

GCE

History A

Unit **F963/02**: Option A Modern 1815-1945

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2015

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

| Annotation | Meaning of annotation |
|------------|---|
| C | Grouping (QB)/ Similarity or Difference (QA) |
| Eval | Evaluation |
| Ju | Judgement |
| F | Formulaic/Stock comments |
| KU | Knowledge used to support analysis and evaluation |
| K | Bolted-on knowledge |
| P | Provenance |
| S | Sequencing |
| NAQ | Not answering the question |
| Nar | Narrative |
| XP | An unconvincing comparison/contrast |
| Seen/BP | Blank pages etc. |

NB. A brief summative comment is required following both questions. Use the language of the generic mark scheme to justify the level you have awarded. For specific guidance please refer to the topic specific mark scheme. Marks awarded must match the comments given.

Here are the subject specific instructions for this question paper

Candidates should answer on only one Option. They should answer questions (a) and (b) on that Option. If they answer on more than one Option then the higher mark should be awarded. Do not allow marks across more than one option. If they answer on Q(a) comparing the wrong source or sources then no more than a high L6 mark can be awarded. If less than the 5 sources on Q(b) are used then the next level down from the one awarded otherwise awarded is given, although please use professional judgement here.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

Notes related to Part A:

- (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 be at the same level for each AO

Marking Grid for Question (a)

| A0s | A01a and b | A02a |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Total for each question = 30 | <p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. | As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination. |
| Level 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p>13–14</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p>15–16</p> |
| Level 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p>11–12</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p>13–14</p> |

| A0s | A01a and b | A02a |
|----------------|---|---|
| Level 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p>9–10</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p>10–12</p> |
| Level 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and / or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p>7–8</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p>8–9</p> |
| Level 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and / or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p>5–6</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p>6–7</p> |

| A0s | A01a and b | A02a |
|----------------|---|--|
| Level 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. 3–4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. 3–5 |
| Level 7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. 0–2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. 0–2 |

Question (b) Maximum mark 70**Notes related to Part B:**

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

| AOs | AO1a and b | AO2a and b |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Total mark for the question = 70 | <p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. | <p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p> |
| Level 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p>20–22</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p>42–48</p> |
| Level 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p>17–19</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p>35–41</p> |

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| Level 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p>13–16</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p>28–34</p> |
| Level 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p>9–12</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p>21–27</p> |
| Level 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p>5–8</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p>14–20</p> |

| | | |
|----------------|--|--|
| Level 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. 3-4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. 7-13 |
| Level 7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. 0-2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. 0-6 |

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

| Question | | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|--|------|---|
| 1 | a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is the focus on workhouse conditions following the building or reorganisation consequent upon the New Poor Law of 1834. The mid 1840s saw a series of scandals and publicity over poor management, ill treatment and insufficient diet, all eagerly seized upon by the opponents of the Act, most notoriously the Andover Scandal in 1845-6 in the rural south, mentioned in Source E. The Huddersfield Scandal in 1848 was arguably greater and involved public health issues, although candidates may not know the details of this case. • The Similarities are that both sources portray a negative view of conditions, as was intended by the Act. Both imply a better past for the treatment of the poor (the steer in E refers to resistance on implementation whilst D mentions singing perhaps nostalgically about days 'gone by'). Both agree that the treatment of the poor is harsh – they are 'unsatisfied' in E and Castle is reluctant to enter the workhouse and is moved away from the area in D. • The differences lie with the clientele. In E the focus is on conditions for the really poor, infirm and sick. In D it is on the treatment of the able bodied unemployed, the real potential target of the New Poor Law. Castle in D appears well clothed, albeit a uniform; in the Report in E clothing is 'miserably deficient'. Because the focus is on the sick in E there is no mention of the work regime evident in D. They differ over the issue of overcrowding, very evident in E but apparently fine in D with the provision of a well heated room for basic recreation (singing and reminiscing) although some may spot | 30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for conditions in the new workhouses. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|--|
| | <p>that Castle is soon moved on, possibly because of overcrowding issues. Bedding seems poor in E (beds of straw on the floor) but is not referred to in D whose work is making up mattresses. Castle in D is subject to discipline (the 'regimentals' or uniform); this seems absent in the Report in E where conditions appear chaotic. Castle in D also makes no mention of woman or children (separation of the sexes?) or diet, all prominent in E, perhaps because of its purpose. E focuses on cruelty; D on strictness, work and control, with the odd saving grace (the heated room for some basic recreation) - but then he is a skilled adult male not an infirm and sick woman or child. The Report's focus in E is disease, not apparent in D. As regards management and the spending of ratepayer monies there is the implication in D that it is at the least sufficient. In E the opposite is the case. Money is wasted and management negligent and appalling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Provenance is that both are from critics writing at about the same time. Their purpose is similar – to publicise and potentially damn the new workhouse system. Both are public and published for a literate audience. However there is considerable difference. Castle in D is an able bodied, probably temporary, inmate (depression in the rural silk industry). He reacts to a system designed to deter but then encourage such men to leave and get employment. Conditions are disciplined, the work unpleasant, but there is relief and some small comfort. His reaction is to this and is not entirely negative but when moved arbitrarily out of his area he is insolent, fined and expelled. The Report in E is a local newspaper report on the | | <p>is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. There is much to compare. Do not expect coverage of all the comparative points mentioned in the indicative content. Candidates may judge both equally valid. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
| | <p>findings of an official inquiry into a breaking public scandal that had implications beyond the workhouse involving infectious and fatal disease, very much the concern of the 1840s when health issues were to the fore. The context is important as the industrial north had resisted the New Poor Law – there is the implication that this sort of state of affairs was bound to happen, especially to a system devised to deter the able bodied rather than cope with the sick and infirm. Its tone is one of shock and outrage, in contrast to the more matter of fact language of D. Candidates may be prompted by the Andover reference in E and may also know it was the Leeds Mercury, 15 years before, that had published Oastler’s famous letter on ‘Yorkshire Slavery, condemning child labour in the factories. This was a campaigning and radically inclined newspaper – candidates may note the pejorative title of the article – ‘Huddersfield Workhouse Abominations - Andover in the Shade’. Nonetheless its language in part reflects the factual tone of the report it is informing its readership of.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of judgement both are useful for workhouse conditions in different parts of the country, one industrial and urban (infectious disease) the other rural and more traditionally artisan in its industry. Castle in D is the evidence of just one man, a skilled traditional weaver. He may not be typical but it reflects the experience of the adult able bodied. The article in E, which paraphrases part of the official Inquiry, is based upon an inspection and takes a more comprehensive view of workhouse conditions, although again its typicality could be called into question. Candidates may decide that both are | | |

| Question | | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|---|------|--|
| | | useful for different types of experience, that E is better than D because of its inquisitorial and more comprehensive nature or that D is more valuable given the campaigning tone of E . No set judgement is expected. | | |
| 1 | b | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The argument that the New Poor Law succeeded in helping the poor can be found in Sources A, B and in one reading of D. Sources A and B both come from the minor, locally elected, ratepayer officials put in charge of the new system who tended to be local gentry (B is Langham Rokesby, gentleman), farmers or shopkeepers (possibly the authors of A). The steers indicate both sources are from rural areas, the South and the East Midlands. Knowledge would suggest that it was, in part, their interests that the framers of the New Poor Law had in mind when drawing it up – concerns that the poor were idle, undisciplined, the authors of their own woes, a drain on the thrifty through expensive outdoor relief. That may condition the evidence they give on the poor being more effectively helped by the new system. Both views are published by the Poor Law Commissioners perhaps eager to find evidence that the new system was working quickly in helping the poor improve their lot. The dates of both are early – 1835 and 1836, possibly too early to really tell whether the NPL was helping the poor be more responsible and hard working. Source B reports on the turnaround as the formally idle and negligent become ‘good labourers’ who, apparently, ‘express no dissatisfaction’. Thus the NPL has helped the poor in Source B by improving their moral character. Large and debilitating families, formerly thrown onto parish outdoor relief, | 70 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|---|
| | <p>are in decline, along with the bastardy rates amongst the poor. There are presumably less mouths to feed. However Source B hints that they have to be cruel to be kind – the poor now have a ‘great dread’ of the workhouse. Much of this is confirmed by Source A which implies that the poor could find work when outdoor relief stopped. It comments that those offered admittance to the new workhouse preferred to find jobs and that most stayed for only a few days. The dependency culture that had kept them poor seemed to have ended according to both sources. The evidence of Castle in D confirms the view in A and B that the workhouse was a deterrent and last resort but the inference is that treatment was in part reasonable – work, companionship, food and clothing but could, for a skilled worker, be demeaning, particularly sudden arbitrary movement. Thus the evidence of A, B and D shows that in rural areas at least the new system was helping the poor back to self-respect and independence, albeit somewhat harshly and suddenly. However their view is coloured in A and B by being from those who saw a benefit. Here D may provide subtle evidence that the system worked in part, although his ultimate fate is unknown.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternative, that the New Poor Law failed to help the poor, can be found in Sources C, D and E. These are a more varied type of source than A and B – Source C is a famous and prominent romantic poet who clearly thought the poor were being unfairly disadvantaged under the NPL and sought to publicise their plight. His is the traditional radical cry in defence of the old Hanoverian welfare state based on the right of the poor to help from the | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | <p>better off, now abrogated by the NPL. He refutes the idea that the poor were to blame by referring to the indiscriminate capitalist trade swing, the whims of foreign governments and new technological unemployment (clearly the fate of Castle in D). They are the hapless guinea pigs of 'reckless' abstract ideas – 'the scourge of the poor'- the sudden application of which far from helped. This confirms the sudden impact referred to in A and B as this too is a relatively early date, 1835-6. Yet the date of D (1837) and E (1848) show that matters did not improve for the poor. Candidates may challenge the evidence of Source C on the grounds that he was the most removed from the experience of the poor of all the sources but his evidence could be supported from own knowledge. It was the standard view of the critics. The evidence of Castle in D is the only source from an inmate and this may give it weight. He clearly resents the new type of treatment – especially the movement and discipline ('regimentals'). He implies that such treatment for the skilled, unemployed through no fault of their own, was inappropriate just as Wordsworth does in C. The Inquiry in E, despite its provenance as being reported in a campaigning newspaper, might be considered very telling evidence of how the poor were disadvantaged under the new system – the larger numbers in a sizeable industrial town like Huddersfield would suddenly erupt into a system that couldn't cope and was 'badly managed'. The conditions in the Huddersfield Workhouse exacerbated disease, subjecting the poor to even more appalling conditions that <i>may</i> have pertained less 'outside' under the old system. It is certainly</p> | | <p>sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. • It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point. • Success in helping the poor may be found in Sources A, B and one reading of D. Failure to help the poor may be found in Sources C, D and E. Grouping is open and examiners need to bear this in mind. • Judgements may be varied and could be based variously on the authors of the sources, on north/South differences or on different types of experience – rural/ industrial; able-bodied/sick and old. Candidates are not expected to include all such perspectives in their approach. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
| | <p>'official' evidence that the sick and infirm suffered unduly under the NPL. Coming on top of the Andover Scandal in 1845/6 (inmates gnawing at the bones they were to crush as part of the work regime out of sheer hunger) it led to some administrative change and more rigorous inspection. Its evidence, despite the Mercury's tone of exaggeration, could be considered reliable - that for the industrial northern poor and the sick and infirm the NPL was inappropriate and deleterious. Old Outdoor relief better helped the poor there. Even Source B, in saying that most of the poor in the south were reconciled to it, implies that some were not. Castle in D implies that outdoor relief may have helped more for the temporary unemployed (although his technological obsolescence would have ensured a more permanent job loss).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No set judgement is expected. Candidates could either argue that the system helped the poor by successfully attacking the dependency of outdoor relief and permanent pauperisation, as A and B argue or that it unnecessarily plunged, particularly the sick and infirm, into quasi prison conditions whilst ignoring both the need for doles and reasons for unemployment like the trade cycle and technology, as C, D and E do. The latter especially argues that the workhouse made matters worse on the health and cleanliness front. Much depends on the relative value accorded the evidence of the sources. Candidates may conclude that the authorship of A and B are too self-interested and that the more varied views of C, D and E are to be preferred. Others may conclude that it is a question of North and South, industrial versus rural, when it | | |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
| | came to effective help for the poor. A variety of conclusions can be expected but they must be supported. | | |

| Question | | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|--|------|--|
| 2 | a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Context for both sources is the crisis in Irish affairs in late 1881 and early 1882. Following Parnell's strategy of challenging the 2nd Land Act by court cases and obstruction, Gladstone lost patience and allowed Forster, his Irish Chief Secretary, again to pursue coercion. This led to Parnell's arrest and imprisonment in Kilmainham Gaol, Dublin, in the autumn of 1881. The so called 'Treaty' (Gladstone never labelled it as such; the Irish invariably did to demonstrate an agreement between equal sovereign states), negotiated in late April 1882 and announced on 2nd May was an escape from the impasse for both Gladstone and Parnell. Both claimed victory. The sources reflect this division in view, although both from the Irish point of view. • The Similarities are that both sources stress the strength of Parnell's position going into the Treaty, O'Connor in C stressing the failure of government coercion, Davitt in D commenting that 'English rule in 1881-82 was never so shaken'. Davitt comments that Parnell was backed solidly by a devastatingly effective Land League that had unleashed an unprecedented Land War in Ireland. They also agree, from different perspectives, that Ireland was more peaceful as a result of the Treaty. O'Connor refers to 'tranquillity', Davitt to firm 'English rule' once more. Yet for O'Connor in C there is a sense of peace as a result of victory, for Davitt in D it is force of English law and savours of defeat. • Difference outweighs the similarities. For O'Connor in C the Treaty represents a great political victory; for Davitt it represents defeat and a triumph for continued English rule in Ireland – 'a | 30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for views on the Kilmainham Treaty. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02. • |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | <p>price too great'. Both are selective in what they choose to emphasise. Thus for O'Connor in C there is no mention of the winding down of the Land League (after all he is an MP and represents the new Irish parliamentary party that Parnell had so ably moulded over the previous few years). Instead he mentions land concessions and the end of coercion symbolised by Parnell's release. But for Davitt the disbandment of the Land League looms large in his assessment. Very much his creation, it was supposed to be the means of changing the agrarian structure of Ireland. Now it was to be wound down at the point of possible triumph.</p> <p>O'Connor in C argues that the Treaty strengthened Parnell's leadership; Davitt argues that it threatened it because it disadvantaged the Irish cause and would have destroyed it if not for the Phoenix Park murders (of the new Irish Viceroy and his Chief Secretary). They disagree over the impact of the Treaty. Davitt thinks the landlords have now survived his attempted destruction of them. Yet for O'Connor the tenants had wrung further concessions out of the government on land at the expense of the landlords. Davitt considers English government to be revitalised by the Treaty but O'Connor thinks it has put them on the back foot, acknowledging error and seeing off the hated and coercive Foster (and the Lord Lieutenant, Cowper). Davitt fears the Arrears Act will take the sting out of his recruitment campaign amongst discontented tenants and pointedly doesn't mention this aspect of the Treaty. O'Connor does and makes it a key point of English concession, previously resisted by governments.</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. • There is much to compare. Do not expect coverage of all the comparative points mentioned in the indicative content. • Candidates may judge both equally valid. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As regards provenance the key is their respective positions in Ireland. Both write with some hindsight but take a very different view of its impact. Both are Irish nationalists but O'Connor is an MP and journalist, Davitt a radical land reformer and revolutionary nationalist. O'Connor's view is essentially of a Westminster political triumph. He was clearly a fan of Parnell's and had been elected in 1880 as part of Parnell's drive towards a formidable Irish political party. He was writing a biography of 'Parnell and his Movement' at the pinnacle of their power, 1887, in the full knowledge that Parnell would go on to secure a commitment to Home Rule from Gladstone in the years that followed Kilmainham. The Treaty was just another milestone in Parnell's triumphant progress and his language reflects this. He sees only victory and is selective in his evidence (Forster got rid of, Gladstone on side and apologetic, further concessions on land). Davitt comes from a very different perspective – agrarian radicalism and revolutionary nationalism. He had taken the risk of putting his Land League, which had tipped Ireland into a grave Land War and seriously threatened British rule, at the disposal of Parnell, who had become its President. As a sincere land reformer, unlike Parnell, (see the title of his book – the 'Fall of Feudalism'), he saw the Treaty as a grave betrayal. His focus is largely on the League, which the treaty agreed would be wound up. • In terms of judgement both are equally useful as evidence for Irish views as they come from different slants. Some may deem O'Connor the better evidence for the Treaty as he mentions more of the specifics. Davitt focuses on the League and the | | |

| Question | | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|---|------|---|
| | | potential it had to transform Ireland radically but whether it could was a moot point. | | |
| 2 | b | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ireland became a major headache for the 2nd Gladstone government as the agricultural depression and Parnell's Irish political party at Westminster combined to create both a Land War and obstructionism at Westminster. The focus of the question is whether Gladstone succeeded in pacifying Ireland in the Second Ministry in the face of this, either through coercion, land reform, the Kilmainham treaty or 'good government' (Source B) or failed. The sources can bear a variety of interpretations with only Davitt in Source D being unequivocal that Gladstone had outwitted his opponents and secured an 'English victory'. There are three liberal and English perspectives on this, one from Gladstone himself (Source B), two from his devoted younger colleague and first biographer, who wrote from hindsight, although taking rather different views on the question of success according to the moment written about (Sources A on 1881 and E looking back from 1885/1903). They provide mixed evidence. Two of the sources (C and D) give an Irish perspective, one that Gladstone had triumphed politically over the opposition, taking the wind out of their sails (D), the other (C) that Gladstone was now doing their bidding. Yet both imply that Ireland had been pacified, although Davitt is concerned that the opportunity for radical change has been lost. The view that Gladstone succeeded in pacifying Ireland is to be found in parts of all the Sources. The focus of Morley in Source A is the 1881 Land Act, a key factor in Gladstone's | 70 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | <p>pacification of the Land War. He regards it as one of Gladstone's 'greatest achievements'. It undermined tenant support for the Land League by conceding the 3 'F's which Morley argues tenants will see as the 'freedom charter' they long for (very liberal language). He considers the achievement all the greater given the opposition Gladstone faced from just about everybody – the implication is he did it alone against the odds. Later, in 1885, Morley looks back in Source E and reflects on comparative success – 'conspirators fled, comparative order restored, the dire emergency of 1879-82 brought to an apparent close'. Nonetheless the provenance is of a Gladstonian devotee, yet the comments are even handed and could be confirmed by own knowledge - the Land war did die down and the Land Act did, in part, begin to solve some of the agrarian problems. Gladstone in Source B, in a private letter to his Chief Secretary in Ireland, goes on, actively, to take the initiative beyond the Land Act, stressing the importance to Forster of 'good government' and interestingly, given the date, sees the need to come to terms with the Irish opposition if he is to secure pacification. There is some ambiguity here, which candidates may spot, as at one point Gladstone dismisses the opposition ('their MPs, leaders and the Land League are good only for mischief', a reference to the Land War and parliamentary obstructionism) yet at another hints at a rapprochement with them ('the question of careful prison releases...may become of importance'). The provenance is important. He has to be careful given his Chief Secretary's identification with coercion and indeed over the</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|--|
| | <p>next couple of weeks, and behind Forster's back, he secretly began the Kilmainham negotiations which led to Forster's resignation. The Treaty that resulted is seen by O'Connor in Source C as delivering 'tranquillity' to Ireland, although he thinks Parnell should be given the credit rather than Gladstone. He comments on further pacification through more land reform which he says 'Gladstone welcomed' – the clearing up of contentious rent arrears. Davitt in Source D is telling evidence from an opponent, the man behind the vexed Land War and Land League. He is of the opinion that Gladstone has pacified Ireland but for the continuance of 'English rule'. His Land League is to be disbanded and the Irish opposition outwitted and potentially divided by the 'victory' of the Kilmainham Treaty. Parnell has been defeated and candidates may also know that a parliamentary guillotine had quashed obstructionism in parliament. The Irish view is that pacification has occurred, like it (O'Connor in C) or not (Davitt in D). Thus both English liberals and the Irish leaders consider Gladstone to have succeeded in pacifying Ireland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternative view, that Gladstone failed or his success was at best mixed, can be found in parts of Sources A, B, C and E. Morley in Source A is perceptive evidence for the limitations of Gladstone's pacification given his liberal and Gladstonian credentials. He points out that Gladstone was isolated on the 1881 Land Act (the Whigs in his own party dissatisfied, the Tories totally opposed). Writing from hindsight Morley knows that assisted land purchase was the way forward to solve the land problem ('if a policy had | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point. Success in pacifying Ireland may be found in all the Sources but particularly parts of A, D and E. Failure to pacify may be found in parts of Sources A, B, C and E. Grouping is open and examiners need to bear this in mind. Judgements may be varied and could be based variously on the internal Liberal/Opponent perspective or on the Land/Political distinction. Candidates are not expected to include such perspectives in their approach and examiners will need to be open to different candidate approach. In terms of Source E, Morley, candidates may point out that he may be painting a picture of failure and |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | <p>been adopted...') but justifies a lack of progress here as being too advanced for 1881. In Source B Gladstone is also telling on the inadequacy of pacification. He admits that something was lacking. He dismisses Irish MPs and leaders as hopeless but is considering going over their heads by introducing local government reform – elected local representatives to involve the Irish in their own affairs and get them to take responsibility. Only then will government be supported by the Irish people. He may have felt the country as a whole was not ready for this, as Morley in Source A did with land purchase, so nothing could be done. This is a very liberal approach and there is more than a hint at the wider solution to peace in Ireland of Home Rule, which he would come up with 3 years later. As a confidential source at the very top of policy making it is valuable, although he has to talk in generalities to Forster who was following a different coercive policy in Ireland itself. Gladstone is all too aware of the limits of his success.</p> <p>O'Connor in Source C argues that the initial coercive policy of 1880-2 has failed but he sees the new initiative to end this, the Kilmainham Treaty, as a triumph for the Irish opposition – Parnell is now the 'master of the situation' rather than Gladstone who has lost his Chief Secretary, Forster, through outraged resignation. Knowledge and Davitt in Source D might challenge this view (see above).</p> <p>Morley in Source E is a particularly valuable source as his view of the 2nd ministry's efforts to pacify Ireland, from the vantage point of a Gladstone supporter, is pessimistic. However it is from the hindsight of later developments, especially Home Rule and land purchase. He points out that</p> | | <p>gloom as part of a gathering story leading to what he regarded as the heroic apogee of Gladstonian Liberalism, the great moment of Home Rule, just around the corner when he had arrived at 1885 in the biography of 1903. This historiographical point may be made by some candidates but candidates do not have to make this evaluative point (that it diminishes the evidence of E in relation to the question of pacification in the period 1880-85) to reach a Level 1 or 2.</p> |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
| | <p>Irish problems never go away. He considers policy ‘only half in place’ (the other half to be Home Rule?) and appears to counter his earlier optimistic evidence in Source A on land reform. Now Ireland is ‘squalid and dismal’, ‘deep in hostile intent’ and he quotes Gladstone as admitting that government there ‘had no moral force behind it’. All this would suggest a failure to pacify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may conclude that the sources suggest pacification, especially given that the Irish opposition sources (C and D) take that line. Knowledge might at least suggest that both the Land War and the parliamentary opposition was tamed, or they might argue for failure and little progress given the internal liberal evidence of B and E (Gladstone and Morley) who are all too aware of the limitations of pacification. Some may seek to distinguish between success via Land Reform (A, B and C) to pacify the countryside but a failure politically to reconcile the Irish opposition – on local government and a sense of the big issue of Home Rule pending (B and E). Others may stress his triumph over the Irish opposition as portrayed in D. No set conclusion is expected. | | |

| Question | | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|---|------|---|
| 3 | a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is that the Liberal governments, 1906-14, comprised many New Liberals, who were keen for government to play a greater role in the organisation of society and address many of the key problems of the time. • Similarities. Both align themselves with the dispossessed. In Source A, Churchill sees ‘the cause of the Liberal Party is the cause of the left-out millions’ and in Source B Lloyd George talks of redeeming ‘hundreds and thousands living in poverty’. Both agree that the dispossessed need the help of others. Source A regards ‘state organisation’ and ‘new services which have to be undertaken by the State’ as the way forward and in Source B stress is placed on ‘the duty of every class of the community’ to tackle the misery of others. Both present a vision of the State providing help for everyone. Source B is emphatic that ‘all this misery and wretchedness should be put to an end’ and Source A looks ‘forward to the universal establishment of minimum standards’. • Differences. Source B is adamant that poor people, cannot be saved by themselves’, only by others, whereas Source A regards ‘individual incentive’ as complementary to ‘state organisation’. Indeed, Churchill emphasises how ‘No man can rely entirely on the state alone or himself alone’. Source A seems to look to the long term, envisaging a time when standards can be improved beyond the minimum (‘their INCREASING improvement’), whereas Source B is focused on the immediate ending of poverty. • Provenance provides a lot of scope for comparison. The fact that the authors are of very | 30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’ (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for the vision of New Liberals. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. For this question candidates who evaluate Source A using the introduction or using the more generic idea of being a leading Liberal politician will be sufficient to achieve these levels. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or ‘stock’. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | <p>different backgrounds indicates that the relief of poverty was a vision shared by a cross section of New Liberals. Lloyd George stresses his credentials as 'a man of the people' which helps explain the emotive language he uses. Candidates may know that Churchill enjoyed a privileged background. His language is measured and designed to outline the principles he wishes to define. He is doing so within the first year of the Liberal administration when the government is at pains to demonstrate its commitment to its election pledges. By October 1906 free school meals had been introduced and candidates could refer to the terms of these measures to confirm Churchill's claim about 'minimum standards'. Lloyd George is speaking in the context of his struggle to introduce old age pensions and his speech might be regarded as a means of rallying support for this policy. The role of each man may be considered. Candidates may take the introduction of Source A at face value and see Churchill as the President of the Board of Trade in 1906. However others may point out that Churchill was, in fact, Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies and attempt to evaluate from this perspective. Candidates may also adopt the valid alternative of evaluating Churchill as a leading New Liberal and any of these approaches should be credited equally. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lloyd George was in a position to cost the expense of social reforms and had the power to fund them. In this respect some candidates might use the reference to 'this rich country' and comment on the budget which Chancellors controlled, even anticipating the Budget of 1909.</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02. • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. |

| Question | | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|----------|---|-----------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In judgement candidates might conclude that the vision of both sources was their emphasis on increased State intervention to deal with social problems even if Source B was prepared to go further than Source A in this regard. | | |
| 3 | b | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates will differ in how they group the sources. Sources A and B are the most explicit in support of the interpretation though E provides further evidence (IF USED). Sources C, D and E could be the basis of a counter argument. In Sources A and B Churchill and Lloyd George present themselves as men on a mission to improve the lot of large numbers of people. In Source A Churchill claims the Liberals side with 'the left-out millions' and Lloyd George, in Source B, with the 'hundreds and thousands living in poverty'. It would not be unreasonable for candidates to argue that such people may have voted for the Liberals in 1906. Indeed, some may regard the reforms proposed by Churchill and Lloyd George as necessary to realise the promises made in the election campaign. The commitment of both Churchill and Lloyd George to New Liberalism could be developed with reference to various measures associated with them (for example, Labour Exchanges). Churchill's determination is evident in his sense of conviction and confidence anticipating an improved society ('I look forward to the universal establishment of minimum standards'). Source B presents a similar impression of Lloyd George whose language might be described as aggressive. His determination is such that he is prepared to 'fight the battles of the class from which I have sprung' and to beat down | 70 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. Candidates who use only sources A-D may still achieve levels 1-2 if the answer is particularly well written. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|--|
| | <p>vested interests. The strength of Liberal leadership might be developed (BUT NOT NECESSARILY) by reference to Source E. This clearly suggests that working men supported the leadership of the Liberals claiming 'the closer the Labour Member sticks to the Liberal Party the better the workman is pleased' and that they 'believed in the right of the middle classes to do the work of government', not 'his own mates'. This implies deference to the Liberals, and in the period in question, by virtue of the fact that they were in power. Some may take this further and argue the source suggests a weakness on the part of the leadership of the Labour Party.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source C may be central to the counter-argument for many candidates. All those in the boat appear to be apprehensive, horrified and even fearful that they all face ruin (by capsizing), specifically as a result of the introduction of the National Insurance Bill. The four individuals represent all classes and both genders and as such suggest that there was universal concern, even opposition, to Liberal policy. Details about the Bill might be provided to explain the objections, both practical and philosophical, to the Bill. By describing Lloyd George as a 'pitiless philanthropist' it suggests Lloyd George's determination to carry the Insurance Bill is a negative factor which would undermine the position of the Liberals. Candidates may explain the political realities of the time. The Liberals lost over 100 seats in the elections of 1910 and were dependent on the Irish Nationalists. Indeed, if the Parliament elected in 1906 had run its full term the Conservatives would probably have won an | | <p>A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | <p>election in 1912 or 1913. Nonetheless, the House of Lords had been weakened with the Parliament Act of 1911, and after the election of Dec 1910, which produced a similar outcome to the one earlier in the year, arguably, the Liberals could afford to take risks with no resistance in the Lords likely and no immediate challenge at the polls. Indeed, the Bill did pass into law, in part because of the determination of Lloyd George to see it through. In that respect, the cartoon suggests that the Liberals' position was damaged by the determination of Lloyd George rather than providing an explanation for them staying in power. On the other hand, the Insurance Act of 1911 had received a similar reception but, nonetheless, did have support, and in that respect the response to the 1912 Act depicted in the cartoon may not be entirely typical of the public reaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As an alternative, candidates may argue that the Liberals stayed in power in part because of the weakness of the Conservatives and the Labour Party. Source D indicates that the Conservatives were divided over Tariff Reform. Reference is made to the issue being a problem since 1906 and candidates may expand on how important Tariff Reform was in the campaign of 1905/06. The return of 400 Liberal MPs was a clear indication of the appeal of the Liberal manifesto but it also reflected the unpopularity of the previous Tory government and its division over Tariff Reform. It divided the Tory Party then and clearly, according to Source D continued to do so thereafter. Derby claims that 'if we had settled this in 1906 we should be in a much better position now' and that the food taxers 'have persistently ignored the fact that | | <p>to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point. Candidates may present a case for determined leadership based on A, B and C and an alternative argument based on D and E. Others may discuss C as evidence that refutes the idea that determined leadership explains the dominance of the Liberal Party. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
| | <p>Lancashire hates Tariff Reform' so much so that in 1912 Derby fears a crisis: 'a split seems to me inevitable'. Whilst he was referring, in particular, to the feelings of the Lancashire Tory Party, it was the case that the party remained divided on the issue especially since Bonar Law retracted his pledge to hold a referendum on the issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source E claims MacDonald's 'friendliness to Lloyd George represents the views of the bulk of Trade Unionists' and implies that Labour was not a distinctive alternative to the Liberals. Further, it seems that British workers approved of Liberal policy as 'the closer the Labour Member sticks to the Liberal Party the better the workman is pleased'. Knowledge of the Lib-Lab Pact, agreed in 1903, might be mentioned to explain this point, as it was based on the understanding by the ILP that Liberal Party policy would benefit the working class and was, therefore, worth supporting. After 1906 there were 30 Labour MPs who, it could be argued, owed their election to the Pact, and small in number, the Labour Party had little choice but to throw in their lot with the Liberals. In similar vein, candidates might argue that the pledge of leading Liberal ministers, in Sources A and B, to support the 'left-out millions' and the 'thousands living in poverty' would have been popular with those numbered. Given that these aims were announced in prominent public speeches, which would have been widely reported, such an assumption would be reasonable. • In judgement candidates may conclude that it is indisputable that the Liberal Party was dominant, 1906-14, in so far as it enjoyed a huge majority after 1906 and, despite the setbacks of 1910, they | | |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|----------|
| | <p>were still in power in 1914. In evaluating Sources A and B as evidence that this was due to the determination of Liberal leaders candidates may regard them as of limited value as they represent the determination of two leading Liberals at the beginning of the period. However, the Source C confirms the determination of Lloyd George as late as 1912. In evaluating other sources candidates might suggest it was as much the weakness of their political opponents (Sources D and E) that explain why the Liberal stayed in power. Source E may be omitted by some candidates but credit should be given appropriately for the use of Source D to argue the case for weakness of political opponents.</p> | | |

| Question | | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|--|------|--|
| 4 | a | <p>The Gold Standard in which the issuing of paper currency was regulated by the gold reserves held by the Bank of England was seen in the nineteenth century as a vital part of the self-regulating nature of the capitalist system. It prevented inflation and gave the world confidence in sterling as a world currency which brought in huge returns in terms of financial services. After 1870 this tertiary sector was more important than actual manufacturing exports. It was also a symbol of British power and prestige. It was suspended during the First World War and restored in 1925 until it was suspended again in 1931 after considerable efforts to maintain it.</p> <p>Content. Differences: Source C sees it essential to trade and to Britain's international position, Source D sees it as having brought England to destruction. C sees it not as a rash step, but the implication in D is that it was rash because it brought bad effects. The advantages in C – competing in world trade on equal terms, securing raw materials and food at low prices, are not echoed in D which sees it as a very grim and bad move using extreme vocabulary (possibly ironically). The similarity is that both accept that it had been respected – Schuster is speaking for the banking community and the fact that Churchill brought it to cabinet shows that this is a respected opinion. Churchill in D acknowledges his support for orthodox finance and C indeed is the justification for this orthodoxy.</p> <p>Provenance: Source C is from a leading banker looking back to the Victorian heyday and advocating a return to 'normal' financial and economic policy : he is making a case at a time when Churchill had returned to Gold and was receiving some criticism. It is essentially a defence of policy. D is from a different period and following the Wall Street Crash and depression which was blamed partly on incorrect financial policy, so is not attempting to defend</p> | 30 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for attitudes of Churchill's policy to the Gold Standard If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|---|
| | <p>policy. Unlike Schuster in C he has no financial responsibility so can afford to take a detached view of his past errors and mock himself. The key difference is obviously when the two sources were produced and the situations of the authors.</p> <p>In terms of value – both offer explanations for attitudes to the Gold Standard, B explaining why it was thought by influential financial opinion to be a good thing and exonerating Churchill’s decision. D does refer to the reason for it – it was so respected – and is valuable for seeing the consequences of the decision and the change in attitudes to orthodox finance. The cheers and support for Churchill’s self-deprecating reflection shows the change in attitude by the mid-1930s. Both might be seen as typical of ‘establishment’ attitudes, though Source C might be more typical given the over-statement in D and the context – parliament rather than high financial circles.</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <p>The first section in the indicative content column is to offer some guidance to the background. Candidates are not expected to include this.</p> |
| 4 | <p>b</p> <p>Sources A, B and C would support the view that Churchill’s period in office as Chancellor boosted his reputation. D and E, with the benefit of hindsight suggest the opposite, though D is an example of Churchill managing to be cheered even when admitting failure and misjudgement. Amery with even more hindsight is more critical and shows that in the longer term Churchill’s reputation suffered even suggesting that the election result of 1945 was influenced by his period as Chancellor. A shows a different aspect of his work to B and C, but is related to his own claim in D to financial orthodoxy. He is here protecting the taxpayer cat from the over spending ministerial dogs by holding back public spending. As this is from a popular newspaper and as the cartoon is so obviously in favour of Churchill, this would support the view that his reputation was enhanced. In terms of context, the desire to keep down living costs in the mid-1920s was</p> | 70 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|--|
| | <p>marked in a time of calls for return to 'normalcy'. Concerns about free trade had helped boost Labour's popularity and the Conservatives feared the type of inflation seen in Germany. Some might know that Churchill's reduction in the military budget did little for his longer-term reputation when he criticised governments for following policies which he had instigated. B and C both offer evidence for Churchill's responsibility in following what was seen as majority opinion about the Gold Standard. He was humble in not passing himself off as an expert (B) but following the type of expert opinion seen in the Committees and Conferences referred to in B and in the expert testimony of a leading banker (C) The reality of financial services bringing in more than manufacturers was true and is present in both Sources. However, the alternative – that it raised export prices for vital commodities like coal and had negative effects, put forward by critics like Keynes is not considered. The view of Sir Frank Schuster (C) that it is not merely for banking and financial interests might be challenged and the nature of the Source is revealing – a meeting of shareholders who would benefit from additional income from financial services. This is not a dispassionate economic analysis and it says something about Churchill's credulity in financial matters that it was presented as evidence to cabinet without much consideration of its provenance. Churchill is anxious to make a case for policy urged by experts on a relatively ignorant minister so 'Reality' is referred to, but it is a rather restricted reality which does not look at costs for manufacturing exports. The relationship with the USA is passed easily over, but 1929 was to reveal its limitations. However, hindsight is a fine thing, and the alternative views outline its benefit. D was thought noteworthy enough to be reported back home by a Canadian politician. Here was a major political figure of the 1920s openly admitting to terrible mistakes and</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|--|
| | <p>referring to a policy he had once advocated in extreme terms and mocking his own ignorance and outdated views. Surely this had a major effect on his national and international reputation. However, laughter and cheers indicate that, in a way, it did not; though the atmosphere in parliament where Churchill was a popular and entertaining speaker may not be typical of the nation as a whole, and E offers a sterner judgement. The return to gold did have a deflationary effect and did favour some sectors of the economy above others. In an attempt to maintain the value of the Pound considerable damage was done both economically and politically in 1931. The raft of criticism offered by a Conservative politician however might seem to be somewhat exaggerated. The reference to drawn out industrial conflict refers to the General Strike, but though the return to gold may have been a contributory factor, the conflict went deeper and had earlier causes. The claim that Churchill's policies in the 1920s led to a conviction among the working class that socialism alone could cure unemployment seems exaggerated. Unemployment was a result of international causes and what was more an issue was the measures taken to alleviate unemployment than concerns about financial policy in the 1920s. The view that Churchill's policies were the 'main reason' for the defeat of 1945 is tendentious and may be trying to divert from the general concerns about the Conservative Party as opposed to its charismatic leader.</p> | | <p>assertions made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. • If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. • It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point. |

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

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 2015

