

**GCE**

**History A**

**Unit F964/01:** European and World History Enquiries.  
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555

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

| <b>Annotation</b> | <b>Meaning of annotation</b>  |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| C                 | Grouping                      |
| Eval              | Evaluation                    |
| S                 | Sequencing                    |
| Ju                | Judgement                     |
| KU                | Relevant contextual knowledge |
| P                 | Provenance used               |

**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 fewer 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"> <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> | As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.   |
| <b>Level 1</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15-16</b></p> |
| <b>Level 2</b>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>  |

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

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

**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"> <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>           | <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>  |
| <b>Level 1</b>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources.</li> <li>• Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>20-22</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of <b>all</b> the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>42-48</b></p>                             |
| <b>Level 2</b>                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context.</li> <li>• Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>17-19</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped analysis and use of <b>most</b> of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>35-41</b></p> |

|                |  |  |
|----------------|--|--|
| <b>Level 3</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-16</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28-34</b></p> |
| <b>Level 4</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-12</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-27</b></p>  |
| <b>Level 5</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-20</b></p>   |

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

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

| Question |   | Answer/Indicative content   | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|---|---|------|---|
| 1        | a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Context</b> is that the People's Crusade was an immediate response to the Papal sermon at Clermont and largely an unofficial one. The members were often untrained in military skills. There were questions asked about Peter, one of the leaders. Some felt he was a genuine holy man but others were less convinced of his sanctity.</li> <li>• <b>Similarities</b> are that they agree Peter was respected, <i>held in great respect</i> in <b>B</b> and <i>inspired every heart</i> in <b>E</b>. They agree that he led a large force, <i>significant</i> in <b>B</b> and <i>outnumbering the sands of the seashore</i> in <b>E</b>. They also agree that he arrived in Constantinople before the other crusaders. Both suggest he did not have much control over those he led and both are critical of him, <b>E</b> suggests he ignored good advice while <b>B</b>, more directly, accuses him of hypocrisy.</li> <li>• <b>Differences</b> in content can be identified. <b>Source B</b> suggests that Peter won his reputation for holiness on false grounds and was careful to cultivate this reputation. But <b>Source E</b> is more supportive and when he is criticised it is for a different reason, his refusal to take note of good advice from the Emperor. <b>Source B</b> indicates that his army lingered in Constantinople and became destructive, while <b>Source E</b> suggests he moved on more rapidly. <b>Source E</b> claims he heard a holy voice but <b>Source B</b> has no reference to any such sign of divine favour.</li> <li>• <b>Provenance</b> indicates different viewpoints. Robert the Monk probably knew Peter and was unimpressed with him as a leader and as a hermit. He disliked the random nature of the People's</li> </ul> | 30   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The focus must be comparative.</b> Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is good reason for not doing.</li> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• The comparison must be for the <b>key Issue</b> – as evidence for <b>Peter the Hermit</b>. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded.</li> <li>• The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• <b>Provenance</b> 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'.</li> <li>• <b>Stand-alone knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use <b>context</b> to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul> |

| Question |   | Answer/Indicative content   | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|---|---|------|--|
|          |   | <p>Crusade. Anna Comnena, who was equally writing from a viewpoint of direct knowledge, might be expected to be hostile as Peter's forces were not welcome in Constantinople and were seen as a threat, but she is surprisingly positive about Peter as divinely inspired. His worst fault is to ignore good advice from her father. The atrocities committed by the crusaders are blamed on Normans who joined him.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Judgement – Source E</b> is likely to be seen as more reliable, since Anna was eye-witness to some of the events (or at least had good access to those who were present) and her account is much more balanced than that of Robert the Monk. Robert's remarks about Peter certainly are critical but he was not present for any of the events covered by the sources.</li> </ul>   |      | <p>below for A02.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Judgements</b>, 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. <b>Judgement on the topic</b> 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.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</li> </ul>   |
| 1        | b | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sources provide a variety of views as to whether the Crusaders were well-organised or not. <b>The view that they were well-organised can be seen in parts of Sources A, B and E and more fully in Source D.</b> In <b>A</b> plans were made and the attacks on the Jews were co-ordinated to an extent. The troops were organised into battalions and there were princes among them, men used to leadership. In <b>B</b> Peter led a large force and got to Constantinople in good time. In <b>E</b> Peter led a force of warriors, which included counts, men of property and military experience. Source <b>D</b> shows the Crusaders as well-organised most clearly as they revealed strength and initiative in attacking and defeating the Hungarians. The forces included archers and cavalry, along with the usual foot-soldiers. A case be made that even in <b>Source E</b> when the Norman soldiers broke away and attacked Nicaea, they were organised in their</li> </ul> | 70   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is to <b>assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation</b>. The <b>focus must be on the sources</b>, 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.</li> <li>• A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but <b>no set conclusion is expected</b>. 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.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is <b>good reason</b> for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in</li> </ul> |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|--|------|---|
|          | <p>tactics. The sources all benefit from being written by chroniclers who were present at some of the events or relying on largely eye-witness accounts. But candidates could argue that only <b>Source D</b> is wholly suggestive that the Crusaders were well-organised. Moreover, even in <b>Source D</b>, they were attacking Hungarians who were fellow Christians as <b>Source C</b> makes clear, so if they were well-organised, they appear somewhat misguided. Also Albert of Aachen was not consistent in his argument that they were an efficient fighting force as elsewhere he describes them as ruffians.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The view that the Crusaders were not well-organised is found in Sources A, B, C and E.</b> The ‘Anonymous of Mainz’ in <b>Source A</b> shows them as an out of control mob venting their anti-semitism on the hapless Jews of Germany. In addition they extorted money and were destructive. The attacks on Jews are fully supported by other Jewish chronicles such as Solomon bar Samson. Clearly Jewish sources are partial in their attitude but the degree of support they give is too great to be disregarded. The destructive tendencies are borne out in <b>Source B</b> where the Crusaders descended again into riotous and destructive behaviour, even destroying Christian churches in Constantinople. Robert specifically lays this indiscipline down to inadequate leadership. This theme is further developed in <b>Source C</b>, where, again, Christian targets were attacked and various kinds of mob activity took place. This is picked up in <b>Source E</b> with references to the horrible cruelty of the Norman detachments at Nicaea. Most of the writers of chronicles about the Crusades were dismissive of the People’s Crusade. They had the</li> </ul> |      | <p>at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bolt-on knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> 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 <b>unbalanced</b>. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</li> <li>• It follows that <b>knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source</b> (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01.</li> <li>• <b>Evaluation</b> 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the <b>sources need to be grouped</b> 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. <b>Check that a grouping makes sense</b> – 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.</li> <li>• <b>A judgement based on the sources</b> 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 <b>or on</b></li> </ul> |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content  | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|--|------|--|
|          | <p>hindsight knowledge that it was a failure and knew that experienced leadership and military experience were necessary for success. They did not want to be associated with such poor examples of Christian zeal and the crusading ideal, when they were writing partly to justify the Crusades. If Crusaders behaved as badly as their enemies it did not reflect well on the movement. Hence their criticisms. Peter is depicted as a hypocrite. Innocent Jews and Hungarians are viciously treated. It is implied that the Crusaders were vainglorious. Indeed, their main support comes unexpectedly from the court at Constantinople, but Anna Comnena had a different agenda. She was overall more concerned for her father's reputation and shows this in her attitude to Peter's disregard for Alexius' advice. But otherwise she was more ready than the Western authors to recognise some good and even divine favour in Peter. But she is the exception.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In terms of <b>provenance</b>, <b>sources B and D</b> are from writers who depended on others for their accounts. This is also true of <b>Source C</b>, but Guibert of Nogent's reputation as a writer lends his account credibility. <b>Source A</b> by the Jewish 'Anonymous of Mainz' is fairly graphic, but other contemporary sources suggest that his observations have validity even if they may be somewhat exaggerated by an understandable hostility to those who slaughtered members of his faith. Anna Comnena, in <b>Source E</b>, was a girl at the time of the People's Crusade (aged 11 or 13 depending on the source) but she was an eye witness and had access to many at the court who would have seen or met with Peter. Her balanced opinion of Peter is less hostile than might have</li> </ul> |      | <p><b>the topic rather than the sources.</b> 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be impressed by <b>cross reference</b> 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 <b>do not apply inflexibly</b>.</li> <li>If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the <b>sources to illustrate</b> 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 <b>referencing</b>.</li> <li>It is <b>not</b> 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.</li> <li>Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <b>Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded</b> – 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.</li> </ul> |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content   | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|------|----------|
|          | <p>been expected. All the sources have the benefit of hindsight. <b>Sources A, B and C</b> were all written very close to the events described and this may add to their validity. <b>Sources D and E</b> were written later but none of the five were written outside the lifetimes of some of those who were directly involved in events.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of a <b>judgement</b>, the balance of the argument seems to lie with the view that the People's Crusade was poorly organised, premature and led to the deaths of most of the participants, although not Peter the Hermit. Candidates could draw a contrast with the outcome of the First Crusade. The fall of Jerusalem showed a lack of organisation in that the leaders failed to prevent atrocities, but chroniclers were less critical, partly because the Crusade had succeeded in its aim and partly because most of those slaughtered were not Christians.</li> <li>• Candidates can use the Sources flexibly as most of them offer opportunities to be used for both sides of the argument. Consequently, no specific judgment is expected, but any conclusion should be well supported by reference to the sources.</li> </ul> |      |          |

| Question |   | Answer/Indicative content  | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|---|--|------|--|
| 2        | a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content. Both are written in October 1529 with the purpose of recording what happened at the Marburg Colloquy, the authors are the leading participants and each expresses his personal view of events to a supporter. <b>Source D</b> states that the Swiss radical Zwingli's side won the 'battle of words', and in <b>Source E</b> Luther refers to this claim by Zwingli, which has stirred his anger. Both claim that the other made concessions – Zwingli claiming that Luther conceded on the symbolism of the body of Christ in the Communion service and Luther that Zwingli took back his teaching on 'baptism, the sacraments, scripture and the rest'.</li> <li>Both use angry and emotive <b>language</b> in regard to the other. Zwingli uses sarcasm, describing Luther as 'that fine fellow', and calls his ideas 'ludicrous', while Luther refers to Zwingli's teaching as 'pestiferous'. Zwingli's view is that Luther's ideas have 'countless inconsistencies which he bleats out like a babbling brook' and Luther in return calls his opponents, Zwingli and Carlstadt, 'liars, the very incarnation of deceit and hypocrisy'. Luther is trying to smear Zwingli by linking him to Carlstadt.</li> <li><b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm inconsistencies such as 'Christ is everywhere' and 'the flesh has no spiritual benefit'. Luther believed in consubstantiation and a real presence of Christ while Zwingli saw the Communion service as merely commemorative and symbolic. However, there is unlikely to be explanation of these theological ideas. Luther's earlier connection with Carlstadt might be used to explain Luther's angry reference to his words and deeds, i.e. in taking Wittenberg in too radical a direction during Luther's absence in 1521-22.</li> </ul> | 30   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The focus must be comparative.</b> Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below.</li> <li><b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is good reason for not doing.</li> <li>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)</li> <li>The comparison must be for the <b>key Issue</b> – as evidence for <b>what happened at the Marburg Colloquy in 1529</b>.</li> <li>If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded.</li> <li>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer.</li> <li>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.</li> <li><b>Provenance</b> 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'.</li> <li><b>Stand-alone knowledge</b> is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use <b>context</b> to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse.</li> <li>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.</li> <li><b>Judgements</b>, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at</li> </ul> |

| Question |   | Answer/Indicative content  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|---|--|------|---|
|          |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sources are also <b>different</b>. In <b>Source D</b> Zwingli states that his supporters had won the argument and refuted Luther ‘so successfully that now Philip of Hesse agrees with us’, whereas in <b>Source E</b> Luther refers to this statement as ‘lying, deceit and hypocrisy’ and it was well known that Luther aimed for princely support and held more conservative views than Zwingli, e.g. on iconoclasm. While Zwingli states in <b>Source D</b> that his party refuted Luther, in <b>Source E</b> Luther says ‘we conceded nothing’. Luther’s comment that Zwingli tried to seem in harmony with his party does not ring true in the light of Zwingli’s comments about fighting a battle.</li> <li>It might be <b>known</b> that Zwingli became an army chaplain, so his <b>style</b> of writing is true to character and Luther commented on Zwingli’s death in the Second War of Kappel two years later as God’s judgement for wielding a sword. It might be known that the Colloquy had been called by Philip of Hesse to establish a united front against imminent Catholic attack. This explains Luther’s immediate response in his first letters on the Marburg Colloquy, which stressed agreement and harmony. Therefore <b>Source E</b> is Luther’s later reaction provoked by Zwingli’s inflammatory comments. Its tone is <b>typical</b> of the abuse Luther adopted towards opponents, but his inconsistency on events at Marburg lessens the value of <b>Source E</b> in comparison to the more immediate reaction in <b>Source D</b>.</li> </ul> |      | <p>A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. <b>Judgement on the topic</b> 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</li> </ul>   |
| 2        | b | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped according to their view. <b>Source A</b> might be used to <b>support</b> the interpretation that Luther provoked a quarrel in <b>Source B</b> with the radical reformer Thomas Müntzer. <b>Source D</b> might be linked to <b>Source E</b> to <b>oppose</b> the interpretation, that the quarrel over the Marburg</li> </ul>   | 70   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The question is to <b>assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation</b>. The <b>focus must be on the sources</b>, 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</li> </ul> |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|--|------|---|
|          | <p>Colloquy was provoked by Zwingli and Luther's opponents. <b>Sources C and E</b> might be seen to have a dual use – a provoked response likely to incite further quarrels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> is useful for <b>supporting</b> the interpretation when cross-referenced with <b>Source B</b>. <b>Source A</b> records Luther's condemnation of radical reformer Thomas Müntzer and the radicals of Allstedt for their iconoclasm and attacks on the scriptures. He urges the princes to take action against them, if they should 'draw the sword' to 'wipe out the ungodly'. The <b>context</b> of July 1524 is before the start of the Peasants' War, which began that summer much further south near the Swiss border. However, the Source has some balance, as Luther advises the princes to leave the Allstedters alone unless they carry out their plans to 'wipe out the ungodly' and merely 'be alert'. Therefore the title of <b>Source B</b>, Müntzer's pamphlet, 'A Highly Provoked Vindication . . .' might be evaluated as highly exaggerated as his views were already extreme even without provocation. The <b>provenance</b> of both sources might be evaluated – their emotive <b>tone</b> as typical of their authors' reactions to opponents. Luther's phrases about the radicals, such as they 'rave' about the spirit, 'revile' the Bible, and will have to 'bathe in blood' show his vehement opposition to their distortion of scriptural teaching. In a similar way, Müntzer uses terms later included in the 12 Articles of Memmingen, regarding 'fish', 'birds' and 'grass', and refers to the birds 'gathering to devour their (the rulers') carcasses' soon to be seen in the Peasants' War.</li> <li>• Müntzer's attitude to Luther is coloured by his view that Luther was a political and religious conservative who saw himself as 'the Pope of Wittenberg' and sought princely favour - hence his terms of ridicule: 'Dr. Liar',</li> </ul> |      | <p>description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but <b>no set conclusion is expected</b>. 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.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is <b>good reason</b> for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</li> <li>• <b>Bolt-on knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> 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 <b>unbalanced</b>. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</li> <li>• It follows that <b>knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source</b> (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01.</li> <li>• <b>Evaluation</b> 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the <b>sources need to be grouped</b> 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.</li> </ul> |

| Question | Answer/Indicative content   | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|---|------|--|
|          | <p>'Dr. Pussyfoot', 'Dr. Easychair'. Therefore, the extent of Luther's provocation might be tempered by the fact that the two men's views were poles apart and <b>Source B</b> is therefore limited and hyperbolic. This group of sources has the limitation of being in the public domain, but <b>Source B</b> is more obviously invective and propaganda than <b>Source A</b> despite 'bathe in blood' in <b>Source A</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source D</b> might be linked to <b>Source E</b>, with cross-references to <b>C</b> and <b>B</b> to <b>oppose</b> the interpretation, that the quarrel over the Marburg Colloquy was provoked by Zwingli and the radicals. Zwingli boasted that he and his supporters, including Carlstadt, had won the argument and forced Luther to concede, thus provoking Luther's angry reaction in <b>Source E</b>. As the introduction to <b>Source E</b> states, Luther had written letters to his wife and supporters shortly after the Colloquy, implying a more positive and harmonious outcome.</li> <li>• <b>Knowledge</b> of the purpose of the Colloquy might be used to extend the sources. Called by Philip of Hesse, its purpose was to resolve existing differences between the leading reformers so that a united front might strengthen the Protestant cause in the face of imminent Catholic enforcement of the Edict of Worms. This might explain Luther's earlier emphasis on harmony, but might also confirm the inconsistency Zwingli mentions in <b>Source D</b>.</li> <li>• It may be that some candidates argue that Zwingli was not a radical, perhaps citing the fact that there was agreement on 14 of the 15 Marburg Articles. If that argument is convincingly made, then credit should be</li> </ul> |      | <p><b>Check that a grouping makes sense</b> – 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A judgement based on the sources</b> 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 <b>or on the topic rather than the sources</b>. 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.</li> <li>• Be impressed by <b>cross reference</b> 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 <b>do not apply inflexibly</b>.</li> <li>• If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the <b>sources to illustrate</b> 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 <b>referencing</b>.</li> <li>• It is <b>not</b> 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.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <b>Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded</b> – do <b>not</b> 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</li> </ul> |

| Question |  | Answer/Indicative content   | Mark | Guidance                               |
|----------|--|---|------|--|
|          |  | <p>given.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Provenance</b> might be developed to explain Luther's more conservative views on the Communion, the sacraments and baptism mentioned in <b>Sources D</b> and <b>E</b>. In contrast, it might be known that Zwingli and Carlstadt encouraged iconoclasm whereas Luther accepted pictures in his Bible and on church walls in <b>Source C</b>. These conservative views might count among 'those ludicrous ideas of his' stated by Zwingli in <b>Source D</b>. This point might be linked to Müntzer's description of Luther in <b>Source B</b> as 'the Pope of Wittenberg' or 'Dr. Easychair'. Thus the radicals felt Luther was inconsistent in his views on Communion and retained support for some Catholic practices. <b>Sources D</b> and <b>E</b> are both private letters with a high level of reliability and utility but <b>Sources B</b> and <b>C</b> are pamphlets designed to rally support, so are less reliable as evidence.</li> <li>• <b>Sources A, B and C</b> might be linked to oppose the interpretation by explaining how the radicals' violent and rebellious activities provoked quarrels with the socially and politically conservative Luther. Luther's support for the princes is apparent in <b>Sources A</b> and <b>C</b>. However, he advises them to leave the Allstedters alone as long as they are peaceful. Yet Müntzer, in <b>Source B</b>, threatens to cast down the rulers from their seats and murder them, extending the quarrel. <b>Source C</b> is evidence of the Zwickau prophets inciting violent destruction of images, 'making the mob wild and rebellious' provoking Luther to respond very calmly and cautiously in suggesting the value of images for congregations. It is clear from <b>Source C</b> that Luther wishes to ally with the princes and enlist their help in</li> </ul> |      | an argument or refer later to a point. |

| Question |  | Answer/Indicative content  | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|--|------|----------|
|          |  | <p>religious reform so he is bound to distance himself from any taint of rebellion against them. <b>Contextual knowledge</b> of these events and of the Peasants' War is likely to be used to develop these points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, in evaluation of the interpretation, it might be concluded that both sides provoked each other, and that the quarrels related not only to religious teachings and beliefs, but also to social and political differences which were always destined to produce quarrels.</li> <li>• Both groups of Sources have limitations of reliability and use in their relative value as evidence. Consequently, no specific judgment is expected, but any conclusion should be well supported by reference to the sources.</li> </ul> |      |          |

**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 2015

