

**GCE**

**History A**

Unit **F963/01**: British History Enquiries  
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1660

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2014**

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 2014

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

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
<b>BP</b>	Blank Page – this annotation <b>must</b> 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.
<b>C</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a comparison of source similarity or difference is made, either of content or of provenance. In <b>Q(b)</b> it denotes an effective grouping (for two or more interpretations), linkage or cross reference between sources.
<b>J</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a judgement is reached on the sources as <i>evidence</i> using content and provenance. In <b>Q(b)</b> a judgement is made on how far the <i>sources</i> support an interpretation.
<b>P</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> the provenance is discussed and used as part of the judgement. In <b>Q(b)</b> a source's provenance is discussed discretely and not used to evaluate for the question. Linkage to the question is implicit.
<b>S</b>	In <b>Q(a)</b> a source or both sources are discussed separately and sequentially thus preventing comparison. In <b>Q(b)</b> the sources are approached sequentially thus preventing linkage and cross reference for the argument.
<b>XP</b>	Points of content and argument are juxtaposed – they are not comparable in <b>Q(a)</b> or the linkage made is inappropriate in <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>F</b>	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.
<b>KU</b>	Knowledge is used appropriately to support, extend, explain (context) or question a source or sources.
<b>K</b>	Knowledge is 'bolt-on', there for its own sake and not used or linked to the sources.
<b>EVAL</b>	There is evaluation of the sources for the key issue and question. This can be used for <b>Q(a)</b> but is more likely to be used for <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>ILL</b>	The sources are simply used for reference or to illustrate an argument in <b>Q(b)</b> .
<b>NAQ</b>	The points made are not linked to the question and do not answer it.
<b>?</b>	This is to be used in <b>both</b> questions where is a factual error, irrelevant material and, in <b>Q(b)</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.
<b>NAR</b>	There is description, either of the sources or of knowledge, or simply a narrative.
<b>SEEN</b>	The page has been read. This <b>must be used on each page seen</b> 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.

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions that apply across the whole question paper to be included here.**

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

	<b>AO1a and b</b>	<b>AO2a</b>
<b>1</b>	13–14	15–16
<b>2</b>	11–12	13–14
<b>3</b>	9–10	10–12
<b>4</b>	7–8	8–9
<b>5</b>	5–6	6–7
<b>6</b>	3–4	3–5
<b>7</b>	0–2	0–2

**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)

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
Total for each question = 30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15–16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11–12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–14</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9–10</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10–12</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted.</li> <li>• A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence.</li> <li>• Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7–8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it.</li> <li>• Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8–9</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion.</li> <li>• Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5–6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit</li> <li>• Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6–7</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement.</li> <li>• Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context.</li> <li>• Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic.</li> <li>• Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–5</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance.</li> <li>• Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• No structure with extremely weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment.</li> <li>• Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>

## Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
1	20–22	42–48
2	17–19	35–41
3	13–16	28–34
4	9–12	21–27
5	6–8	14–20
6	3–5	7–13
7	0–2	0–6

**Notes related to Part B:**

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

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

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13–16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing.</li> <li>• There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28–34</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9–12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21–27</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5–8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14–20</b></p>
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3–4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7–13</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>• No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>• Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>• No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>• No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0–6</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that they both agree that the regents worked well together. The common sense of purpose in <b>A</b> could be seen to be revealed in Source <b>B</b>, even if not in quite the way Source <b>A</b> meant it. In both cases it is clear that the king issued firm instructions about how England should be ruled. In both cases the ‘peace’ is kept, with firmness in ‘<b>A</b>’ and ‘oppression’ in ‘<b>B</b>’.</p> <p>The Sources also <b>differ</b> in that <b>Source A</b> considers the regents ruled fairly and maintained justice while <b>Source B</b>, indicates that they cared nothing for justice, especially when it was being sought by English complainants. <b>Source A</b> gives more precise detail and is almost describing an overly idyllic situation. <b>Source B</b> shows that the royal absence left the regents free to do as they pleased. In <b>A</b> they carried out his wishes and in <b>B</b> they defied them.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. <b>William of Poitiers</b> was an admirer of the Conqueror and hence praises his administration. He had served as a knight under William before being ordained and becoming a royal chaplain and he was also closely associated with Odo of Bayeux. He was interested in the law and so emphasises the need for legal processes to be observed. <b>Orderic Vitalis</b> had more understanding of the situation in England and, although he used William de Poitiers as a source and admired his scholarship, he was hostile to Odo sympathising with the downtrodden English. Orderic is also writing later and may have more latitude to express negative views. The panegyric nature of <b>Source A</b> means that candidates are likely to see <b>Source B</b> as the more useful. The first sentences of <b>Source A</b> are not necessarily contradicted by <b>Source B</b> and the context of the late 1060s and 1070s may explain William of Poitiers’ views on the behaviour of the regents. Comparison of the provenance is likely to be a key discriminator in this question.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>	30	<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 source ‘as evidence for.....’</p> <p>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The context is firstly William I's conquest and control of England and then the problems of the succession on his death. Robert, the eldest, obtained Normandy, William II seized England, the youngest, Henry, gained only cash and a little land. The barons, as co-owners, did not like such a divided inheritance as it posed problems of allegiance. William II sought to gain control of Normandy from his elder brother. The <b>opposing</b> view, that the two kings were faced with major difficulties and were less than successful, is found in <b>Source B</b> (for England), Orderic Vitalis, in <b>Source C</b>, Florence of Worcester, who outlines William II's attempts to dislodge his brother from the inheritance of Normandy and in <b>Source D</b>, William of Malmesbury. The <b>supporting</b> view, that they were both successful, is found in <b>Source A</b>, William of Poitiers who outlines success in England and hints at the same in Normandy and partly in <b>Sources B</b>, through oppression in England, <b>C</b> and <b>E</b>.</p> <p>The <b>opposing</b> argument indicates the problems in ruling on both sides of the Channel. <b>Source B</b> shows that William I risked rebellion and discontent from the behaviour of his regents and indeed Odo was later dealt with by William I, until released at the end of the reign in time to plot against William II, while <b>Source C</b> indicates that placating his brother cost William II time and money. From <b>Source D</b> comes the account of civil war in Normandy, bound to be a major problem given the divisions of the territories by William I, with the loyalty of the baronage being unreliable and also the additional complication brought by the resentment of Henry, the youngest of the brothers. Even <b>Source E</b> supports the argument in part as it shows how pleased William II was to have the issue settled and how he could then deal with problems which had been left to build up in England (the threat of the Welsh) while he challenged Robert for control of Normandy.</p> <p>The <b>supporting</b> argument that the rulers were successful and not that challenged by the situation comes across in <b>Source A</b>. Here William I's regents are doing a good job and no difficulties have arisen, although it begs the question why William I was absent in Normandy (trouble?). <b>Source B</b> could also be used to demonstrate an iron control over England. <b>Source C</b> shows how William II sought to wrest control of Normandy from his brother with money, troops and other methods and implies it was a successful attempt. Similarly <b>Source E</b> shows that, in the end, Robert gave up Normandy to go on the First Crusade and so William had no further need to worry. <b>Source D</b> shows that William II's attempts at wresting control with the help of nobles, who faced loss from the warfare, had some success, at least until Henry intervened.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence 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 conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>A third interpretation is also possible. <b>Sources A and B</b> could be used to demonstrate that William I's attempts at ruling both were successful but that William II, given the division of territory in 1087, had less success in Normandy where he faced the problem of his ducal elder brother. This is amply demonstrated in <b>Sources C, D and E</b>, although <b>E</b> demonstrates his final success, albeit with some neglect of England.</p> <p><b>Contextual knowledge</b> could be used to argue that William I as Duke of Normandy and king of England divided his time reasonably between his territories and was able to reduce rebellion in each with relative ease. William II faced a more serious situation because of the way the Conqueror divided his possessions and, in the end, the situation was only brought to a conclusion by the departure of Robert. In the meantime it led to destructive war in Normandy and kept William away from England. The financial exactions which resulted were another issue and candidates may be familiar with the example of William calling up the militia and then sending them home, after relieving them of the money they had brought for their expenses. But they could also argue that Ranulf Flambard kept England under control effectively.</p> <p>With regard to <b>provenance</b> candidates might suggest that the critics of the Norman kings are guilty of some extravagance of language with both <b>Sources B and D</b> referring to England and Normandy groaning under the strain of the conflict. In general most of the sources take an even-handed view. <b>Source A</b> is perhaps too sanguine about what happened in William I's absence, but <b>Source C</b>, from a chronicler not always sympathetic to William II as he based his work on a version of the A-S Chronicle, shows that William II was successful, at least in part, in 'disinheriting' his elder brother. Even the intervention of the French king did not help Robert that much. <b>Source D</b> is also eager to suggest that men of sound understanding prevailed, recognising that civil war benefited no-one and that William II was probably the better bet given his undisputed control of England. William of Malmesbury is here reflecting the view of a monk and probably also the results of his careful research. He certainly provides much detail on the attempt by William II to wrest control of Normandy from Robert and gives cautious approval to that in his handling of the Maine mediation. Henry of Huntingdon in <b>Source E</b> is in a position to take a broader perspective, once the outcome of the problem was an effective solution. It is therefore likely that candidates will conclude that there were moments of difficulty which caused some challenges to the first two Norman kings, particularly William II, but that they emerged successful in the end, partly through some good fortune. It should be borne in mind that <b>Sources B, C, D and E</b> were all written later in the reign of Henry I, undisputedly ruler of both territories, who had imprisoned his eldest brother Robert in Cardiff Castle. They may look over-favourably on the two Williams' attempts to control both lands. Reading between the lines in <b>Sources C and D</b> William II clearly had great difficulty before the Crusade in ousting his brother from Normandy.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>The sources share <b>similarities</b>. Both are royal responses to some of the rebel grievances, selecting items particularly significant to the government's interest. Both rebuke the people for taking upon themselves the king's authority. In <b>Source A</b>, Henry VIII calls the common people 'presumptuous' in criticising the King's choice of counsellors. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to explain that this referred to Thomas Cromwell and Richard Rich, named in the Pontefract articles of the following Yorkshire phase of the same rebellion – the 1536 Pilgrimage of Grace. <b>Source C</b> similarly claims, in the name of Edward VI, that the common people 'take my authority upon yourselves'. However, here the authorship is that of 'the Privy Council', in fact Protector Somerset in July 1549. The context of both sources is a time of religious, social and economic change – the Break with Rome and Dissolution of the monasteries in <b>Source A</b>, the First Prayer Book and dissolution of the chantries in <b>Source C</b> coupled with a price inflation blamed on enclosure.</p> <p>Both Sources claim that Parliament plays a part in rebels' grievances. In <b>Source A</b>, Henry claims that Parliament had passed the Dissolution Act of 1536, so the common people had no right to challenge this. He dismisses their complaint about the Statute of Uses as none of their affair, as it has been passed by the landed classes whom it concerns. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to point out that Cromwell had contrived immoral charges against monasteries and taken 6 years to make the Commons accept the Statute of Uses, which had caused heated debate.</p> <p>The <b>differences</b> are that inflation provides the <b>context</b> of both sources, but while <b>Source C</b> emphasises government attempts to deal with high prices and rents, <b>Source A</b> dismisses attempts to cancel a tax, justified by the costs of defence. In contrast, Somerset in <b>Source C</b> protests, on behalf of Edward, that parliament, though not presently in session, would reduce rents in future. Thus the government response in <b>Source C</b> is more conciliatory than Henry in <b>Source A</b>, perhaps because it is Somerset's protectorship that is in the firing line rather than Henry's monarchy. <b>Knowledge</b> of the likelihood of gentry MPs and Lords passing such a measure might inform evaluation. <b>Source C</b> claims that proclamations had regulated food prices and offers concessions on rents and wool prices. In contrast in <b>Source A</b>, Henry dismisses grievances on poor relief. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to evaluate these views. Both sources suggest the government did not heed people's grievances, as they had no say at this time.</p> <p><b>Provenance</b> might be used to evaluate the comparative reliability and use of the sources. The authorship of <b>Source A</b> is the king himself, while <b>Source C</b> is Somerset on behalf of the minor Edward VI. His claim of Privy Council involvement is less convincing, as he often bypassed the Council and issued proclamations on his own authority. Both adopt a haughty tone, but in</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u> 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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Source A</b> Henry VIII is more indignant, calling the rebels ‘presumptuous’, and ‘wondering at their ‘madness’. Likewise, <b>Source C</b> also ‘marvels’ at rebel boldness. <b>Source A</b> is very disparaging, calling the Lincolnshire rebels ‘rude common people of the most brutish and beastly county of the whole realm’ while <b>Source C</b> complains of the rebels ‘first arming’ and ‘violently demanding’ despite concessions already made. The main difference in approach is that Henry uses very emotive language and stands firm, while Somerset offers concessions. A substantiated judgement on the comparative value of the sources as evidence is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme. Candidates may refer to the utility of both in establishing a similar government response (the temerity of rebels), the value of ‘A’ lying in a monarchical response, the value of ‘C’ lying in the more uncertain government of a minor.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources may be grouped by interpretation. <b>Sources A, B and C</b> might be used to support the interpretation, but may also be used to support religious and political causes by cross-reference with <b>Sources D and E</b>. Weaker answers may lapse into general information about individual rebellions.</p> <p><b>Sources C, B and A support</b> the interpretation. <b>Source C</b> gives the strongest evidence for the importance of social and economic causes, as it focuses on food and wool prices, enclosures and rents. <b>Source B</b> states that the Western rebels complain of shortages of food and goods and <b>Sources A and B</b> mention complaints about tax, food shortages and a lack of poor relief, though Henry denies that the dissolution was responsible. <b>Knowledge</b> of Henry’s and Somerset’s policies – Acts, commissions and proclamations might be used to evaluate the validity of their replies – e.g. that Somerset had reformed ‘many other matters’. It might be argued that his attempt to appear humanitarian had caused further economic problems and that his commissions had encouraged enclosure riots. These sources suggest social causes, such as the sense that ‘the</p>	70	<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 conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>feet wished to rule the head', in <b>Source A</b> 'rude common people criticising their prince'. <b>Source C</b> suggests that class tensions had caused the rebels to 'take authority upon itself' and present 'bold' petitions. <b>Knowledge</b> of grievances against landlords and ministers might be used to extend these sources, in context of the rebels in these three sources being common people, unlike <b>D</b> and <b>E</b>, although '<b>A</b>' has some legal and gentry input.</p> <p>However, <b>Sources A</b> and <b>B</b> emphasise religious causes as strongly as social and economic ones. <b>Source A</b> refers to the Dissolution of the monasteries, and to certain 'Bishops' (Cranmer?) perhaps the most important of many causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace and <b>Source B</b> emphasises religious change, the attack on Catholic practices and the 1549 Prayer Book as the main causes of the Western Rebellion. There is a sense that Edward VI himself is the author of <b>Source B</b> rather than Somerset as indicated in the introduction, as it insists that he fully supports Protestant changes. Knowledge of the religious context of 1549 might develop religion as a cause of rebellion. Both rebellions, in <b>A</b> and <b>B</b>, had local, social and economic causes as well as religious and it had been the clergy who had drawn up their petition of grievances in both cases, an important evaluative point.</p> <p>Aspects of <b>Source D</b> and <b>E</b> also support religion as a main cause of rebellion, despite emphasis also on political causes. Simon Renard may be unreliable in stating in <b>Source D</b> that the main cause of Wyatt's rebellion was religion rather than the Spanish marriage, as he is writing to the Emperor, who will not wish his son's marriage plans to be undermined. Xenophobia and foreign involvement played a part in causing this rebellion, as in that of the Northern Earls in <b>Source E</b>. Northumberland's purpose here is to plead his cause and spread the blame. Again, the Catholic</p>		<p>A supported overall <b>judgement</b> is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious context. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>religion is stated as the main cause of the rebellion, though there are political causes concerning Elizabeth's failure to name an heir and a proposed marriage between Mary Queen of Scots and Norfolk. Politics and religion might be seen as intertwined in <b>Sources A, D and E</b>. Factional rivalry and criticism of ministers are hinted at in <b>A and E</b> and provide the context for all these sources. Perhaps it might be concluded that rebellions were multi-causal during this period. Certainly <b>Sources A, B and C</b> are reliable in that they address, directly, key grievances in the rebellions of 1536 and 1549, if only by listing them or repeating issues that may have been overly screened through a religious input, although Somerset via Edward in '<b>C</b>' is concerned to appear reforming and conciliatory on some social and economic grievances perhaps suggesting that these were the more important, not so in '<b>B</b>' on religious issues. <b>Source D and E</b> are less reliable, <b>D</b> reporting on rumours, <b>E</b> a statement extracted during imprisonment. <b>Source E</b> plays up religion and the succession and downplays any political threat to Elizabeth herself. This may suggest that religious issues were just a screen for political rebellion – it depends how candidates interpret the evidence. A supported overall <b>judgement</b> is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing context. No specific judgement is expected.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>The Sources have some <b>similarities</b> as evidence for the King's unwillingness to negotiate. In both the King seems reluctant to accept the Newcastle Propositions sent to him by Parliament and, in <b>Source A</b> only, those offered by the Scots. <b>Source A</b> might be seen as of less value than <b>Source C</b> as it is general and does not state specific proposals. <b>Knowledge</b> of these might be used to evaluate the King's response in <b>Source C</b>. In <b>Source A</b> the King is unwilling to negotiate and hopes to delay his reply for his own benefit. The date of <b>Source C</b> confirms that he did so, as it records his third answer to Parliament's Propositions more than ten months later. In <b>Source A</b> the King is unwilling to accept a Presbyterian settlement offered by the Scots or parliament, fearing loss of conscience, crown and honour. In <b>Source C</b> he is only willing to accept a Presbyterian settlement with significant conditions which would severely limit religious change. It might be inferred that, as this is his third reply, his two earlier answers had been less co-operative and he had been buying time. <b>Source A</b> suggests that he dislikes negotiation with the Scots as he is in the custody of the Scottish army - 'no honest man can prosper in these people's company'. This is confirmed by <b>Source C</b> where he wishes to come to London to discuss a settlement 'for better contact with Parliament'. In <b>Source C</b> the King does not give a straight answer to the proposals for a settlement, and this is similar to his statement in <b>Source A</b> that 'a flat refusal would put him in a difficult position'. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm his attempts to play his enemies off against each other which undermined their trust in him.</p> <p>However, it is likely that the Sources will be seen as more <b>different</b> than similar. In <b>Source A</b> the King seems ready to refuse the Propositions straight away on first reading them. In contrast <b>Source C</b> seems co-operative and willing to accept key aspects. He is willing to call home Prince Charles and offers a free pardon to combatants of both sides. In <b>Source A</b> the King states that the Scots wished him to accept a Presbyterian settlement 'to clip the king's wings' and shows his unwillingness to lose his royal power. He states that the Newcastle Propositions are against his 'conscience, crown and honour'. In <b>Source C</b> his conditions suggest an attempt to solve the problem of 'loss of conscience' (<b>Source A</b>) by making an exception of himself and his household, to use the old form of worship and Prayer Book, which might be considered to show his duplicity. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm Charles's crypto-Catholicism, and his support for the episcopacy during Laud's tenure. Thus in <b>Source C</b> his apparent willingness to accept a Presbyterian Church government for three years seems hypocritical and contradicts his comment in <b>Source A</b> that a Presbyterian settlement went against his conscience. This difference is also reflected in his desire to keep some control over the form of church settlement (he will add some of his 'own ministers' to consider the resulting religious settlement) despite ratifying the Westminster Assembly. He will also hand over the militia for ten years but desires control</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u> 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>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>thereafter, perhaps indicating his desire to retain royal military control in the long term. Thus in evaluation of content, <b>Source C</b> would seem to be less reliable, as Charles' acceptance of the Propositions run contrary to his deeply held beliefs about church and state. The reasons for these differences partly lie in their <b>provenance</b> and partly in the changing <b>context</b>.</p> <p>In discussing <b>provenance</b>, the Sources have clear <b>differences</b> in tone and nature. <b>Source A</b> is a private letter to his wife in which the King confides his negative feelings about the proposals for a settlement by Scots and Parliament. He confides his fears of the consequences of refusing them. In contrast, <b>Source C</b> is his official answer read out in the House of Commons, tailored to an audience of MPs, to try and retain as much power as he can while appearing to make concessions. Thus <b>Source A</b> has his true feelings towards a settlement, and <b>Source C</b> represents his considered offer with the purpose of retaining his power and position. The <b>context</b> of <b>Source A</b> is his confinement by the Scots, whereas <b>Source C</b> is published after the Scots have handed him over to Parliament in January 1647 and Parliament had become disenchanted with an increasingly restless New Model Army. Charles is back in the mainstream of settlement proposals in <b>Source C</b> and might be seen to be playing his divided enemies off against each other. Thus <b>Source C</b> might be seen to be factually more useful, although <b>Source A</b> might be considered more reliable concerning the King's true views on negotiations. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		
(b)	<p><b>Sources B, D and E</b> are useful to support the interpretation that divisions among the King's opponents were the main reason, whereas <b>Sources A and C</b> are useful for a counter argument that the untrustworthiness of the King was to blame. <b>Sources C and E</b> might be considered to have a dual use.</p> <p>The Sources are likely to be grouped for argument. <b>Sources B and D support the interpretation</b> that divisions among the Scots (also alluded to by the King in <b>Source A</b> - 17<sup>th</sup> June 1646) and between agitators and Independents in the New Model Army hindered negotiations with the King. The Presbyterian author of <b>Source B</b> claims that Independents are 'against being tied to any government' let alone a Presbyterian Church system, one of the terms of the Newcastle Propositions mentioned in <b>Sources A and C</b>. Thus the untrustworthy King might feel he is safe in accepting an element of Presbyterianism in <b>C</b>, knowing the Army was divided on this. The introduction to <b>Source B</b> states that Presbyterians considered the Independents to be a political threat as they desired total liberty of conscience, also hinted at by hearsay of Cromwell's views in <b>Source E</b>. The typicality and reliability of this view might be evaluated in light of provenance – Edwards is an outspoken minister and critic, and the title of his pamphlet is emotive, revealing it</p>	70	<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</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>as sectarian propaganda. Similarly, <b>Source D</b> uses an emotive tone. Here, a Scottish Presbyterian refers to elements of the Army who had marched on London as ‘silly rascals’ and ‘serpents’ and the Army overall as having ‘immeasurable pride’. An element of national feeling is suggested in the boast that the Scots army could crush them for the King if he required their help, a boast that events proved hollow. There might be some cross-reference with <b>Source A</b> here, as the context of Scottish custody of the King shows divisions among the Scots influencing negotiations, as the King felt he might play factions off against each other or gain their untied support against his English opponents. Similarly, <b>Source E</b> represents the Queen’s envoy’s one-sided view of discussions. His report contains hearsay of quarrels within the army over Cromwell’s sincerity and the influence of the Independents in the army. Divisions between Parliament and the Army are reported colourfully – the City of London and the Presbyterians ‘opposed the Army to the death’. Thus Parliamentary proposals are devalued in the King’s eyes and he responds very bitterly, recalling humiliating concessions he had made prior to the Civil War. <b>Source D</b> also reports the army’s capture of ‘King, Parliament and City’. Although <b>Source D</b> reports support and pity for the King, it also condemns his ‘unparalleled wilfulness’ so seems to adopt a more even-handed approach, perhaps because the author is an outsider writing from Edinburgh. Thus the supporting case is based on subjective sources, although their very subjectivity infers considerable division. <b>Knowledge</b> of Parliament’s attempts to reduce the power of the army, of Cornet Joyce’s seizure of the King, of the Solemn Engagement and the imminent Putney Debates might be used to develop and evaluate these views on the effect of divisions on negotiations.</p> <p>In contrast, <b>Sources A, C</b> and to an extent <b>D and E</b> might be cross-referenced to support the counter-argument that the King was to blame for the failure of negotiations during these years. <b>Source A</b> suggests that the King, in a private letter to his wife, revealed his true negativity towards the proposals on offer. He feared loss of his power, conscience and honour if he should accept either the Scottish or London propositions for a settlement. However, cross-reference with <b>Source C</b> reveals acceptance of key aspects with significant exceptions and conditions in his third public reply to Parliament’s Propositions. Evaluation of his trustworthiness might be informed with knowledge of his attempts to play off his divided enemies among themselves. <b>Source E</b> further casts doubts on the sincerity of his part in negotiating a settlement. Somewhat similar in subjectivity to <b>Source A, E</b> is based on Sir John Berkeley’s knowledge in acting as Henrietta Maria’s envoy at the discussions for a settlement in the summer of 1647. Writing under Charles II, he recalls the King’s bitter response to the Army’s proposals and his shame at having signed Strafford’s death warrant. His suggestion that the King felt his views were still powerful enough to</p>		<p>addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>prevent parliament's actions is feasible. Berkeley's <b>purpose</b> might be to enhance his reputation after the Restoration. <b>Knowledge</b> of Charles's personality might be used to support the charge of 'wilfulness' in <b>Source D</b> or manipulation in context of divisions between the Presbyterians, the army and the City of London. <b>Source C</b> is a reasonable representation of the King's 3<sup>rd</sup> answer, whereas <b>Source E</b> might be seen as less reliable than <b>Sources A</b> and <b>C</b>. It not only reports hearsay but in memoirs written during Charles II's reign, long after the event. Particularly its report on Cromwell might be exaggerated with the purpose of exonerating the King from criticism for not accepting a settlement. A judgement is expected. All the sources represent partisan views, although '<b>A</b>' is from one of the King's parties expressing its private views which may suggest the King as the main obstacle to a settlement. However the partisan views of <b>B, D and E</b> certainly suggest opposition divisions, especially Parliament versus the Army and Presbyterian versus Independent. No set conclusion is expected.</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 2014

