

**GCE**

**History B**

Unit **F985**: Historical Controversies

Advanced 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

## Generic mark scheme for part (a) questions

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

	<b>AO1: Knowledge and understanding</b>	<b>AO2b: Historical interpretations</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Some relevant knowledge demonstrated. However this knowledge is used to develop the references to historical content rather than being used to explain the interpretation. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Structure of writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level. <b>4 – 6</b>	Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the interpretation by explaining several features of it. Thereby demonstrates some synoptic understanding of the methods of the historian. <b>4 – 6</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	Some knowledge demonstrated but largely irrelevant to the interpretation. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level. <b>1 – 3</b>	Shows understanding that the extract is an interpretation and describes / summarises its main points. Thereby demonstrates a limited synoptic understanding of the methods of the historian. <b>1 – 3</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	No additional knowledge is provided. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent. <b>0</b>	Shows no understanding of the interpretation in the extract. A characteristic of these answers may be that they consist of little more than paraphrasing of the extract. Thereby demonstrates no synoptic understanding of the methods of the historian. <b>0</b>

## Generic mark scheme for part (b) questions

	<b>AO1 Knowledge and understanding</b>	<b>AO2b: Historical interpretations</b>
<b>Level 5</b>	<p>Relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated and consistently used to assess both the advantages and disadvantages of the approach / method. Uses appropriate historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is coherent. Writing is legible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13 – 15</b></p>	<p>Demonstrates reasonable understanding both of how the approach / method has contributed to our understanding and of the disadvantages / shortcoming of the approach / method. Answers at this level will involve some assessment of the approach / method. Answers at the top of the level will do this by comparing with other approaches or methods. Thereby demonstrates a synoptic understanding of how historians engage with evidence to produce an interpretation of the past.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13 – 15</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated and used to assess either the advantages or the disadvantages of the approach / method. Uses historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument is clear. Writing is legible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10 – 12</b></p>	<p>Demonstrates reasonable understanding either of how the approach / method has contributed to our understanding or of the disadvantages / shortcomings of the approach / method. Answers at this level will involve some assessment. Better answers will do this by comparing with other approaches or methods. Thereby demonstrates a synoptic understanding of how an historian has engaged with evidence to produce an interpretation of the past.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10 – 12</b></p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Relevant and largely accurate knowledge demonstrated and used to explain the method / approach. Uses a limited range of historical terminology accurately. Structure of argument lacks some clarity.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7 – 9</b></p>	<p>Demonstrates good understanding of an historical approach / method. There will be some attempt to explain its advantages and / or disadvantages. Thereby demonstrates a generalised synoptic understanding of how historians generate an interpretation of the past.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7 – 9</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p>Some relevant knowledge demonstrated. However this knowledge is used to develop the references to historical content rather than being used to explain the method / approach. Uses a limited range of historical terminology with some accuracy. Structure of writing contains some weaknesses at paragraph and sentence level.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4 – 6</b></p>	<p>Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of some of the main features of an historical approach / method. Advantages or disadvantages of the approach / method may be asserted but will not be explained. Thereby demonstrates some synoptic understanding of the approach / methods of the historian.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4 – 6</b></p>

	<b>AO1 Knowledge and understanding</b>	<b>AO2b: Historical interpretations</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	Some knowledge demonstrated but largely irrelevant to the approach / method. Use of historical terminology is insecure. Structure of writing is weak, with poor paragraphing and inaccuracy at sentence level.  <b>1 – 3</b>	Describes some features of an historical approach / method. Some knowledge of the approach / method demonstrated but little understanding. Thereby demonstrates a limited synoptic understanding of the approach / methods of the historian  <b>1 – 3</b>
<b>Level 0</b>	No additional knowledge is provided. Does not use appropriate historical terminology. Structure is incoherent.  <b>0</b>	Demonstrates no understanding of the approach / method. Shows no synoptic understanding of how historians use evidence.  <b>0</b>

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

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	a	<p><b>Knowledge and Understanding</b></p> <p>Knowledge and understanding of the main events of the Norman Conquest and of the period immediately preceding it should be demonstrated. This knowledge should inform the interpretation offered and enable candidates to comment on it in an informed way. Candidates will need to demonstrate a sound overview of the entire period given the willingness of the author to adopt a 'bird's eye view' of 1042-1216. Candidates will need to understand feudalism and its impact on Britain, and to know about the changing frontiers of the Conquest regarding Wales, Scotland and Ireland. Candidates will need to understand the consequences for Angevin and Plantagenet kingship of the events outlined in the extract. This should include developing the points in the extract and contrasting them with other views.</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b></p> <p>This extract compares the position c.1042 when political structures and identities were hard to discern with that at the end when distinctive units had emerged. There were also, however, substantial elements of continuity with cross-Channel interests outlined in direct fashion, making a case for unity of an Angevin Empire. England was run by foreigners, but its particular wealth and importance meant that it was never subsumed into the Empire of which it was part. However, much of England was prey to imports such as feudalism and the strength of local practices and customs meant that kings across the whole period could never exercise unbridled power.</p>		
		<p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>The approach adopted here is 'broad brush'. An overview is taken of one hundred and fifty years of history, covering much of western Europe as well as Britain. England is approached as part of a continental, Angevin Empire. However, the approach gives full credit to 'particular</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		characteristics' and 'native institutions' which gave England its character and which meant that its central place within a larger structure could not be overlooked or taken for granted by any one of a number of kings from Edward the Confessor to John. The approach is partly 'top down', examining kingship and feudalism and their importance across centuries. Continuity and change are fundamental to the approach, with an emphasis on continuity.		
1	b	<p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Candidates will need to know and understand the main aspects of the Norman Conquest in the form of, for example, political and monarchical developments. These may be short-term to include, for example, the succession issues surrounding William Rufus and Henry I and long-term, referring perhaps to the introduction of a Norman ruling noble elite and its implications for the Anglo-Saxon status quo. Responses may also address social and cultural developments deriving from a Norman origin, particularly with reference to the Church. Reasonable coverage is expected of the whole period under review, and candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge of how issues first apparent in 1066 and the immediate aftermath of the Conquest had substantial implications across the period to 1216. Was there any sense that post-Conquest changes had lost their novelty and resonance by the reign of Henry I, for example?</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding and Evaluation of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>Some understanding of arguments advocating and those which criticise the named approach will reasonably be expected. Why are such views held by some historians, and how persuasive and convincing are they? Some understanding of the evidential difficulties which historians interested in continuity and change have to face should be apparent in students' responses. Is the study of change more natural for historians as a point of focus in relation to castles, or feudalism, for example? How can an approach based on continuity and change bring fresh insights to the study of the period? Responses may come to a view about whether or not it is possible to understand the values and</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>attitudes of Norman and Angevin society and changes within them. Likewise, in terms of methods, responses may consider whether it is possible or desirable to distinguish social and cultural changes which came about as an immediate consequence of the Conquest from later medium or longer-term changes.</p> <p>The shortcomings and limitations of an approach which focuses on post-Conquest change should be explored, alongside what can be gained: what can be learnt from such an angle which cannot be otherwise discerned? The opportunities which this approach affords to avoid a concentration on kings and nobles in favour of a focus on institutional and structural change, for example, could be evaluated. The long-term consequences of the Norman Conquest for England, Normandy and the Angevin Empire can perhaps be more readily assessed by such an approach than one which addresses a narrower range of issues. Evaluation of whether the changes discussed are sufficient to constitute advances in our historical understanding of the period, for example, may be appropriate. Candidates might reasonably be expected to express an informed and coherent opinion about the value of the named approach to the period.</p>		

The debate over Britain's 17<sup>th</sup> Century Crises, 1629-89

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	a	<p><b>Knowledge and Understanding</b></p> <p>Knowledge and understanding of the main features of the crises in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. This knowledge and understanding should inform candidates' reading of the extract and enable them to comment on it in an informed way. Knowledge and understanding of the rule of Charles I and the reasons for growing opposition to him and his regime.</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b></p> <p>The main interpretation is the conservative nature of the opposition to Charles and its unity and breadth. Charles upset their notions of law and good rule, of ancient rights and liberties and good practice in religion. His innovations such as Arminianism were unwelcome. There was a right way of ruling (through Parliament) and Charles was ruling in the wrong way. He was threatening tradition in politics and religion. The author also argues that the opposition was united across the Parliament and the landed, the middling sort and right down to labourers and rioters. They all feared losing what they saw as traditional rights. This shows there was a connection between the threat to local and national rights.</p> <p>This is seen as a Court-Country split with Charles' courtiers receiving much of the blame. The point is also made these strains had been developing for some time which explains why they appear to come to the boil so quickly in the early 1640s. The crucial issues are liberties and religion and with the Popish threat these amounted to the same thing. A final point is made that the unity over religion, unlike that in politics, was only skin deep allowing for the divisions that appear later and the creation of a King's party.</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>In terms of approaches there is use of a from below approach to some extent. There is a Court-Country approach and analysis used. The author is interested in connections between different classes. Local examples are used from Somerset, Beckington and the western foresters. The whole analysis is from the perspective of Charles' opponents.</p>		
2	b	<p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant main events and aspects of England's crises. They should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of different approaches and interpretations. They should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the 'Three Kingdoms' and the relationships between them.</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding and Evaluation of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the 'Three Kingdoms' approach to the seventeenth century crises and how it changes our perspective on the seventeenth-century crises. They should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of several different interpretations that these have led to. They should also show knowledge and understanding of other approaches. Candidates should explain what we have learned from this approach - how it has added to our understanding, as well as its shortcomings. The 'Three Kingdoms' approach should be explained as an approach rather than as any one particular interpretation.</p>		

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

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	a	<p><b>Knowledge and Understanding</b></p> <p>Knowledge and understanding of the main features of British Imperialism 1850-1950 and especially of the decline of the empire and of the reasons for decolonisation. This knowledge and understanding should inform candidates' reading of the extract and enable them to comment on it in an informed way. Candidates should also have a knowledge and understanding of different interpretations of the decolonisation in the twentieth century.</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b></p> <p>The overall argument is that British decolonisation was mainly influenced by the international situation and international events after the Second World War ie the Cold War and the need to defeat communism. The other main cause was Britain's need for international respect and support.</p> <p>Pressure from the periphery is not seen as important. Indeed, it is suggested that some leaders in the colonies wanted to move more slowly towards independence and were not putting pressure on the British government. The centre is seen as the place where decisions were made and so was much more important. The decisions by government and civil servants were influenced by the Cold War and Britain's need for respect and support. An important part of the former was to ensure that newly self-governing countries did not support communism. An important part of the latter was that Britain was not left as the last European country with colonies because this would damage her reputation and standing internationally.</p> <p>Other factors are named such as longer term factors - the fact that the imperial system was becoming unmanageable and dysfunctional</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>The approach of the author is to consider the role of both decision making at the centre and pressure from the periphery. A wide range of factors are considered including immediate and longer-term, domestic and international. The context of the period after the Second World War is considered and used. The author has used evidence from civil servants of the time, and from ministers such as Lennox-Boyd and Attlee.</p>		
3	b	<p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant main events and aspects of British Imperialism 1850-1950. They should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of approaches that have focused on the periphery.</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding and Evaluation of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of approaches that have focused on the concept of new imperialism. They should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of this concept, how it has added to our understanding of British Imperialism and how a focus on it has influenced historians. They should also show knowledge and understanding of other approaches and explain how a focus on new imperialism has some shortcomings. Candidates should explain a focus on new imperialism as an approach rather than as an interpretation.</p>		

## The debate over British Appeasement in the 1930s

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	a	<p><b>Knowledge and Understanding</b></p> <p>Candidates should have knowledge and understanding of the main features of the events in the 1930s and of Appeasement. They should also have knowledge and understanding of the international situation at the time and of the relative strengths of the main powers. This knowledge and understanding should inform candidates' reading of the extract and enable them to comment on it in an informed way.</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding of interpretations</b></p> <p>The author's argument is highly critical of Chamberlain. The author argues that Chamberlain got just about every decision and judgement wrong. For example he believed that Hitler might be provoked, instead of deterred, by intransigence, he thought time was on Britain's side, his judgements about the military and economic strength of Germany were wrong, he thought that if Germany did attack then France's resistance would give Britain time to arm and fight and he failed to see that it might have been better to go to war in 1938. Not all of this was his own fault because he was given misleading information. He was also following traditional British policy over Czechoslovakia and over the belief in France's strength.</p>		
		<p><b>Understanding of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>The author's approach is to focus on human agency (Chamberlain's decisions and misjudgements) but also on structural factors such as traditional British policy and beliefs. The author does place Appeasement in the longer context of British foreign policy since 1919 and look for continuity. There is a focus on the relative military strength of the main powers and some use of counter-factual history (what if there had been war in 1938?). Primary sources are used e.g. the Chief of Staffs' report, Sargent and Halifax.</p>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	b	<p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant main events and aspects of Appeasement. They should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of events in the 1930s and of the development of public opinion in Britain in the 1930s and of some of the indicators of this e.g. opinion polls.</p>	30	
		<p><b>Understanding and Evaluation of approaches/methods</b></p> <p>Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of approaches that have focused on public opinion in Britain. They should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of how a focus on British public opinion has contributed to our understanding of Appeasement. They should also show knowledge and understanding of other approaches and explain how a focus on British public opinion has some shortcomings. Candidates should explain a focus on British public opinion as an approach rather than as an interpretation.</p>		

**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

