to Venice, although religious themes remained dominant. Such discussion needs to be set in the wider context of developments in the Renaissance to answer ‘How important?’ – the role of the nobles, princes, guilds and other patrons who commissioned and influenced the subject matter of the Renaissance, the influence of classical ideas and literature, the individual genius of particular artists and writers and so on.</p>	50	<p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to deal fully with the role of the the Church even if they wish to argue that its importance was not as significant as other factors.</p>
6	<p>Candidates may discuss the distinctiveness of developments north of the Alps such as the Protestant prejudice against religious art and the development of Christian humanism that was less inspired by the examination of Greek and Roman classics and more by a concern to apply humanist ideas in a Christian context. In relation to this they may refer to the <i>Devotio Moderna</i> and the importance placed on the true reading of scripture (albeit by using the methods of Italian scholars) and the reality of religion. There may be reference to Reuchlin, Erasmus, Colet and others. Similarly there may be reference to the distinctiveness and realism of northern artistic developments, particularly in relation to Dutch art and the concerns of northern patrons and the influence of Lutheran and Calvinist ideas. With respect to the influence of the Italian Renaissance, candidates may refer to the importance of Rome and Italy more generally as a place of pilgrimage, art and learning (with its universities) to which scholars and artists from across Europe came. They may also point to the spreading of Renaissance ideas and influences via merchants and diplomats. Candidates may also refer to the Italian influences apparent in the works of painters like Holbein and Dürer (but also point out the differences – the realism of Holbein, the ‘German strength and character’ found in Dürer’s work).</p>	50	<p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates do need to deal with the influence of the Italian Renaissance even if candidates wish to argue that developments north of the Alps were essentially distinct.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Candidates are likely to argue that pursuit of wealth was the most important motivation although this will need analyzing and supporting. Candidates may discuss the desire to break into the spice trade – pepper, cinnamon, cloves – and the trade in luxury goods (silks and jewels) both of which offered the prospect of high profits – so the search was on for a new route to the east. This search was also motivated by the growing insecurity of supply (partly as a result of Ottoman advance). This desire helps to explain Portuguese search for a route round Africa and Columbus’ attempt to find an ocean route across the Atlantic. Another aspect of the pursuit of wealth was gold – a factor in Portuguese exploration of the African coast (‘Gold Coast’) and Spanish exploration of Latin America. In addition to the pursuit of wealth candidates may discuss the search for labour (slaves) – especially for Portugal; the desire to find land to settle (Columbus’ 1493 voyage included 1200 settlers); the role of religion – to spread Christianity and find Prester John and other Christians – explorers testified to the dual motivation of religion and gold / spices; the influence of the Renaissance (and its emphasis on human endeavour); issues of individual and national prestige/rivalry; and the desire for knowledge.</p>	50	<p>No specific answer is looked for, but candidates must deal with the given factor adequately even if they wish to argue that other factors were more important.</p>
8	<p>Candidates are likely to consider both Cabral and da Gama, but may well also consider leaders of other expeditions (Diaz, Covilha etc.) to assess relative significance. In relation to Cabral, candidates are likely to consider the acquisition of Brazil (1500), whilst in relation to da Gama (voyages of 1498, 1502 and 1524) they are likely to discuss the establishment of interests along the coast of Africa and India and the establishing of sea routes. Such discussions are likely to be set in the context of other factors, not least royal patronage and the desire of kings like John II and Manuel to set up trading posts and capture the spice trade (there may be reference to sea battles (eg Diu in 1509) and seizing of various staging posts (eg Ormuz in 1515)). There may also be some discussion of the earlier establishment of control in the Azores, Cape Verde Islands and Madeira. Candidates may well argue that individuals like da Gama were the trailblazers that began the process of empire-building, rather than the empire-builders themselves.</p>	50	<p>No specific answer is being looked for. Candidates may assess the importance of the role of individuals in relation to the role of other factors. They need to come to a reasoned evaluation about importance in order to score well.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Candidates may discuss the question in terms of positive and negative consequences, short or longer term effects. They may argue, for instance, that the impact on Mexico and Peru was negative (in the short term), pointing to the destruction of native civilizations and cultures and the imposition of Spanish and Catholic ways of life. They may also point to the deliberate exploitation of these colonies in the interests of Castile (no least through the extraction of their gold and silver) and the forced labour required of native populations on the settlers' <i>encomiendas</i>. Further they may discuss the demographic impact of the arrival of Europeans with their diseases against which natives had little resistance. Candidates may balance such analysis with discussion of possible (longer term) positives. Mexico and Peru were colonized and settlers wanted to develop their economies and wealth: cash crops like sugar and cotton were developed as were various cereals; European cattle, sheep and horses were introduced and thrived. The Spanish brought with them their systems of government and administration.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for.
10	<p>Candidates may discuss both the winning of the civil war and the measures taken after its conclusion to secure Isabella's position in Castile. In relation to the Civil War candidates may refer to some of the following: securing of the Treasury at Segovia, confirmation of privileges of loyal nobles, attempts to buy support, fortification of key points, conclusion of a truce with the Moors of Granada, peace with Louis XI, the birth of a son, Ferdinand's accession to the throne of Aragon and the use of propaganda. However, they will probably see the Battle of Toro and the subsequent Treaty of Alcaçovas as key. In relation to the consolidation of rule more generally candidates may well discuss the monarchs peripatetic style of rule, measures towards the nobility (threats, pressure, action against key nobles like the Duke of Cadiz, and bribery), increasing royal control over military orders and the revival of the <i>Santa Hermandad</i>.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11	<p>Candidates may seek to test the degree of success, for instance, against the threats / problems posed by the nobility. Candidates may discuss the power of the aristocracy and the influence of powerful families like the Mendozas before Ferdinand and Isabella came to power. They may also point to the deals done with and promises made to grandees to win their support during the war of succession. They may point to the increasing influence of <i>letrados</i> in royal councils (and lessening influence of nobles), but recognize the role of the aristocracy in provincial government (as governors and viceroys). They may also point to Isabella's limited success in dealing with the land question, discussing, for example, the decision of the 1480 Toledo Cortes agreeing to the recovering of lands lost since 1474 (whilst accepting those lost before that date). There may also be discussion of the war against Granada in this context (nobles could be rewarded with lands from conquered territory). There may also be discussion of royal attempts to gain control of military orders and the noble unrest accompanying the succession crisis following the death of Isabella. Candidates may well argue that the price of royal control at the centre was acceptance of aristocratic control and influence at a provincial level and that whatever success there was the nobility remained a real or potential threat to royal authority.</p>		No specific answer is looked for
12	<p>Candidates need to assess both strengths and weaknesses. In discussing strengths and weaknesses, candidates may address some of the following areas: the Church and religion; government and administration; Castile and the other provinces; relations with the nobility; finance; the impact of the New World; the impact of foreign policy; the economy. They may argue that the pattern of strengths and weaknesses is a mixed one. The failure of the Reformation to make any headway in Spain may be considered a strength – religious unity remained strong – although the problem of the <i>moriscos</i> remained; royal government at a local level was perhaps dependent on the nobility, but worked reasonably effectively at the centre through its councils and candidates may pay tribute to the work of Gattinara, los Cobos and the bureaucracy of <i>letrados</i> – the conciliar system, despite corruption worked well enough in normal circumstances, but proved less effective at times of crisis. Many may argue that finance was an area of weakness, partly because of noble exemption from taxation, but mainly because of the demands made on Castile especially by Charles' expensive commitments outside Spain. New World bullion became more significant later in the reign, but debt was a constant feature. Many will argue that the economy was an area of weakness: heavy taxation and the failure to use New World revenues effectively distorted the economy.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>Candidates may well argue that abuses in the Catholic Church played an important role in shaping Luther's actions. In relation to the abuses in the Catholic Church, candidates may discuss his visit to Rome in 1510, the indulgences controversy and the <i>95 Theses</i>, the <i>Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation</i> (with its attack on Church corruption / abuse). Such discussion may be balanced against other influences, such as his theological studies (including the influence of Christian humanist thought) and his belief in the efficacy of faith (they may refer to the so-called 'tower experience') and its development into the doctrine of '<i>sola fide</i>', the development of the idea of <i>sola scriptura</i> in response to the debate with Eck, the idea of the priesthood of all believers, the reliance on scripture led him to question the sacraments (<i>The Babylonish Captivity of the Church</i>). Candidates may argue that Luther's ideas were developed out of his own study of theology and concern for his own salvation and then in response to the debate and pressures his ideas unleashed rather than simply as a reaction to the abuses of the Church. There may be discussion of the events of 1517 – 21 that brought Luther into open dispute with Rome (Cardinal Cajetan, Eck, Luther's pamphlets of 1520 (above) and events at Worms).</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for
14	<p>Many candidates are likely to argue a strong case in favour of the quoted factor, pointing to the role from early on of Frederick of Saxony, the difficulties facing Charles V in imposing his will without the support of the princes, the formation of the Schmalkaldic League, the reluctance of Catholic princes to take up arms against Protestant princes, and the eventual acceptance of Lutheranism in the Peace of Augsburg (<i>cuius regio, eius religio</i>). Such discussion needs to be balanced against other considerations such as: the power of Luther's ideas; their spread (including the role of the printing press and the context of anti-papal feeling); the role of the towns, peasants, Imperial Knights; the intermittent attention Charles V was able to give to the issue given the distractions of Habsburg-Valois rivalry, his absences, his desire for religious division to be settled by a Church Council; the Ottoman threat and so on.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal adequately with the role of princes even if they wish to argue that other factors were as or more significant.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>The assessment of reasons why Charles V was at war with France for much of his reign may take into account aims, outcomes and context, for example. Candidates may discuss the strategic and political situation in 1519 and Charles' aims, referring to the extent of Charles' territories, the strategic importance of Italy to the physical linkage of these territories, the history of warfare and rivalry with France. In relation to France candidates may point to the direct threat to northern Spain, the Netherlands, Germany and Charles' interests in Italy. Candidates may point to Charles' desire to recover Burgundy and personal rivalry with Francis I. Candidates may discuss developments over time using such discussion to illustrate identified reasons – such as the ups and downs of the Habsburg-Valois rivalry in the 1520s (Pavia, Madrid, Cognac, Sack of Rome, Landriano and Cambrai) and Charles strong position at the end of the decade, the events of the 1530s and 40s to Charles' triumph' in the Peace of Crèpy (1544) and the renewal of war with Henry II and the failure of the siege of Metz. Candidates may discuss the interlinking of various problems to explain the lack of resolution of the Habsburg-Valois conflict (eg linkage with the Ottoman threat and the problems with the princes and Lutherans in the Holy Roman Empire).</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for
16	<p>Success may be assessed by reference to aims, outcomes and context. Candidates may discuss Philip II's faith, relations with the papacy, and the position of the Church and royal powers over it at the start of the reign by way of context. There may be discussion of: the differences with the papacy over matters such as Church jurisdiction; the need for reform and Philip's success in promoting it; the work of the Inquisition; policy towards <i>conversos</i> and 'heretics'; policy towards <i>Moriscos</i> and the Revolt of the <i>Moriscos</i>. Candidates may argue that overall the success of Philip II's religious policies was variable by arguing, for example, that whilst Philip maintained control of the Church, relations with the papacy were uneasy; that there was some success in Church Reform and some evidence of a revival in religious fervour, but that the <i>Morisco</i> issue remained unresolved.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	<p>Candidates are likely to focus on his policies towards the Turks, France and England. In discussing aims, candidates may refer to: dealing with the Ottoman threat; the defence/sponsorship of Catholicism in France and England; security of the New World and the Netherlands. Candidates may well stress that 'achievement' in one area was hampered or rendered more problematic because of the other concerns (as well as other issues). Candidates may suggest that at best Philip had not dealt with the Turkish menace, but had contained it and secured a measure of peace by the 1580s. In reaching a judgement they may discuss the extent of the Ottoman / Corsair threat, the defeat at Djerba in 1560, the subsequent aggression of the Corsairs (even raiding Granada), the relief of Malta, the victory at Lepanto, and the armistice of 1580. Candidates may argue that Philip's chances of success were limited by the diversion of resources to other problems (such as the Netherlands) and the different interests of the Papacy and Venice that made cooperation difficult. In relation to England, candidates may refer to marriage to Mary, attempts to woo Elizabeth, growing differences, conflict over the New World and the Netherlands and the failures of his armadas. Candidates may well judge his policy here as a failure (although England was excluded from the New World). In relation to France, candidates may discuss early fears of a Guise empire, but are likely to focus on his support for the Catholic League against Henry of Navarre. They, again, may judge his policy a failure, although in the end France remained Catholic.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for
18	<p>In relation to William of Orange candidates may discuss his abilities and contribution as a figurehead, statesman and military leader in the years up to his assassination and his importance as a symbol of national resistance thereafter. They may refer to his role in the initial stages of the Revolt, his importance in Holland and Zeeland in the early 1570s, his role in the Union of Utrecht, and his role in securing foreign support. Such discussion may be set in the context of the importance of other factors, such as the impact of Spanish policy, diversions and mistakes, the significance of foreign aid (especially from England), the significance of religion and the resistance of Holland and Zeeland and so on.</p>	50	No specific answer is looked for. Candidates must deal with the given factor adequately: the focus must be on the assessment of the contribution of William of Orange, an assessment that may well involve evaluating his role against that of other factors.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

