

# **History A (Schools History Project)**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Unit **A951/11-14**: Medicine Through Time/Crime and Punishment Through  
Time Development Study/Depth Study

## **Mark Scheme for June 2013**

---

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 2013

## SECTION A MEDICINE THROUGH TIME

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b><u>Study Sources A and B.</u></b>  <b><u>Are you surprised by these two sources? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Responds to the source at a common sense/everyday empathy level</b></p> <p>eg 'I am surprised by Source B because it is not very nice calling Galen a liar.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Analyses sources in context but fails to state whether surprised or not</b></p> <p>eg 'Source A shows a dissection taking place. This is when they took a body apart to understand it better. This was beginning to be done a lot more at this time. Before then dissections were banned.'</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1–2</p> <p>1</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 2 Uses contextual knowledge to explain whether surprised by source(s) – used separately</b></p> <p>eg ‘Source A shows a dissection taking place. This does not surprise me at all because it is from 1494 and this is when things were beginning to change. This was about the time when the Medical Renaissance was starting and more dissections were taking place to find out more about the human body.’</p> <p>eg ‘I am not surprised by this source because I know that what is happening is that the teacher would read from Galen’s book and someone would point to the right part of the body. This is how they taught medical students at that time. This is why it is not surprising.’</p> <p><b>Level 3 Uses contextual knowledge to explain whether surprised by the two sources used together</b></p> <p>eg ‘I am very surprised by these two sources. In Source B it says that they should stop just learning from books like Galen’s. However, Source A which comes from before Source B shows them learning about the body from dissections and not from books. So I am surprised by what is being said in Source B.’</p> <p>eg ‘I am not surprised by these sources. Source B is saying that it is best to learn about the body from people and practical experience and not from books. However, Source A shows that they have gone beyond using Galen’s book, they are carrying out a dissection to learn about the body. So the two sources agree and I’m not surprised.’</p>	<p>3–4</p> <p>5</p>	<p>3 marks for 1 source, 4 marks for both.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Study Source C.</u></b>  <b><u>In what ways is this source useful to an historian studying the Medical Renaissance? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions lacking any support or explanation</b></p> <p>eg 'This source is not useful because it does not tell us anything about the Medical Renaissance.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on surface information in the source</b></p> <p>eg 'This source is very useful because it tells me about the treatments they used at that time. It tells me that they used bleeding and laxatives.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on provenance/typicality</b></p> <p>eg 'This source is very useful because it comes from the time and is by the doctor who was there so it must be right.'</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 3 Answers that use contextual knowledge to explain the treatments in the source</b></p> <p>eg 'The source tells me they used Bezoar which was meant to have magical effects.'</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Undeveloped assertions that it shows that old treatments were continuing or that the Renaissance did not change anything</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Contextual knowledge used to relate the treatments in the source to the Medical Renaissance</b></p> <p>eg 'This source is very useful as evidence about the Medical Renaissance because it shows that the old treatments were carrying on despite all the developments in the Renaissance. They are still using bleeding although Harvey had shown that blood circulates around the body.'</p>	<p>3</p>          <p>4–5</p>	<p>Candidates might argue that the Renaissance did not change medical treatments although it came up with many new ideas.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>Study Source D. Why was this cartoon published?</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that fail to address the issue of reasons for publication</b></p> <p>eg 'This source shows that there were lots of quack doctors around at that time and that people were making fun of them. They did not think that they were proper doctors.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on surface information</b></p> <p>eg 'This cartoon was published to tell people that quacks went around dressed in black. The sign says no quackery.'</p> <p>or</p> <p><b>Level 2 General assertions that it was published to show what quacks were like</b></p> <p>or</p> <p><b>Claims cartoon is making fun of quacks, but misunderstands what quacks were</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 3 Valid message identified/explained – critical, making fun of quacks</b></p> <p>3 marks for identifying the message, 4 marks for explaining either through contextual knowledge or source use.</p> <p>eg ‘This cartoon was published to tell everyone that quacks were no good. Quacks were not properly trained doctors and they pretended to have cures that could cure any disease. They went around the country selling their medicines which were usually no use at all.’</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies valid purpose eg to discourage people from using quacks</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Answers that explain a valid purpose either by contextual knowledge or source use</b></p> <p>eg ‘This cartoon was published to say that quacks were no good. The cartoon is trying to get people to stop using quacks because they were no good. The cartoon is making fun of them by showing all the ducks running round and by saying that they cured people by skinning them alive which is clearly nonsense. This was to make fun of them and tell people not to trust quacks.’</p>	<p>3–4</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p>	



Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)	<p><b>Briefly describe what happened at an Asclepion.</b></p> <p>Target: AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: Patients prayed to be cured and gave offerings to the god, patients slept in the abaton, and while asleep they were visited by Asclepios and his daughters. They cured the patient. People also went there to bathe and meditate, go to the gymnasium and to exercise.</p> <p>eg 'The Greeks would go there to be cured by the god. When they were asleep they were visited by the god and cured.' (2)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why the theory of the Four Humours was important to Greek medicine.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'It was very important because without it they would not be able to make any progress in medicine.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific reasons</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: a natural theory, gave them natural treatments, it fitted in with ideas of their philosophers about the universe, it was based on observation of the body, it led to blood-letting, it led to sensible ideas such as a balanced diet.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes/explains the theory of Four Humours (max 3)</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>2–3</p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>Level 3 Explain one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg ‘The theory of the Four Humours was very important to the Greeks because it gave them lots of treatments they could use. It led to treatments like blood-letting and having a balanced diet. The Theory made them think that to stay healthy you needed to keep the humours in balance. Blood-letting was used when the body had too much blood and helped to get the humours back into balance.’</p>	5–6	
		<p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	7	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The Egyptians contributed more than the Romans to the development of medicine.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Written communication assessed in this question.</b></p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I think the Egyptians contributed more because they thought more carefully about things and came up with many more new ways of dealing with illness which the Romans did not.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies examples of contribution of Egyptians or Romans</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: Romans – public health, work of Galen – the opposites, anatomy, physiology; Egyptians – the channel theory, knowledge of inside of body, recording findings, use of examination, diagnosis and prognosis, specialist doctors.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 3 Identifies examples of contribution of Egyptians and Romans</b></p>	4	
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains either the contribution of the Egyptians or of the Romans</b></p>	5–6	
	<p>eg 'I think the Romans contributed more because of the work of Galen. He made new discoveries in how the body works and what is in it. He wrote books about this and these books and his ideas were used all the way through the Middle Ages. Doctors used his books to help them do their work. His ideas fitted in with Christian beliefs and this is why people were happy just to accept all his ideas.'</p>		
	<p><b>Level 5 Explains the contribution of both the Egyptians and the Romans</b></p>	7	
	<p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about 'how far'.</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual, but valid attempts eg the Romans contributed more because Galen's ideas were central to medicine throughout the Middle Ages while the Egyptians had no long-lasting impact.</p>	8	
	<p>Spelling punctuation and grammar</p>	6	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe nursing in the first half of the nineteenth century.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: not trained, poorly educated and paid, often worked in people’s homes – neglected patients, got drunk.</p> <p>eg ‘Nurses did not do their job very well. They were usually employed privately to work in people’s homes. They were often old, untrained women who fell asleep or got drunk instead of looking after their patients.’</p> <p>(5)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why the work of Lister was important in the later nineteenth century.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg ‘His work was very important because he helped a lot of people get better. They would have died without his ideas.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific reasons</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: many patients were dying from infection, antiseptics, carbolic spray, insisted surgeons cleaned clothes and equipment with carbolic, realises it is not the air but the microbes in the air doing the damage, developed antiseptic ligatures, his methods were copied all over Europe and the USA.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes Lister’s work</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg ‘Lister was important because before his work many people died during surgery. This was because of infections. The operations were carried out in dirty conditions and the patients would die from gangrene. Lister’s methods reduced the death rate in operations.’</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'Who was more important in the history of medicine, Florence Nightingale or Mary Seacole?'</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Written communication assessed in this question.</b></p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I think that Florence Nightingale was far more important. She was more well known and her work with patients was far more important than the work done by Mary Seacole.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons why Nightingale or Seacole were important</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: Nightingale – helping soldiers in the Crimea, set up a nursing school, turned nursing into a respectable profession, redesigned hospitals, emphasis on sanitation, ventilation and the right food, trained midwives; Seacole – helped soldiers in the Crimea, carried out surgery, had a lot of practical experience, regarded as a hero in England when she returned, no more use made of her expertise.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes what Nightingale/Seacole did</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons why Nightingale and Seacole were important</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	<p>Include in this level descriptions of what Nightingale or Seacole did.</p> <p>Include in this level descriptions of what Nightingale or Seacole did.</p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains why either Nightingale or Seacole were important in the history of medicine</b></p> <p>To be placed in this level answers must address ‘in the history of medicine’ ie why they were important either because of how they improved the situation compared with what had gone before or they made further developments possible in the future.</p> <p>eg ‘I think that Florence Nightingale was more important. This is because although Mary Seacole cared for soldiers in the Crimea her work had no long lasting effect. When she returned to England she was not involved in hospitals and she contributed little to the development of medicine.’</p>	5–6	
	<p><b>Level 5 Explains why both Nightingale and Seacole were important in the history of medicine</b></p>	7	
	<p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about ‘more important’.</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg Nightingale started long-term developments such as the development of nursing schools but Seacole had no long-term impact as she did little after caring for Soldiers in the Crimea.</p>	8	
	<p>Spelling, punctuation and grammar</p>	6	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe one example of chance from the nineteenth or twentieth century which affected the development of medicine.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid part of the story identified.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: Pasteur's assistant forgetting to inject chickens and leaving the germs exposed, Pasteur being asked to look into the problems of the wine industry and the development of pasteurisation, Fleming and his messy lab and the discovery of penicillin, allow Jenner.</p> <p>eg 'Chance was important when Pasteur was trying to find out how vaccination works. He was injecting chickens with chicken cholera when his assistant left some of the germs on a shelf when he went on holiday. He injected the germs when he returned but the germs had become weaker and the chickens did not die. This allowed Pasteur to work out that vaccination worked through the use of weaker version of the germs building up resistance.' (5)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain how religion held back medical developments in the nineteenth century.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'Religion held back medical developments because it meant that people believed that God caused disease and made people better so this meant that they did not bother to find new treatments or did not investigate disease.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific examples</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: opposition to vaccination, opposition to anaesthetics.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Tells a relevant story</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'Religion was responsible for opposition to anaesthetics being used in operations. When Simpson developed chloroform some people opposed it. They said that God wanted childbirth to be painful and to take the pain away was going against God's will. So this stopped anaesthetics being accepted as quickly as they might have been.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'Governments did little to develop public health and medicine in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Written communication assessed in this question.</b></p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I think governments did a lot to improve medicine. There were many important developments that would not have got off the ground without governments.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies examples of helping or not helping</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: helped – public health reform in nineteenth century, funded Pasteur's work, funded development of penicillin, NHS; did little to help – opposition to improving public health in nineteenth century, refused to fund development of penicillin.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 3 Identifies examples of helping and not helping</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains examples of either helping or not helping</b></p> <p>eg 'I think governments helped a lot. When penicillin needed to be mass produced in the Second World War the American government stepped in and funded American chemical countries to mass produce penicillin in enormous vats. They wanted this for their troops because they had just entered the war.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains examples of both helping and not helping</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about 'how far'.</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual, but valid attempts eg in certain examples eg public health there was an initial reluctance to do anything but it was only government that could do anything important and when they did step in they made an enormous difference.</p> <p>Spelling, punctuation and grammar</p>	<p>4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>6</p>	

## SECTION A CRIME AND PUNISHMENT THROUGH TIME

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b><u>Study Source A. How useful is this source as evidence about smuggling? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Rejects the source as useful</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on surface information</b></p> <p>eg 'I think this source is useful because it shows all the taxes people had to pay.'</p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers that infer attitude/purpose or infer it is saying that taxes cause smuggling or use contextual knowledge to explain aspects of smuggling this source does not tell you about.</b></p> <p>eg 'I think this source is useful because it tells you that there were lots of people who opposed paying all the taxes at that time.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Answers that cover two aspects of Level 3</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3-4</p> <p>5</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Study Sources B and C. Why do these two sources give such different impressions of smugglers? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Describes the differences rather than explaining the reasons for them</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on undeveloped use of provenance</b></p> <p>eg ‘These two sources are so different because one was published in the eighteenth century and the other was published in the twentieth century.’</p> <p><b>Level 3 Uses contextual knowledge to explain that they are showing different aspects of the smugglers or different perceptions of the smugglers</b></p> <p>eg ‘These two sources are different because they show the different sides of smugglers. Some smugglers were very violent and the Hawkhurst Gang were one of the worst gangs. They did kill people and attacked revenue officers. But smugglers were also supported by the local population and many people would buy goods from them because they were cheaper. Source B shows a parson buying tea from a smuggler. This was very common.’</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3–4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Answers based on developed use of provenance or purpose</b></p> <p>These answers will explain that Source B was published for children and so will not focus on the vicious side of smuggling – must contain use of the impression given of the smuggler; Source C was published at the time to warn people of smugglers or to discredit them – must contain use of the impression given of the smugglers.</p>	4–5	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>Study Source D. How far does this source explain why the government found it difficult to catch and punish smugglers. Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Undeveloped rejections of the source</b></p> <p>eg 'This source is not useful because it only describes one part of the country.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers restricted to the information in the source</b></p> <p>eg 'This source is very useful because it tells us that the smugglers were not being caught because the people were meant to catch them were corrupt and were not trying to catch them.'</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Acceptance of the source because it is written by a customs official.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers that explain other reasons</b></p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Evaluates Source D in terms of motive/purpose</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3–4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Answers that explain the reason in the source and other reasons</b></p> <p>eg 'This source does not fully explain why the government found it difficult to catch smugglers because local people supported them and refused to give evidence against them. However the source does tell us the crews of revenue ships were bribed to turn a blind eye and because of the isolated nature of the coast off Ventor they could not be apprehended on land.'</p>	5	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe how tithings worked.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Points might include: a group of ten men, all males over the age of 12 had to belong to one, they were responsible for each other's behaviour, if one broke the law, the others had to bring him to court.</p> <p>eg 'A tithing was a group of 10 men. If one of them broke the law the others had to take him to court to be fined.' (3)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain how medieval men and women were treated differently by the law.</u></b></p> <p>AO 1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'Women were treated differently because they were not punished so harshly for some crimes but for other crimes they had very harsh punishments.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific examples</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Examples include: when married lost many of their rights eg own property, she could not divorce her husband, only sons inherited if there were sons and daughters, women were punished as scolds, women were punished as witches, women could not sit in judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific example</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one example explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'Women were treated differently because the Church told everyone that women were inferior to men. This meant that when a woman got married she lost nearly all of her rights. All her property belonged to her husband, she was not allowed to own anything.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific example</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'By the end of the Middle Ages the monarchy had successfully established law and order across the country.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p>Written communication assessed in this question.</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I agree with this because I think that by the end of the Middle Ages law and order was much better than at the beginning. This was because of all the changes introduced by the kings of the time. Their reforms meant that they were really in control.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons for agreeing or for disagreeing</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: agreeing – the extension of the King's peace, travelling royal judges, royal courts established around the country; not agreeing – outlaws like Robin Hood, problem of over-mighty subjects, rivalry with Church eg benefit of clergy or sanctuary, no police force.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes the system of royal justice</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons for agreeing and for disagreeing</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains reasons for agreeing or disagreeing</b></p> <p>eg 'I do not agree with this because the kings found it very difficult to control all the important landowners. They often had armies of their own and could ignore the king if they wanted to. Some of these nobles ran their part of the country themselves and the king's law was often broken by them. JPs were not powerful enough to stand up to them. These over-mighty subjects were able to intimidate and bully juries.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains reasons for agreeing and for disagreeing</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about 'how far'.</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg the idea of the King's peace meant that any crime was now against the king, even if the law was not enforced everywhere the idea that the king's authority ran everywhere was a crucial step forward.</p> <p>Spelling, punctuation and grammar</p>	<p>4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>6</p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the main features of the Bloody Code</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: harsh punishments to deter, executions for minor offences, to protect property, crimes such as poaching were targeted.</p> <p>eg ‘The Bloody Code meant that punishments became harsher. The death penalty was used even for small crimes.’ (2)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why highway robbery was a serious problem for the authorities in the eighteenth century.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'Highway robbery was a very serious problem because there was so much of it. People were robbed of their wealth and the government found it hard to do anything about it.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons why highway robbery was a serious problem</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: it was on the increase, the violence used, difficulty of stopping it in lonely places, local constables did nothing about it, more people were travelling in coaches, many rich or important people were robbed.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes highway robbery</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'Highway robbery was a serious problem because it became very common in the eighteenth century. This was because of the massive increase in the number of people travelling in coaches. This gave the robbers more opportunities and more people were robbed. This is why it became a serious problem for the authorities.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'Transportation was a failure.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>Target AO1, 2</p> <p>Written communication assessed in this question.</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I think it was a failure. This was because people were not caught or punished properly and they got away with their crimes.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons/examples of success or failure</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: failure – not a deterrent because of tickets of leave, wages were higher in Australia so seen as an opportunity, discovery of gold in Australia, it was very expensive and so replaced by prisons; success – courts were keen to use it as a punishment, it was an effective deterrent – people never saw their families again, treatment in Australia was often very harsh, it did successfully reform some convicts.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes transportation</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons/examples of success and failure</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains how/why it was a success or a failure</b></p> <p>eg 'I think it was a great failure. This is because the conditions for poor people in England were terrible. Many were unemployed and wages were low. When they were sent to Australia they could be given their freedom after a time and then there were lots of opportunities to build a rich and successful life – far more than in England. This meant that people were no longer scared by being sent there and so it was not a success as a punishment.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains how/why it was a success and a failure</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about 'how far'.</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg despite arguments for and against it the government stopped using it and replaced it with prisons so it could not have been working.</p> <p>Spelling, punctuation and grammar</p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>6</p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe how the police force was established by Peel in 1829.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: failings of existing system, increased fear of crime, taxation, based on Bow Street Runners, started with 3200 men, given a uniform, recruits of poor quality.</p> <p>eg ‘Peel had already set up the Bow Street Runners. They patrolled the London streets by day. Peel based the police force on them.’ (3)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain the causes of the Rebecca Riots.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'They were caused because people were very unhappy and had lots of grievances. They wanted lots of changes.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons for Rebecca Riots</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: tollgates and rising tolls, lots of different turnpike trusts, need for farmers to use roads, tithes, New Poor Law.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes the Rebecca Riots</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'The Rebecca Riots were caused by the tollgates on the roads that the farmers had to use. They need to transport lime on the roads and used them a lot. When the tolls kept going up the farmers, who were very poor anyway, could not afford them and so this led to the riots.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The authorities dealt successfully with the protests at Peterloo.'</u></b>  <b><u>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p>Written communication assessed in this question.</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I don't think they dealt with the protests very well because there was lots of trouble and people got hurt.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies examples of success or failure</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: success – the protests were dispersed, Hunt and others were arrested, the passing of the Six Acts; failure – over reaction by yeomanry, great anger and opposition to government followed, turned a peaceful meeting into a violent riot.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes what happened</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies examples of success and failure</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains success or failure</b></p> <p>eg 'I think that they did not deal with the protests very successfully. This is because it started off as a peaceful meeting with lots of women and children there. There was a happy atmosphere. However, the panic by the magistrates and the yeomanry turned it into a slaughter. The yeomanry rose into the crowd with their swords and killed and wounded many people. This was not a success.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains success and failure</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about 'how far'</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg ended in the Six Acts which destroyed agitation for reform until 1830s.</p> <p>Spelling, punctuation and grammar</p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>6</p>	

## SECTION B ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)	<p><b><u>Study Source A. Why did Elizabeth write this letter? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers based on surface details</b></p> <p>eg 'Elizabeth wrote this letter to say to Mary that her actions were vile and to say goodbye to her.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies context or explains message without contextual explanation</b></p> <p>These answers either identify the fact that this is when Elizabeth had accepted that Mary should be executed or explain what Elizabeth is saying in the letter but without contextual explanation eg 'Elizabeth was telling Mary that she has decided she must have her executed.'</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains the context of the letter</b></p> <p>These answers might explain Mary's history of being involved in plots, the Babington plot and its consequences, or Elizabeth's reluctance up until now to have Mary executed. Answers will fail to use the content of the source.</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains valid purpose</b></p> <p>Candidates might, for example, explain that Elizabeth is trying to justify the decision to have Mary executed.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3–4</p> <p>5</p>	

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p><b>Level 5 Explains message or purpose in context</b></p> <p>eg 'Elizabeth wrote this letter to tell Mary that she could not tolerate her involvement in plots any longer. The letter is really telling Mary that she will be executed. You can tell this because Elizabeth is saying goodbye to her. Mary had been involved in lots of plots and the Babington Plot was the last straw. Walsingham was able to prove to Elizabeth that Mary was involved and the pressure grew on Elizabeth to agree to the execution.'</p>	6-7	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Study Sources B and C. In what ways do these two sources differ. Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Surface description of one or both source(s) – no comparison, no inferences – or undeveloped provenance – no comparison</b></p> <p>eg ‘Source B shows Mary being executed. It shows that lots of people were watching.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Compares surface features of sources – no inferences – or compares provenance</b></p> <p>eg ‘These sources do differ because Source C is more of a close-up of Mary’s execution. It shows Mary more clearly but Source B shows you how many people were there which Source C does not do.’</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains impression(s) given of Mary and the execution – no comparison</b></p> <p>eg ‘These two sources differ because Source C is very sympathetic towards Mary. The artist shows her to be innocent. She is dressed in white and is surrounded by her executioners who are dressed in black and made to look like brutes.’</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Compares impressions but these are not explained</b></p> <p>eg ‘These two sources do differ. Source C shows Mary to be pretty and innocent but Source B just seems to be a factual drawing.’</p> <p><b>Level 4 Compares the impressions of Mary and the execution given by the sources</b></p>	<p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5–6</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>Study Source D. Are you surprised by this source? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that do not explain whether surprised or not</b></p> <p>eg 'Elizabeth seems to be upset in this source about Mary's execution. In Source A she seemed to agree to the execution.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on everyday empathy or answers based on internal logic of source</b></p> <p>These answers will be limited to the source and will suggest eg that they are not surprised because she is writing to Mary's son and so will not want to upset him.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers based on source content and provenance only, no contextual knowledge</b></p> <p>These answers will explain eg that they are not surprised because Elizabeth needs to keep on good relations with James because he is king of Scotland or because he is the heir to the English throne.</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1–2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	
	<p><b>Level 4 Contextual explanation of why surprised (can include cross reference to Source A)</b></p> <p>eg 'I am surprised by this source. Elizabeth agreed to the execution in Source A after she knew about the Babington Plot and so it is surprising that in this source she is claiming that she did not want the execution to take place.'</p>	5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 5 Contextual explanation of why not surprised</b></p> <p>Answers might explain Elizabeth's reluctance to have Mary executed or the events surrounding Mary's execution where it does appear that Elizabeth was tricked, or develop explanations about relations with Scotland/James.</p>	6-7	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the religious problems faced by Elizabeth when she became Queen in 1558.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Problems might include: England divided between Catholics and Protestants, persecution of Protestants in Mary's reign, demands for a strong Protestant settlement, returning extreme Protestants from exile.</p> <p>eg 'The religious situation in 1558 was bad. Because of the way that Mary had persecuted Protestants the country was divided between Catholics and Protestants. Many Protestants wanted revenge on the Catholics.' (3)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain what Elizabeth hoped to achieve by her Religious Settlement of 1559.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'Elizabeth was hoping that everyone would like her religious settlement and that it would go down really well. This was very important for Elizabeth.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific hopes/aims</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Hopes/aims: to unify the country, to allow Catholics to worship without causing trouble, to have a moderate Church, to keep the outward trappings of old Church, to have a mainly Protestant doctrine, to win people's loyalty.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes aspects of Religious Settlement</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific hope/aim</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'I think that Elizabeth was trying to keep the Church looking the same as it did in the past. This would make it easier for people to accept. So things like the vestments of the clergy and ornaments and decorations in the churches were kept. This would allow Catholics to accept the new Church.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific hope/aim</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'Neither Catholics nor Puritans ever really accepted Elizabeth's Religious Settlement.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'They didn't really like the Religious Settlement and this is why they caused a lot of trouble over it for the rest of Elizabeth's reign.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons/examples of acceptance/non acceptance by Catholics or Puritans</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: Catholics: liked some features such as structure and outward features and services, able to interpret as they liked; against – idea of Elizabeth as head of the Church, support for Jesuits, disliked Elizabeth's stricter enforcement during parts of the reign, but many able to attend church and worship secretly; Puritans – liked the fact that it was not catholic, disliked vestments and other catholic trappings, disliked the organisation and structure, wanted a more democratic model, opposition throughout the reign, printing campaigns, stricter enforcement by Whitgift lead to resentment, different reactions from different sorts of Puritans.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes examples/what they did</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons/examples of acceptance/non acceptance by Catholics and Puritans</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains why/how Catholics or Puritans did/did not accept it</b></p> <p>eg 'Catholics were able to accept the Religious Settlement. They were able to recognise Elizabeth as Queen and did not support rebellions against her. This shows that most were not out to cause trouble. As long as Elizabeth's government let them attend the church services and then go away and secretly worship in the catholic way they were happy to go along with the Religious Settlement because it was not stopping them from worshipping in their own way in their own houses.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains why/how Catholics and Puritans did/did not accept it</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about who did/did not accept it the most.</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg Catholics accepted her as Queen far more than they accepted her Church which went against some of their basic beliefs while many Puritans were able to accept most of the Church.</p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the activities of vagrants in Elizabeth's reign</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: stole, pretended to be ill/lame/helpless, begged, stole clothes from washing lines, sucked soap to appear ill, pretended to be mad, gathered together in large groups and terrorised villages.</p> <p>eg 'Vagrants like Abraham men pretended to be mad by walking around half naked and making strange wailing noises.' (3)</p>	1–5	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain the different ways in which the authorities dealt with the poor during Elizabeth's reign.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'The authorities dealt with the poor in many different ways. Some of these ways were better than others. But they had real problems with the poor and didn't really know what to do.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies different ways</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: flogged, burnt on the ear, hanged, House of Correction, hospitals for the poor, set to work, the Poor Law.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific way</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified</p> <p>eg 'They did this by setting up the Elizabethan Poor law. This gave children apprenticeships and helped the old and sick by setting up almshouses for them to live in. The unemployed were given materials and tools so that they could work.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explain more than one specific way</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The poor posed a greater threat than the theatre to Elizabeth.'</u></b>  <b><u>How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I think the poor posed a greater threat because people were really scared of them. They were a big problem at that time and the government struggled to deal with them.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons why the poor or the theatre was a threat</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: the poor – moved around from original parishes, seen as a threat to stability, gathered together in large groups and threatened villages, dangerous in time of rebellions; the theatre – plays used for political messages, the crowds of vagrants, prostitutes and others outside theatres, the crimes that took place there eg pickpocketing, danger to morals.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes the poor and/or the theatre</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons why the poor and the theatre were threats</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains why the poor or the theatre was a threat</b></p> <p>eg 'I think the theatre was much more of a threat. This was because some people used the theatre and the plays to send out political messages. This meant that plays could be used to stir up rebellion. The theatre was very popular and so many people would see this. This happened with the rebellion by the Earl of Essex although it didn't do him much good.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains why both the poor and the theatre were a threat</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about which posed a greater threat</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg the theatre could be used for direct political purposes eg attacking a monarch whereas the poor did not have such political aims.</p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p>	

## SECTION B BRITAIN 1815–1851

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5 (a)	<p><b><u>Study Source A. Why was this source published in 1831? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers based on surface descriptions – the source was published simply to convey information</b></p> <p>eg ‘This source was published to tell people what the riots were like. It shows they were bad. It looks as if Bristol is being smashed up.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on identifying the context – not explained, or identifies valid message or purpose – not explained</b></p> <p>eg ‘This drawing was published in 1831 because this is when they wanted reform of Parliament.’</p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers restricted to the context of 1831 and the campaign for electoral reform – no message or purpose</b></p> <p>eg ‘This source was published in 1831 because this was when the reform Bill was going through Parliament. The Tories and the House of Lords wanted to stop the reform and these demonstrations were taking place to put pressure on Parliament to pass the reforms.’</p> <p><b>Level 4 Contextual answers explaining message</b></p> <p>eg ‘This drawing was published in 1831 to tell people how dangerous the reforms were. It shows that the rioters are wrecking everything and says that they do not deserve the vote because they will not be able to govern the country properly.’</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1–2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4–5</p> <p>6</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 5 Contextual answers explaining purpose</b></p> <p>eg 'This drawing was published in 1831 to try and persuade people that reform was needed. It shows that if reform was not passed there could be a revolution like in France. The drawing was published to persuade people to support the reform of Parliament.'</p> <p>eg 'This drawing was published in 1831 to discredit those supporting parliamentary reform. They are made to look drunk and this suggested that they were not the right kind of people to be given the vote.'</p>	7	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Study Source B. Does this source prove that the 1832 Reform Act achieved what its supporters wanted? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that paraphrase the source – not directed at the question</b></p> <p>eg ‘This source shows that the stability of the government will be destroyed and that influence will be lost if a secret ballot is introduced.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers that use evidence from the source to argue that it did achieve something or that it did not achieve anything</b></p> <p>eg ‘This source tells me that it did give the supporters what they wanted. It says that there was one man, one vote.’</p> <p>eg ‘This source shows that they did not get a secret ballot which they wanted.’</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Answers that ignore the source and use contextual knowledge to explain if the supporters got what they wanted.</b></p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Assertions that Peel was an opponent of reform therefore he cannot be trusted.</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers that use evidence from the sources to argue that it did and did not achieve anything</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1–2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p><b>Level 4 Contextual knowledge used to explain that they did or did not get what they wanted</b></p> <p>These answers will either will use contextual knowledge to test the claims made by Peel or will use contextual knowledge to explain that Peel was an opponent of reform and so is making a case against further reform therefore he cannot be trusted.</p> <p><b>Level 5 Contextual knowledge used to explain that they did and did not get what they wanted</b></p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>Study Source C. Are you surprised by this source? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that fail to explain whether surprised or not</b></p> <p>eg 'This source shows that Lovett did not approve of O'Connor. This was because O'Connor believed in using violence to get what the Chartists wanted but Lovett believed in using peaceful methods.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Surprised because both Lovett and O'Connor were Chartist leaders so it is surprising to see one criticising the other</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Not surprised/surprised about one aspect of the source rather than about Lovett's overall argument</b></p> <p>eg 'I am not surprised that the source is criticising O'Connor for his behaviour because he was very extreme and put a lot of people off Chartism.'</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Identifies but does not explain a valid reason for being not surprised</b></p> <p>eg 'I am not surprised by this source because there were two sides to Chartism – physical force and moral force.'</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Not surprised that Lovett is trying to justify his position later.</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3–4</p>	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Contextual answers that explain no surprise by focusing on the differences between O'Connor and Lovett, or between physical force and moral force</b></p> <p>eg 'I am not surprised that Lovett is criticising O'Connor. They were both leaders of the Chartists but believed in very different methods. Lovett wanted to use peaceful methods like petitions and marches but O'Connor believed that force should be used if they were not getting anywhere. Lovett is criticising O'Connor and physical force because he thought that it would turn people off Chartism.'</p>	5-6	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the hardships experienced by poor people around 1815.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: the slump after the war, unemployment, jobs replaced by machines (Luddites), no unemployment money, high corn prices, seasonal nature of some employment, damp living conditions, long working hours.</p> <p>eg ‘The poor suffered badly because people were being put out of work by machines. People like hand-loom weavers lost their work and they attacked the machines in revenge.’ (3)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why some people criticised the Speenhamland System of poor relief.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answers. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'People criticised it because they thought that it did not work very well and it was making the situation worse.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific reason</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Examples include: too expensive, encouraged people to have lots of children or not to find work, led to laziness, led to moral decline, rates too high, people should sort out their own problems.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes Speenhamland system</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'They did this because they thought that it encouraged people to have lots of children. As the system paid people more, the more children they had it encouraged people to have large families. They argued that this simply made the situation worse and meant there were more mouths to feed and support.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explain more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The conditions inside the workhouses were the main reason why some people opposed the New poor law of 1834.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer</b></p> <p>Target AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge</p> <p>eg 'I agree with this. People opposed it because I would not like to be in a horrible workhouse.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons for agreeing or for disagreeing</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: splitting families, no outdoor relief, harsh discipline, not suitable for north.</p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes the opposition</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons for agreeing and for not agreeing</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains reasons for agreeing and for not agreeing</b></p> <p>eg 'I agree that it was the conditions in the workhouse. When people were admitted, families were split up and mothers were separated from their children. Also there was very harsh discipline from the overseers who punished people for not following petty rules!'</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5–6</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p data-bbox="344 215 1122 247"><b>Level 5 Explains reasons for agreeing and not agreeing</b></p> <p data-bbox="344 284 1267 347"><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about where most opposition came from</b></p> <p data-bbox="344 384 1290 584">Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg reasons outside the workhouse were more important because they led to riots whereas people inside could do little about it.</p>	<p data-bbox="1361 215 1391 247">7</p> <p data-bbox="1361 284 1391 316">8</p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the building of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge. This includes answers that are about railway building in general and not about this railway in particular.</p> <p>Examples might include: crossing Chat Moss using floating platforms, the Olive Mount cutting, the building of the Sankey Viaduct over the Sankey Brook, boring the tunnel out of solid rock outside Liverpool.</p> <p>eg ‘The railway had to cross Chat Moss which was very boggy. Stephenson drained the land and then put down moss and brushwood with earth and gravel. This held the track above the bog.’ (4)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain how the development of the railways benefited the British people.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'It benefited them because they could move about and it improved the quality of their lives. It was an important development.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific examples</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation. Reasons include: better diet because of fresh and different food, seaside holidays, jobs on the railways and building trains and equipment, shareholders did well, development of suburbs, the Chartists used them.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific example</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one example explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'The British people did benefit from the railways because they provided lots of jobs. There were all kinds of new jobs created by the railways like drivers and ticket inspectors. The engines and carriages had to be built and so there were more jobs there as well in places like Swindon.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific example</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The main opposition to the development of the railways came from the landowners.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I agree with this. The rich people with lots of land did not like the railways at all and so they opposed it a lot. They were much more important than other groups that opposed the railways.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons for agreeing or for disagreeing</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: agreeing – crossed their land, danger to animals, worried that the masses would be exposed to new dangerous political ideas; disagreeing – canal companies, stage coach companies, turnpike trusts, scared of the speed, early accidents.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes the opposition</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons for agreeing and for not agreeing</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains reasons for agreeing or for not agreeing</b></p> <p>eg 'I agree that the main opposition was from landowners. They led the opposition because the railways led to newspapers being sent around the country more quickly and to political speakers like the Chartists being able to get all parts of the country. The landowners ran the country and they were worried that new ideas would make the workers start to demand reforms and cause trouble.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains reasons for agreeing and for not agreeing</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about where most opposition came from</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg the landowners had more political power so their opposition mattered more than eg from stage-coach companies.</p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p>	

## SECTION B THE AMERICAN WEST 1840–1895

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	(a)	<p><b><u>Study Source A. Does this source prove that the settlers' journey west was an easy one? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers based on surface information – no contextual knowledge of railways demonstrated</b></p> <p>eg 'This does show that it was an easy journey. They are all sitting comfortably on the train and are having no problems. So it looks like a really easy journey.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons for disagreeing eg by identifying other ways of travelling west or problems on the journey or asserting the railways were not there at first</b></p> <p>eg 'This source does not prove that the journey west was easy. There were lots of problems such as Indians.'</p> <p>or</p> <p><b>Level 2 A focus on 'modern ship'</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1–2</p> <p>2–3</p>	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Study Sources B and C. Which of these two sources is more useful to an historian studying the American West? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers based on assertions about provenance</b></p> <p>eg ‘Source B is a lot more useful because it is a photograph and therefore is real.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on identifying details in the source(s)</b></p> <p>eg ‘I think that Source B is more useful because it has more information in. It shows a wind-pump and what their home was like. Source C, on the other hand, does show that they kept chickens.’</p> <p>Award 3 marks for identification based on knowledge.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers that compare photograph (B) with idealistic or propaganda (C) – not developed</b></p> <p>eg ‘Source B is more useful because it is a real photograph showing what it was like. Source C is trying to create a good impression of the homestead and cannot be trusted.’</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>Study Source D. Are you surprised by this source? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that analyse/write about the source but fail to say whether surprised or not</b></p> <p>eg 'They clearly do not want the settlers to settle on Indians land and the soldiers are forcing them off the land.'</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Misinterprets source</b></p> <p><b>Level 2 Answers based on everyday empathy</b></p> <p>eg 'I am not surprised because it wasn't fair that they should take the Indians' land. The soldiers are just getting it back for them.'</p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers that assert not surprised and/or surprised because white Americans did take Indian land/did regard the Indians as inferior or identifies manifest destiny</b></p> <p>eg 'I am really surprised by this because I thought the American government wanted whites to spread west on the land.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Uses contextual knowledge to explain surprised or not surprised by the fact they had moved onto the land</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 5 Uses contextual knowledge to explain surprised or not surprised that they are being forced off the land</b></p> <p>eg 'I am very surprised that the army is forcing the settlers off the land. The American government tried to persuade settlers to move onto the land by passing laws like the Homestead Act. They also believed in Manifest Destiny which meant they had a duty to take over the land. This makes what is happening very surprising.'</p>	5-6	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe Indian beliefs about the land.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: land could not be owned or fenced off, the earth belonged to all people, animals and plants, put there by the Great Spirit, sacred because contained bodies of their ancestors, thought it was wrong to cut the land up and farm it.</p> <p>eg ‘The land was special for the Indians. They regarded the earth as their mother to which they would return when they died.’ (2)</p>	1–5	



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why the Indians were nomadic.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'They were nomadic because this was the best way of life for them. This was the only way they could live their lives. They did not want to live in houses in the same place all the time.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific reasons</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.</p> <p>Reasons include: depended on the buffalo, there was little else to supply food and other materials, the buffalo moved around the Plains, they believed everything went in a circle.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'The buffalo moved around the Plains to use the best grasslands at the right time. As the Indians depended on the buffalo they had to follow them. So when the buffalo moved, the Indians moved. This meant they had to be nomads and could not live in the same place all the time.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>Which was more important in causing the final defeat of the Indians, the actions of the US army or reservations? Explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I think it was the US army because they were always fighting the Indians. This meant that sooner or later they were going to be defeated.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons why US army or reservations important</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: US army reaction to Battle of Little Big Horn, Crazy Horse hunted down, Sitting Bull killed, Battle of Wounded Knee; reservations – destruction of way of life, no hunting, forced to be farmers, become dependent, educated as white men.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons why US army and reservations important</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains how either US army or reservations were important</b></p> <p>eg 'I think that the reservations were more important. When the Indians were put on the reservations they were not allowed to hunt. They were forced to be farmers instead. Also their children were forced to be taught like white people. This killed off their culture. This killing of the Indians way of life is what really defeated them.'</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5–6</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 5 Explains how both US army and reservations were important</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about which was more important</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg the US army was more important because it was the army that forced the Indians onto the reservations.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>8</p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the cowboy's job during the winter.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: riding the range – checking the cattle were not straying, checking the fences, living in line camps, hauling out cows from bogs.</p> <p>eg 'In the winter the cowboys lived in line camps. They had to make sure the cattle were not wandering.' (2)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why cowboys faced dangers and difficulties during the long drive.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'This was their most dangerous job. They could be killed. They faced lots of difficulties in taking the cattle on the long drive.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific reasons</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.</p> <p>Reasons include: crossing rivers, Indians, stampedes, rustlers.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'The long drive was dangerous because of the danger of a stampede. This usually happened in the first days of the drive when the cows were still nervous. A flash of lightening could make them stampede. They then had to try to herd the cows in on themselves until they stopped, exhausted.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The disastrous winter of 1886–7 was the most important reason why the traditional way of life of the cowboy came to an end.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I agree with this because the winter destroyed their way of life. It made it very difficult for them to carry on living like they had been. It changed everything.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons regarding the winter or other factors</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: the winter – snow blizzards, cows could not reach the grass, died in their thousands; other factors – profits going down, over-grazing, over-production, barbed wire, wind pumps.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons regarding the winter and other factors</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains why the winter or other factors contributed</b></p> <p>eg 'I do not think that the winter was all that important. The invention of barbed wire and the wind pump were far more important. They meant that farmers could fence off their land and cowboys were not needed to round up the cattle or to brand them. Some cowboys were still needed but their job had changed.'</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5–6</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 5 Explains how it was the winter and other factors</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about whether it was more due to the winter or to other factors</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg the winter was just a one off but there were other underlying factors like barbed wire that would have finished the cowboys off even without the winter.</p>	<p>7</p> <p>8</p>	

## SECTION B GERMANY 1919–1945

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	(a)	<p><b><u>Study Source A. Why was this poster published in the early 1930s?</u></b>  <b><u>Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that identify a valid message</b></p> <p>eg ‘This source was published to show that people were miserable.’</p> <p>eg ‘This source was published to tell people that the German family needed to be saved.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Context only</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers that identify the purpose</b></p> <p>eg to get people to vote for Hitler, to get people to support Hitler</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains a valid message using details in the source</b></p> <p>eg ‘This source was published to tell people that Germany was in a dreadful state. This is shown by the fact that the people look very miserable. They are in great trouble and the caption says that the German family needs to be saved.’</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p>	





Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Study Sources B and C. Does Source C prove that Source B is reliable? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that write about the sources but fail to compare them</b></p> <p>eg 'Source B shows that Hitler was very popular as many people were trying to see him. Source C talks about people shouting in favour of Hitler.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Compares the sources for surface similarities / differences</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Answers based on comparing content of Sources B and C for support or disagreement</b></p> <p>eg 'Source C does prove that Source B is reliable because it says that people were shouting in support of Hitler. This is the same as Source B where it says that people wanted to see Hitler.'</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Undeveloped use of provenance of one or both sources</b></p> <p>eg 'I do not think that Source C can prove anything because it was said a long time after the events.'</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3–4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Answers based on comparing content of Sources B and C for support and disagreement</b></p> <p><b>Level 5 Answers based on comparing the sources and evaluating at least one of them</b></p> <p>eg 'Source C does not prove that Source B is reliable because it says that only a few people were shouting for Hitler while in Source B there are lots of people doing this. Anyway Source B looks like Nazi propaganda. The way it is drawn to show children desperate to see Hitler shows that it is trying to tell people that Hitler was popular with the German people.'</p>	<p>5</p> <p>6–7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>Study Source D. Are you surprised by this source? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.</u></b></p> <p>Target: AO1, 2, 3</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p>or</p> <p><b>Level 1 Answers that fail to explain whether surprised or not</b></p> <p>eg 'This source is showing that Nazis did not like Jews and they are trying to make German children hate them as well.'</p> <p>or</p> <p><b>Level 1 Surprised – answers based on everyday empathy</b></p> <p>eg 'Yes I am surprised they are allowed to say nasty things about Jews.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Not surprised – assertions that Nazis were anti-Jewish</b></p> <p>eg 'I am not surprised that they are saying things like this about Jews because the Nazis hated the Jews.'</p> <p><b>Level 3 Not surprised – contextual explanations of Nazi attitudes/actions towards Jews</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 Not surprised – contextual explanation of Nazi indoctrination of German children towards Jews</b></p> <p>eg 'No I am not surprised by this. The Nazis regarded Jews as sub human. They thought they were polluting the German pure blood. They wanted their children to believe this as well because they wanted the children to be good Nazis and to fight for the German army. They did not want them marrying Jews. This was why they taught things like this about Jews in schools and put them in children's books. So I am not surprised that this kind of thing is going on.'</p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4–6</p>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the territorial terms of the Treaty of Versailles</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Terms include: Alsace-Lorraine to France, Danzig made a free city, the Saarland taken by League of Nations for 15 years, part of Upper Silesia to Poland, Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium, Memel taken over by the League, all overseas colonies.</p> <p>eg ‘Germany lost the Saarland and all its colonies. It also demilitarised the Rhineland.’ (3)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why events in the Ruhr caused much trouble in the years 1923 to 1924.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg ‘These events caused so much trouble because the Ruhr was a really important area for Germany and so anything that happened there would matter a lot.’</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific reasons</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.</p> <p>Reasons include – important industrial region for Germany, French and Belgian occupation, passive resistance, printing of money, inflation.</p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>Describes what happened</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific reason</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg ‘Events in the Ruhr caused so much trouble because it led to the German government printing lots of money. This led to enormous inflation with all prices going up. The value of people’s wages and pensions were turning into nothing and they were in poverty.’</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific reason</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The most important reason why the Weimar Republic collapsed was the Nazi Party.'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I think this is right. The Nazis became so popular that the Republic had to collapse. It stood no chance at all.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies reasons why Nazi Party or other factors led to collapse of Weimar</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: the Nazi Party – its promises about employment, fear of Communists, popularity of Hitler, use of propaganda; other factors – Depression, unemployment, unpopularity of Weimar.</p> <p>or</p> <p><b>Level 2 Describes the methods/appeal of the Nazis or describes other factors</b></p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies reasons why Nazi Party and other factors led to collapse of Weimar</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains how Nazi Party or other factors led to collapse of Weimar</b></p> <p>eg 'I think that there were other reasons why the Weimar Republic collapsed. In 1929 there was the Wall Street crash in the USA. This led the whole world into the Great Depression. This meant that the USA asked for its loans back and it meant that German trade slumped. This led to huge unemployment in Germany which the Weimar Republic was not able to solve. This is why it became unpopular and collapsed.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains how Nazi Party and other factors led to collapse of Weimar</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about whether political methods was the most important reason</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg the Nazi Party would have got nowhere without the Depression and unemployment. They only started winning votes when this happened.</p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p>	



Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	(a)	<p><b><u>Briefly describe the work of the Gestapo.</u></b></p> <p>Target AO1</p> <p>1 mark for each valid example identified, 2–3 marks for any examples that are described or explained.</p> <p>Award a maximum of 1 mark to general answers lacking specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>Examples might include: the secret police, run by Goering, tapped phones, intercepted mail, spied on people, used network of informers, sought out opponents of the regime, arrested people suspected of being opponents.</p> <p>eg ‘The Gestapo spied on people and got children to inform on their parents. Their job was to find and arrest people who were secretly against the Nazis.’ (3)</p>	1–5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b><u>Explain why the Nazis placed so much importance on the Hitler Youth and the League of German Maidens.</u></b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'They did this because they knew that they needed their support. They knew that they would not be able to stay in power long without having the Hitler Youth on their side.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies specific examples</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no explanation.</p> <p>Reasons include: young people important, to continue the work of the Nazis, to make the army strong, to indoctrinate them, to have children.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Explains one specific example</b></p> <p>Award 6 marks for one reason explained and another identified.</p> <p>eg 'The Hitler Youth and the League of German Maidens were really important for the Nazis because they were organisations of young people. The Nazis set them up so that they could control young people and get them to believe Nazi ideas. They were taught to be good, loyal Nazis. They have the Nazis control over young people and enabled them to get round the parents who might not be Nazis.'</p> <p><b>Level 4 Explains more than one specific example</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–4</p> <p>5–6</p> <p>7</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b><u>'The Nazi regime was very successful in winning the support of the German people'</u> How far do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p>AO1, 2</p> <p><b>Level 0 No evidence submitted or response does not address the question</b></p> <p><b>Level 1 General assertions</b></p> <p>Valid but general answer. No specific contextual knowledge.</p> <p>eg 'I agree with this. I think that they were very popular and the German people supported them a lot. They were very clever in winning the support of the people.'</p> <p><b>Level 2 Identifies examples of, or reasons for, success or lack of success</b></p> <p>Specific contextual knowledge demonstrated but no examples explained.</p> <p>Reasons include: successful – people won over by propaganda, control of the media, Hitler Youth and employment, Strength Through Joy; not successful – need for the Gestapo and the SS, opponents were arrested and often executed, plots and youth opposition during the war, quiet grumbling.</p> <p><b>Level 3 Identifies examples of, or reasons for, success and lack of success</b></p>	<p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>2–3</p> <p>4</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 4 Explains examples of, or reasons for, success or lack of success</b></p> <p>eg 'I think they were very successful. Schemes like the People's Car were very popular where workers could start paying towards a car of their own. Also Strength Through Joy which allowed people to go on holiday and organised popular activities like swimming made them popular. They had never had anything like this before.'</p> <p><b>Level 5 Explains examples of, or reasons for, success and lack of success</b></p> <p><b>Level 6 Supports an argument about overall – how far they were successful</b></p> <p>Answers at this level do not have to be fully developed as far as the two sides of the argument are concerned but they both need to be covered. What is crucial for this level is a clinching argument. Allow original, unusual but valid attempts eg despite much support at the last resort the Nazis depended on fear and violence and no elections – this proves they were not all that successful in genuinely winning people over.</p>	<p>5–6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p>	

## APPENDIX 1

## Spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) Assessment Grid

**High performance 5–6 marks**

Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question.

Where required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.

**Intermediate performance 3–4 marks**

Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question.

Where required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.

**Threshold performance 1–2 marks**

Candidates spell, punctuate and use rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question.

Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response.

Where required, they use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.

**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 2013

