

GCE

History A

Unit F964/02: European and World History Enquiries.

Option B Modern 1774–1975

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 2016

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

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
BP	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
C	In Q(a) a comparison of source similarity or difference is made, either of content or of provenance .In Q(b) it denotes an effective grouping (for two or more interpretations), linkage or cross reference between sources.
J	In Q(a) a judgement is reached on the sources as <i>evidence</i> using content and provenance. In Q(b) a judgement is made on how far the <i>sources</i> support an interpretation.
P	In Q(a) the provenance is discussed and used as part of the judgement. In Q(b) a source's provenance is discussed discretely and not used to evaluate for the question. Linkage to the question is implicit.
S	In Q(a) a source or both sources are discussed separately and sequentially thus preventing comparison. In Q(b) the sources are approached sequentially thus preventing linkage and cross reference for the argument.
XP	Points of content and argument are juxtaposed – they are not comparable in Q(a) or the linkage made is inappropriate in Q(b).
F	In either question the approach to a source, the sources as a whole, or the response in general, is overly formulaic or generic, failing to engage with either source content or precise provenance and context .
KU	Knowledge is used appropriately to support, extend, explain (context) or question a source or sources.
K	Knowledge is 'bolt-on', there for its own sake and not used or linked to the sources.
EVAL	There is evaluation of the sources for the key issue and question. This can be used for Q(a) but is more likely to be used for Q(b).
ILL	The sources are simply used for reference or to illustrate an argument in Q(b).
NAQ	The points made are not linked to the question and do not answer it.
?	This is to be used in both questions where is a factual error, irrelevant material and, in Q(b), an inaccurate, questionable or unconvincing grouping of the sources for the question. It is also to be used in both questions where a judgement is on the topic rather than the sources.
NAR	There is description, either of the sources or of knowledge, or simply a narrative.
SEEN	The page has been read. This must be used on each page seen to ensure that the whole response has been considered.

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"> - 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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">6 – 7</p>
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. <p style="text-align: center;">3 – 4</p>	<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. <p style="text-align: center;">3 – 5</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
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. <p style="text-align: center;">0 – 2</p>	<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. <p style="text-align: center;">0 – 2</p>

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

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

A0s	A01a and b	A02a and b
Total for each 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"> a. key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; b. 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. 	<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.

20 – 22**42 – 48**

A0s	A01a and b	A02a and b
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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">21 – 27</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a and b
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 style="text-align: center;">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 style="text-align: center;">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. <p style="text-align: center;">3 – 4</p>	<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. <p style="text-align: center;">7 – 13</p>
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. <p style="text-align: center;">0 – 2</p>	<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. <p style="text-align: center;">0 – 6</p>

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	a	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the sources 'as evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The context is the meeting of the Legislative Assembly following the end of the Constituent Assembly and the new Constitution of October 1791. Neither Source is very optimistic, but for different reasons.</p> <p>Similarities: Both see problems – inexperienced members (B) faction, selfishness, disruptive influence of Orléanists (C)</p> <p>Differences: In B the focus is on the inexperience of the new representatives (after the Constituent Assembly had barred existing members from election; In C the problem is political divisions, loss of faith in the Constitution and venality.</p> <p>Provenance – both are memoirs of pro-monarchist nobles; both have the benefit of hindsight and both were interested participants not detached observers. One actually sat in the Legislative Assembly; one was prohibited from sitting.</p> <p>Judgement: Both offer a lot of value judgements, but C seems particularly opposed to the Girondins while B puts the issues into context more.</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the</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 –problems facing the Legislative Assembly - as evidence for 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
		Sources as 'evidence for...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.		<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.
1	b	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set answer is expected.</p> <p>Grouping – A and E might provide evidence of there being more hope for the new Constitution and the Legislative Assembly whereas B, C and D seem to show more problems. A seems to show some popular hope for a new Assembly with more enlightened legislator and support from all over France. However, this is a Parisian view and possibly an ironic one. The unrest in the provinces was growing and there was going to be severe civil war and unrest. The new legislators lacked experience and indeed the whole concept of a long-term constitutional monarchy, especially with the divisions and hostility shown in the other sources may make this view somewhat unrealistic. However E seems to show the King accepting it, contrary to the implied view in B and urging Artois to return and abandon the attempts to get support for an invasion – a request that went unheeded. It seems to show that despite the earlier flight to Varennes (mentioned in B). Louis had enough faith in the Constitution to ask his brother to return.</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. • 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

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>B stresses the unfavourable context, particularly the aftermath of the King's flight to Varennes. The humiliating way that the royal family was forced to return to Paris amid hostile, silent crowds and then forced to be in the centre of the city, suspected of collusion with the Austrians and at the mercy of popular disturbance might be expanded on to confirm this evidence. There is also the lack of continuity between the Constituent Assembly and the new Legislative assembly, The long period of the Constituent Assembly and the reforms passed did give its members experience of political realities that the new assembly may have lacked. That evidence is contradicted in D which shows the monarchy uncertain and the Queen far from committed to the new constitutional monarchy, failing to support an invasion only because of jealousy of Artois. However, the source is from a later date and is from an unstable participant in revolutionary events. Did the King's letter (E) really indicate a commitment to the Constitution or was he afraid that the ineffectual activities of the émigrés would only make the situation worse. Did his later support for war show that he really hoped that he could end the constitutional monarchy? Or was this another example of his weakness and inability to withstand pressures? The divisions in the royal family are shown again in C – the political divisions and intrigues may seem to indicate that there was little hope of the Constitutional Monarchy surviving. However, this is not from an objective source and the existence of different political groups may indicate that divisions could be contained. Most will see the differences, however and the elements of corruption as indicative of the opposite. Knowledge of the growth of extremism and political divisions could confirm the dangers of the situation described here.</p>		<p>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 to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach is

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
			<p>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.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	a	<p>The sources agree that Italians were hostile to the Austrians as they resented their presence in the peninsular: Source B states that 'You are disliked as conquerors' and in Source E it is clear that the Italians 'were fighting against Austrians who had occupied their country'. Candidates might suggest that this sentiment is amplified in Source B which objects to the deployment of soldiers from various parts of the Austrian Empire used to garrison fortresses, consistent with the imperial policy of divide and rule. Both sources are opposed to Austrian government. In Source B the complaint is against 'magistrates and administrators who know nothing about this country' and in Source E such hostility is described as intense as people 'were motivated by a burning desire to free their country of Austrian rule'. Yet, Source B seems most concerned about the lack of opportunities for Italians, complaining that 'In Vienna there is not a single post of any standing held by an Italian' and that an 'official career is closed to them'. However, the main cause of hostility in Source E appears to be the 'force' used by Austrians to impose their will. It refers to execution for political offences, imprisonment, flogging of women and the experience of 'the horrors of 1848-49 still in their memories'. Also, Source B implies that hostility was confined to 'young men ... some of them become rebels' and 'young gentlemen' who were alienated by the dismissal of 'a number of ladies' from the Governor's court. The implication is that the hostility to the Austrians was from a small group of people, of the social elite. However, Source E suggests that hostility was widespread, involving 'all men, of every rank'.</p> <p>In evaluating the provenance, candidates may assess the veracity of the authors. Source B was written by an administrator with direct knowledge of the bureaucracy in</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 –problems facing the Legislative Assembly - as evidence for 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>Lombardy and the Austrian system of government. As such, his views are based on personal experience. The same might be said of the author of Source E who was involved with Garibaldi's forces in 1866. However, his impressions of the attitudes of Garibaldi's volunteers might be considered as less reliable as he was a foreigner who had no personal experience of the nature of Austrian rule on which he comments. On the other hand Source B seems concerned only with the attitudes of those whose ambitions for a career in government had been frustrated rather than the impact of Austrian rule on the people as a whole which Source E seems to address. Both sources are direct in stating the points made and indicate a sense of bruised nationalist sentiment but candidates may point to a difference of tone. Whilst Source B is measured and specific about particular grievances Source E is more emotive and focuses on the suffering of Italians rather than the inconveniences of the Austrian system which characterises Source B. Some candidates may argue this is explained by the date of the sources. Source B was a comment on the situation in Lombardy at a time of relative tranquillity. There had been revolutions in 1820-21 and 1830-31 though such disturbances had not affected Lombardy. However, by 1866 Lombardy had experienced the Milan Days of 1848 and the war of 1848-49 and they were currently engaged in war against Austria: all did much to harden attitudes against the Austrians.</p> <p>In judgement candidates are likely to conclude that both sources provide sound evidence of hostility to the Austrians. By evaluation, some might suggest that the focus of each source is different and that the context is important in explaining the difference between them.</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. <p>Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	b	<p>The Sources that provide most support for this interpretation are A and E. Sources C and D suggest otherwise. Source B is ambiguous and candidates may use it differently.</p> <p>In Source A it is clear that the security forces were expected to monitor all aspects of 'public administration' to the degree that the 'behaviour of individual employees' should be checked at work and at home (point 5). Also, written material of every kind was to be controlled (points 4 and 10). In addition, points 1-3 make it clear that the police and secret police were expected to be vigilant about individuals and groups who might be plotting to subvert Austrian authority. Even foreigners – 'officials, states, and subjects' – were to be monitored. The ten points effectively amount to a comprehensive apparatus designed to repress opposition in order to maintain Austrian authority. Candidates may refer to the 'Metternich System' deployed throughout the rest of the Austrian Empire to indicate that the orders were consistent with Austrian practice. As such, it would be reasonable for candidates to infer that the measures listed in Source A were also applied in other states in the peninsula under Austrian control, either directly or indirectly. The context is helpful to explain the orders. Austrian authority was unpopular in the years immediately after 1815 especially in Venice and Lombardy which became part of the Austrian Empire. Also, the activities of the various revolutionary groups, for example, the Carbonari were of concern at the time, and the uprisings of 1820-21 confirmed the danger they posed. Arguably, the defeat of these revolutions was partly due to the repressive measures outlined in Source A.</p> <p>Repressive measures are explicitly outlined in Source E. The Austrians are accused of the deaths and suffering of Italians: those who had committed the smallest political offences had been 'shot' or imprisoned 'in loathsome</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. 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

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>dungeons' and 'women and children' had been 'publically flogged'. The 'horrors of 1848-49 in Milan and Venice', although not specified, were so bad they were 'still in their memories' almost twenty years later. Candidates may provide details about the events of 1848-49 to reinforce this reference. In evaluating the source candidates may question the reliability of it given the evocative language of the author – those who were shot are described as 'their bravest' and the dungeons were 'loathsome' – yet set in context such words may be considered appropriate. However, the author concedes the 'Italians were often cruel in their treatment of Austrian prisoners' which was one of 'extermination' indicating a balanced assessment of both sides even if the brutality of the Italians is excused as retribution for Austrian repression. Equally, it is not surprising that no quarter was conceded by either side given they were at war.</p> <p>Some candidates may argue that the reference to 'every important fortress garrisoned by people from other Austrian provinces' in Source B is proof of the repressive measures of the Austrians in using troops to uphold their power, at least in Lombardy. On the other hand, it might be argued that the author was naive to think that native troops would be used, if that is the implication of this remark. The fact that 'magistrates and administrators' were appointed 'who know nothing about this country' and 'our young men are discouraged since an official career is closed to them' may be used as evidence of repression especially as some 'young men ... become rebels' which suggests repression was so obnoxious that local people had no option but to resist. However, there is no suggestion that repression was anything other than a disregard for the sensitivities of Lombards who disliked the Austrians 'as conquerors'. There is no complaint about the use of force or brutality to impose their power. Writing to the</p>		<p>limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Chancellor, it may be argued that it was judicious for the author to moderate his complaint. Yet, perhaps there was no reason for him to be any more strident. After all, between 1815 and 1832 there had been revolutions in most Italian states but not in Lombardy which might be a reflection of the more benign regime there.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to be unanimous in regarding Sources C and D as evidence to deny Austria used repressive measures. In Source C the Duke refutes the suggestion that he was under any pressure 'to join my forces with those of Austria' or that 'the Austrians offer(ed) their troops to Tuscany to suppress revolution here'. Further, the Duke stresses his independence from the Austrians, despite 'family links', about which candidates may elaborate, and that he did what was best for Tuscany rather than Austria. Indeed, the Duke did ally with Piedmont as claimed here in the war against Austria in Lombardy. However, as the Duke concedes, Austria was 'in no position to send any troops' to Tuscany and his decision to join Piedmont was partly because of 'popular enthusiasm' which he felt he could not resist. Indeed, Leopold was forced to flee for a period. Candidates might argue that the Duke's account is explained by his desire to be seen as a ruler on the side of Italian nationalism, writing years after the formation of Italy was a reality. Yet, although he was restored in 1849 with Austrian forces he maintained the constitution granted in 1848 until 1852. When it was revoked he did so because it was impractical rather than any insistence by the Austrians that he should do so. After the merger of Tuscany into the Kingdom of North Italy in 1860, Leopold moved to Austria where he composed his memoirs.</p> <p>The remarks of Radetsky in Source D indicate that Austrian rule was not repressive. The general complains that 'it is high time to stop giving favours' and he fears the</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		<p>government will take a lenient approach to the revolutionaries of 1848-49: ‘their leaders will ask for mercy and that the government will be lenient with them’. Indeed, the fact that Radetsky urges strong action – ‘it is necessary to let the country feel the power of Austria’, ‘the removal of the wealth of the rich’, and that the Emperor should ‘set aside any thought of mercy’ – indicates how repression had been absent before this point. Some candidates may argue that Radetsky’s views are upheld, to a degree at least, by Source B. Others may argue that his anger is explained by his humiliation on his evacuation of Milan in 1848 but others may argue his views are understandable in the light of the revolution and war of 1848-9. In writing to the Emperor, Radetsky reveals how strongly he felt about the situation in Lombardy.</p> <p>In evaluation of the interpretation candidates might argue that sources on both sides of the argument have limitations in terms of their reliability and use yet, on balance, the sources indicate that repressive measures were the main way in which Austria maintained its power in the peninsula. On the other hand, it may be argued that before 1848 at least, given the evidence of Sources B, C and D in particular, Austrian measures may not have been that harsh or effective, despite the orders in Source A.</p> <p>Indeed, it is clear that by 1866, when Source E was written, that the harshness of Austrian measures was counter-productive and that Austrian power was removed from the peninsula that year. Supported overall judgement should be reached on how far the sources support the interpretation. No specific judgement is expected.</p>		

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	a	<p>These sources are largely in agreement about the abolition of slavery. Both stress the importance of leaving individual states to decide on the issue. In Source D Douglas is adamant that 'slavery can only be abolished by leaving a State free to form and regulate its institutions in its own way'. Buchanan, in Source E says much the same in declaring that 'the Constitution does not give Congress power to interfere with slavery in the States'. Both agree that the North was responsible for the pressure to abolish slavery and that the South responded defensively to it. Source D claims the pressure started 'the moment Abolition Societies were organised' and Source E asserts 'the South threatened disunion unless the agitation ceased'. Arguably, Source D is more definite in apportioning blame to the abolition societies whereas Source E is vague in this respect – was it Congress or other organisations is not clear – and the former is more precise, therefore, in dating the beginning of the agitation as the abolition societies were formed in the 1830s. In addition, both accuse the abolitionists of using force to achieve their aims. Source D refers to 'a violent crusade against slavery' and Source E reflects on 'the attempt to remove (slavery) by force of arms'. Both sources are clear that the result of abolitionist pressure was the division of the States: Source D claims that 'a line was drawn between North and South' and Source E 'that the country was rapidly splitting in two'. This is reinforced by the point made by both sources that views in each section were strongly held. Source E is more specific about this declaring 'the proud people of the South were as fanatical in advocating slavery as were the abolitionists of the North in denouncing it'. Source D implies the same in declaring 'Mr Lincoln proposes to keep up this sectional agitation' to an extent that will threaten the Union, suggesting that the South opposed Mr Lincoln as strongly as he challenged</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 –problems facing the Legislative Assembly - as evidence for 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>them.</p> <p>Both men came from States which bordered States where slavery was practised which might explain their sensitivity to the views of those in the South. More importantly, both were conciliators and preferred to seek agreement between the Sections. Candidates may elaborate on the information in the introductions to emphasise the attitude of these politicians. Both are keen to distance themselves from any blame for the tension between North and South if for different reasons. Douglas wanted to position himself as different to Mr Lincoln in order to win votes in the campaign in which he was involved, and some candidates may challenge the accusations made, or at least implied, in Source D about Mr Lincoln's views on slavery. As President in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the civil war, it could be argued that Buchanan is prepared in Source E to blame Congress and agitators, such as John Brown, rather than shoulder any responsibility himself. Also, Source E was written after the war had finished and he was in a position to reflect on events that had happened so it was not unreasonable for him to assert that the actions of the likes of John Brown help explain the lurch to 'conflict'. However, when Douglas made the speech in Source D he is still optimistic that the abolition of slavery could still be achieved 'under that principle' by which 'the Union has been preserved'.</p> <p>In judgement, candidates may argue that Source E is more reliable than Source D in so far as the points made in the former stand the test of hindsight. Nonetheless, it is clear that Source D was aware of the dangers of the situation in 1858 and given the record of Douglas in previous years of working to reconcile the Sections that his views are equally reliable. Given the close agreement</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.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		between the two sources, despite the difference in context, and the outbreak of war between the Sections in 1861, it might be concluded that they are both equally sound as evidence for views about the abolition of slavery.		
3	b	<p>Candidates will vary in how they interpret some sources. Most will regard Source A as the most explicit in presenting States rights as the key issue dividing the Sections. In addition, Source D places considerable emphasis on States rights and Source B also stresses the issue as important. However, Sources B, D and E see slavery as the key reason for division. Source C and, to a degree, Sources D and E place responsibility for sectional tension on the politicians. There is clearly an argument to be developed.</p> <p>Source A makes clear the frustration of 'many southerners' with the Federal Government and the Supreme Court which they accuse of meddling in the affairs of individual States. The Virginians are said to think that 'the Federal Government is increasingly claiming more power' implying a trend to centralisation. Specific objections are mentioned including 'the establishment of the Bank' and 'the tendency of the Supreme Court to find in favour of the Federal Government in disputed cases with the States' with whom the State was then in dispute intending 'to resist the judgement' if it goes against them. These matters are presented as more important than 'this business of Missouri' (the introduction of Missouri as a slave state into the Union). Virginians were so exercised by the power of the central government and the Supreme Court that they 'talk deliberately of a separation of the States'. In addition, the reference to Ohio having 'a more violent quarrel with the Court' indicates that it was not just Southern States for whom States rights were important. In evaluating Source A candidates may stress the letter as a</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. 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>private one with no motive on the part of the author to do anything other than inform his father about the points made. Indeed, the objective tone of the letter suggests this in merely stating the views of the Virginians and others. It might be argued that the points of frustration mentioned in Source A did not lead to separation until 40 years later which suggests they were less important than other factors proved to be.</p> <p>The importance of States rights is made clear in Source D. The former argues that States should be 'free to form and regulate its institutions in its own way' aware that to deny this 'produces nothing but strife and disunion'. Indeed, because of 'sectional agitation' the author feared for the survival of the Union. Source B also places stress on States rights, explicitly in the final sentence which emphasises the denial of States rights to be 'more alarming than all other causes' of sectional division. Indeed, the author anticipates rebellion 'if the rights of the States are no protection of slavery the Southern States', at least at some time in the future. However, this statement follows others which place emphasis on other factors. Nonetheless, the author was an ardent exponent of States rights and at the time of writing the issue of secession was being discussed, to be adopted shortly afterwards by North Carolina.</p> <p>However, the key issue underlying the defence of States rights for both Source B and D is slavery. Source B considers it to be the issue that 'has placed them in opposition to the majority of the Union'. The controversy of 1830 may have hinged on the Tariff but Source B makes it clear that this was 'the symptom rather than the real cause of the present unhappy state of things'. Candidates may elaborate on how the Tariff debate developed and assess</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 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.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>the validity of Calhoun's claim. In stressing the role of Abolition Societies in fomenting sectional tension, Source D makes it clear that slavery was the key issue dividing the states. Indeed, their activities effectively ended the process of abolition when, previously, the initiative was left to individual states: 'a line was drawn between North and South'. Candidates may argue that Douglas was overplaying this point as abolition of slavery 'from six of the original slaveholding States' had been done before 1820, since when slavery had been extended into other states, notably Kansas, only a few years before. Some candidates may refer to Source A as offering some support for slavery as a key reason for sectional tension as it refers to the 'business of Missouri' which candidates may be able to develop. Source E vividly explains the gulf between the sections because of slavery. Supporters and opponents of slavery are described as 'fanatical' and in highlighting the actions of John Brown, Buchanan provides just one example of the extremes to which some were prepared to go to promote their cause. Again, candidates might expand on the reference to Brown and reflect on the series of events thereafter that illustrate the drift to 'conflict'. However, in evaluating Source E some might consider the efforts made to seek a resolution to sectional conflict and the role or otherwise of the President and the central government which might explain the line of argument presented in Source E.</p> <p>The politicians are also blamed for the sectional tension of the period. Source C is scathing in its criticism of most politicians. They are derided as 'lesser politicians' who are preoccupied with 'little local jealousies' and 'whose sole object seems to be to foster unpleasant sentiments between North and South'. The author states that 'a separation of the States would be madness' by querying</p>		<p>Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		<p>where 'a line between North and South' could be drawn. Source C singles out Calhoun for criticism accusing him either of insanity – 'he is either mad' – or personal ambition 'to be President of the South'. Some candidates may develop a cross reference to Source B. The author of Source C contrasts Calhoun with Webster describing the latter as an 'honest man' and a 'statesman'.</p> <p>Knowledge of the debate on the issues discussed in 1850 would inform answers. In evaluating Source C candidates may stress the fact that the author was himself a politician from the South acutely aware, by association with others from that section, of the narrow perspective of many of his contemporaries. Source D also targets an individual politician – Mr Lincoln – who is accused of stoking sectional tension. However, the speech was part of a series of debates between the two men competing for election to the Senate in Illinois. In Source E the politicians in Congress are held responsible for inflaming tensions: 'the time of Congress was wasted in violent debates on slavery'. Candidates may explain that this was literally the case when Preston Brooks attacked Sumner in the Senate with a cane in 1856. However, as President of the Union on the eve of the civil war it is not surprising that Buchanan looks to pass responsibility for sectional tension to others.</p> <p>In judgement, candidates will divide in their evaluation of the interpretation. Many may agree that States rights were the main reason for sectional tension if only because so many of the sources make that point to differing degrees. However, some will argue that State rights are difficult to disentangle from other issues such as slavery that were clearly divisive. Some may argue that the issue of States rights was more important because it underlay the history of the whole period. The manipulation of the issue by</p>		

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		politicians for various reasons may also be assessed. The reliability and utility of the sources will determine their relative value. Although no specific judgement is expected it should be supported by clear evaluation of the sources.		

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study Sources A and B • Compare these Sources as evidence for how great a problem opposition was for the Nazis in March 1933 • The Sources are similar in content in that they both agree that there is opposition and it is quite extensive. Nearly half the population is referred to in Source A and 5000 internees identified in Source B as examples of opposition rounded up within weeks of the Nazis coming to power. • The Sources also differ in that Source A suggests that opposition can be won over and there will be no need for the bayonet, while Source B suggest the opposition is more of a problem and will need rather more drastic methods to deal with it. Source A hopes to influence the uncommitted so that they become keen supporters, but Source B recognises that some opponents may be incorrigible and that state security demands that they be restrained as a threat. Source A implies that the opposition is half-hearted – more or less reconciled - but in Source B they continue to agitate and cause unrest. • Regarding the provenance and context of the Sources, the dates can be used. Both sources come from the early days of the new government. Source A shows an idealistic hope from the newly established ministry. Source B relies on information from the Ministry of the Interior and could show a more realistic assessment of the extent of opposition. The establishment of concentration camps so soon after coming to power could indicate that opposition was already a problem and also that it had been expected and the Nazis had plans in hand to frustrate it. 	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 so. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (AO1) evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for....' (AO2) • The comparison must be for the key issue. If the focus is general a L4 for AO1 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for AO2 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 AO1 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at AO1 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 AO2 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 AO1 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 AO2. • Judgements based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at AO1. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
				<p>Level 4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the source 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"> Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.
4	b	<p>Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Nazis relied mainly on persuasion to win support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The supporting view that That persuasion was the main method is found in E. Sources A,C and E. The opposing view that it was other factors is found in Sources B and D The supporting view in Source A, the speech by Goebbels, very clearly demonstrates that the aim is to win everyone over to support the government directly. It is not enough for people simply to avoid opposition. Goebbels' mission is to persuade them to love the government positively. Source C, the Press Conference report, shows that the extent of press censorship was considerable, even on relatively minor issues. Source E makes an emotive appeal to German citizens to show how grateful they are to Hitler. The opposing argument that other factors were important comes in Source B, the newspaper report about concentration camps and shows there was no time wasted in trying to persuade Communists and Social Democrats but then they were rapidly imprisoned as they would not give up their opposition. Source D, the Gestapo report, shows the use of force again, with a large number of operations by the Gestapo. Contextual knowledge could be used to argue that references to persuasion from Goebbels do not ring 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is to assess how the 5 Sources contribute to or challenge the given interpretation. The focus must be on the Sources and use their content and relative utility for the question. Award AO1 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two-sided argument then 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 issue may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the Sources for the argument and the question. Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing so. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for AO2. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for AO1. 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 AO2 (according to severity of imbalance).

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>true when set alongside his later practices and the imposition of a Police State. Equally figures like Goering did little to support the idea that Nazi leaders saw social functions as a duty, although Hitler himself could be accurately described as abstemious. Source C does not explain what reprisals could be expected for newspapers which disregarded the rules but candidates could refer to censorship and consider how far this was moving away from persuasion to other methods. Source E from a later period shows how persuasion was overlaid with a veiled threat. Note would be taken if families were not observing the day or did not give generously. Collectors were empowered to enter homes to inspect cooking arrangement and see that only a One-pot meal had been prepared. Candidates might argue that persuasion was worth trying as it was cheaper in many ways than force, but it did often have a sting in the tail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One might expect quite a lot of own knowledge about the roles of the SA and later the SS and the Gestapo. There may be references to events like the boycott of Jewish shops, Kristallnacht, the role of informers etc. The important thing is that this factual knowledge does not overwhelm the sources – this is a source-based paper and contextual knowledge is to support or evaluate an argument, not to be the driving force with sources as illustration. For provenance candidates might indicate that all the Sources come from authors who were either Nazis or sympathisers, but they have different aims. Goebbels wanted to show how persuasive he could be and impress in his new job. In Source E the aim is to use gentle persuasion to get the desired result. The other 		<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, question it), Levels 1-3 for AO1. 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 AO2. 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 AO2 Level 4 and below. To award Levels 3 and above for AO2 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 AO2. Check the extent of assertions made. A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at AO1. 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 AO2). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C,

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	Sources give out information but it has a threatening undertone.		<p>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 to provenance. Please mark what is in 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. Judgement might accept or refute the view.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
5	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provenance of the Sources is in part similar and different. Source A is a set of objectives issued by the North Vietnamese Communist commander in Hanoi to instruct the South Vietnamese communists in planning the Tet Offensive. Knowledge of Hanoi's need to impress their Chinese allies and fears of a stalemate might be used to develop these objectives. On the other hand, Source D is written by the South Vietnamese communists with hindsight to report back to Hanoi on how far the objectives have been carried out. Knowledge of the damage done to the NLF and the costs to Hanoi in lives and morale might be used to evaluate its reliability. It is likely to put a positive spin on events or omit negative aspects, but there is some balance here. Source A is optimistic of success, written two weeks before the Offensive took place, whereas Source D has hindsight, as it is written after the event had begun and is more useful for outcomes. Both Sources have strengths and limitations. The Sources have many similarities of content. A priority in Source A is the main thrust at the cities, and this may be confirmed in the light of knowledge of the attacks on 34 cities, such as Saigon and Hue. Source D confirms this. Source A stresses that the most important objective of the Tet Offensive is to conquer and keep control of the countryside, forcing the US and South Vietnamese government troops into the towns. Source D agrees that liberation of wide areas of the countryside were a key objective. Knowledge might be used to evaluate this as a communist objective in rural areas which had already been targeted by communist cadres in light of the South Vietnamese 'strategic hamlets' policy. A secondary objective in Source A is to mobilise the countryside to revolt and provoke mass uprisings of the 	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 communist objectives in the Tet Offensive 1968. 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>people, and this is confirmed by Source D, i.e. Vietcong use of communist propaganda in the attempt to gain their support. Knowledge of rural reactions to political propaganda and previous policy might be used to evaluate this objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A third objective in Source A is to use shock troops to stretch enemy forces and destroy their bases and infrastructure. Knowledge of the attacks, such as that on the air base at Khe Sahn, might be used to extend the sources. Source D confirms that ‘continuous offensives and simultaneous uprisings’ against enemy nerve centres were an objective. It takes two more angles – the objectives of killing enemy commanders and winning over South Vietnamese troops by propaganda. There are some limitations, e.g. there is no mention of the objective to overthrow the South Vietnamese military regime. <p>Limitations of these two sources as evidence for the objectives of the Offensive might be supplied from own knowledge.</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.
5	b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources A and D together provide evidence of the objectives and outcome of the Tet Offensive, so there is plenty of discussion of whether the Tet Offensive was a success. Sources C, B and to an extent D suggest that it did succeed, but they have different views on the nature of success in particular with regard to US policy. Source C is evidence for Washington’s perception that strong communist planning, trained and equipped forces had considerable impact on South Vietnam. Source D balances successes with failures in South Vietnam. Source B is useful for the US media view, that for Hanoi the measure of success would lie in their bargaining position in peace talks. Cross-reference with Source E confirms their success in this, 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge the 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 then 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:

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>as Johnson is now ready to begin peace talks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provenance of Sources C and E are Johnson and his aides. Source E confirms the negative aspects present in Source D but Johnson takes a wholly negative subjective view of the outcome of the Offensive. Sources D and E might be cross-referenced for their relative use and reliability in light of their contrasting provenance. Knowledge might be used to confirm the heavy toll in lives and munitions and the suffering caused by the Offensive. An interim judgement on its level of success might be reached relevantly and linked to its impact. Sources B, C and E are most useful for supporting the significance of the Tet Offensive was successful in changing US policy. Source B supports or informs the view held by many of the US public that, realistically, the war cannot be won and has reached a stalemate so it is time to talk. Knowledge might be used to extend the source and link it to the nature of Source E, i.e. television reports and their domestic impact, e.g. on protest rallies. The notion of a change of policy caused by the recognition of a stalemate is supported also in Sources C and E, where Clifford refers to a 'bottomless pit' and Johnson begins to de-escalate US troops, as he confirms when withdrawing from the presidential campaign in Source E. Rather than following a 'win the war' policy, he commits his successor to a policy of withdrawal and peace negotiations. There may be different judgements on how far the sources accept the view that the Tet Offensive was successful militarily and socially, but it is likely that candidates will recognise its success in changing the course of US policy in Vietnam to withdrawal. 		<p>reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question.</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

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
			<p>a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of 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 2016

