

GCE

History A

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2015

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

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
C	Grouping
Eval	Evaluation
S	Sequencing
Ju	Judgement
KU	Relevant contextual knowledge
P	Provenance used

NB. A brief summative comment is required following both questions. Use the language of the generic mark scheme to justify the level you have awarded. For specific guidance please refer to the topic specific mark scheme. Marks awarded must match the comments given.

Here are the subject specific instructions for this question paper

Candidates should answer on only one Option. They should answer questions (a) and (b) on that Option. If they answer on more than one Option then the higher mark should be awarded. Do not allow marks across more than one option. If they answer on Q(a) comparing the wrong source or sources then no more than a high L6 mark can be awarded. If fewer than the 5 sources on Q(b) are used then the next level down from the one awarded otherwise awarded is given, although please use professional judgement here.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

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

Notes related to Part A:

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

Marking Grid for Question (a)

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

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

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

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

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

Notes related to Part B:

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

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

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

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

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1 a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context is that the Normans considered the Anglo-Saxon church to be out of touch with recent continental developments and seriously in need of reform. As the Church was such a powerful institution and William had been given the support of the Pope in his invasion, he saw a political need for change as well. But the Anglo-Saxon Church did have its own strengths. • Similarities are that they agree monastic foundations were of key importance in the Church, with the example of Peterborough in A and the Mercian monasteries in C. In both cases the monasteries appear to be in good shape with the achievements of Abbot Leofric being lauded in A and the Mercian monks in C ready to go north to rejuvenate the Church in Durham. • Differences relate to the views expressed about the state of religion in the south and the north. A suggests that all was well at Peterborough with Leofric as an ideal abbot, while C indicates that religion was at a very low ebb in the north and had almost died out, before William came to power. A refers to substantial monastic buildings, whereas C suggests such monasteries as there were in the north were made of branches and thatch. However as time moves on in the sources the situation is reversed. Peterborough declined after the death of Leofric and the monastery at Canterbury was damaged and other foundations had to pay out large sums to the king, as A makes clear. But C shows that as time went on the monks revived religion in the north, with reform of manners and building programmes. 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for the state of the Church in England. If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provenance indicates different viewpoints. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle bewailed the lack of appreciation shown by the Normans of the good points of the tenth-century Church. Leofric, as his name suggests, was a Saxon, and his achievements are praised. The Chronicle considers that the situation worsened under William and juxtaposes events in 1067 to back this up, but this does not necessarily mean the occurrences were connected. Simeon of Durham had direct information about events in the north, but also shows that the situation in Mercia was such that monks could be spared to help refound monasteries and churches, although he makes clear that this was not an organised reform programme and that they did this on their own initiative. He could have exaggerated both the paganism in the north and the work done by the monks, in order to glorify his own monastic house and as a Norman he would be partial in showing how they have improved things. • Judgement - both are equally valid in the points they make. Source A probably did not have much information about the north, while Source C is concentrated on that area. Simeon was a monk and unlikely to be critical of the origins of his monastery. The Chronicle had a more secular aim. 		<p>for A02.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. • Candidates may judge both equally valid.
1 b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sources provide a variety of views as to who was driving reforms forward. The view that it was William can be found partly in Source B and directly in Sources D and E. In B William is seen as the prime mover in some reforms, but out of England during the Synod, so less responsible. Orderic Vitalis and William of Malmesbury both praise his commitment. In the report of the bishops 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>on the Synod meeting in 1075, in Source B, the king was involved in the transfer of sees from the more remote locations favoured by the Anglo-Saxons to cities, namely Salisbury, Chichester and Chester, seen as more appropriate centres by the Normans. William was using the authority of the Church to support his power and so needed it to be demonstrated in places which had considerable settlements. Further transfers were envisaged but had to wait for William's authorisation, thus revealing his desire for control. This theme is echoed in Sources D and E. William chose worthy men for church positions, but the importance lies in the fact that he chose them and so asserted his control. The restoration of monasticism owed much to his drive, but, again, Norman abbots and foundations simply emphasised the Norman hegemony. He is praised for not giving weight to wealth and power but, although he needed literate and intelligent advisers in the church, who could turn their hands to secular administration, he did not need or want them to be men of independent power. He was determined to put in his own men and then leave them to run the church and bring it under Norman control and Sources B, D and E make this very clear. In Source E William apparently bowed to the wishes of visiting Roman cardinals, but he had been eager to remove Stigand, who had crowned Harold, but not William, and Stigand's pluralism as Bishop of Winchester as well as being Archbishop, gave him an excellent excuse. He could get what he wanted and appear to back papal reforms. Knowledge could be used to show that William was not always subservient to the Papacy.</p>		<p>focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The view that others were bringing about reform, or that William was not that bothered, is found in Sources A, B and C. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in Source A does not accept that the Anglo-Saxon Church was in need of reform and blames William, probably unfairly, for the burning of Canterbury, and, with more justification, for the heavy taxation placed on monasteries. It implies that the death of the Anglo-Saxon abbot led to a decline. The report of the bishops in Source B could be seen to support this view to a degree in that William showed little sign of prioritising church reform as long as his control was maintained. He left the consideration of the prevention of simony, a key issue in the papal reform programme, and the forbidding of the involvement of the clergy in capital sentencing to Lanfranc and his colleagues. Source D does, however, suggest William was very hostile to simony. But candidates could argue that William was fully occupied in defending his lands on both sides of the channel and had to decide what mattered most. Hence his apparent lack of interest in the religious revival in the north, as outlined in Source C, could be explained by his preoccupation. Knowledge could indicate that he was very ready to send Odo of Bayeux to avenge the murder of Bishop Walcher at Gateshead in 1080 and himself appointed William of St Calais as the next bishop within six months. Moreover, the decline in the north was due to the ravages of the Vikings, as Simeon makes clear, and the resultant fear and desolation would have made revival difficult. The monastic orders were not enthusiastic about setting up new monasteries in very vulnerable locations. Knowledge could support this view with reference to the Danish raids which damaged Peterborough and 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>other Fenland abbeys in William's reign. Both Sources D and E, although praising William's reforms, also make it clear that the role of bishops and abbots was an essential one, as it was bound to be. This was particularly the case with the logistics of monastic establishments. The king could not be expected to deal with the detail, except at Battle, where he had a particular interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Norman Sources all make it clear that much depended on the role of monasteries and even Source A would not contradict this. The riches acquired by Leofric proved a magnet for the Danish raiders. But equally the sources show that William's forcefulness was a key factor and he galvanised his bishops into action. The monks from Mercia needed the help of the establishment in fulfilling their aims and re-establishing monasteries at Durham, York and Whitby. William's taxation could be justified on the grounds of his need being greater than that of the church in his aim to subdue the country. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point. ○ Candidates can use the Sources flexibly as most of them offer opportunities to be used for both sides of the argument.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2 a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sources have similarities. Both are letters to kings, both those charged were originally of low status and deny the treason charges made against them. Both refer to opponents – Anne Boleyn in Source A refers to her ‘enemies’ who have wrongly advised the King, and Thomas Cromwell appeals to Norfolk and the Privy Councillors to ‘search their consciences’ in Source B. Both are sent to the Tower protesting their innocence. • Knowledge of the context might be used to evaluate the extent of these similarities. Henry VIII’s desire to marry Jane Seymour had contributed to Anne’s fall from favour, perhaps ‘the light fancy’ she refers to in Source A, and similarly in Source B Henry wished to marry Katherine Howard, so rejecting the Cleves marriage Cromwell had arranged for him. In both cases, court factions had interfered in Henry’s choice of new wife. Cromwell had been instrumental in gathering evidence against Anne, and the Duke of Norfolk had been instrumental in introducing Henry to Katherine Howard and in framing heresy charges against Cromwell. Both the accused had been the victims of factional rivalry at court. Both have a similar tone in that they appeal to the conscience of their accusers – Anne to Henry in Source A and Cromwell to Norfolk and the Privy Councillors in Source B. • Knowledge might be used to confirm that the negative outcome of A was the same as that of B where Cromwell is reproached by Norfolk for ‘his evil actions’ and seen by the Privy Councillors as getting his just deserts for his Treason Act of 1534. The difference was that in Source A Anne appealed to the King but knowledge might be used to add that in Source B Thomas Cromwell was unable to. 	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source ‘as evidence for.....’ (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for reactions to charges of treason. • If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or ‘stock’. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sources also have differences. The nature of the treason charges is different, so making the tone of the reaction different – a sense of dishonour, disappointment and humble pardon in Source A compared to anger and indignation in Source B. Provenance might be used to evaluate the comparative reliability and use of the sources. In Source A, Anne, Henry’s wife, writes the letter under accusations of multiple adultery and incest with her own brother – hence her reference to ‘infamous slander’. On the other hand, <p>(vii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source B is a second hand report of Cromwell’s reaction, so is likely to be seen as less reliable as it is based on hearsay at court. The author is the French ambassador, so is likely to value accuracy in reporting the event to such a powerful adviser of the French king, but he is likely to be less objective. Cromwell’s reputation as a religious reformer is likely to colour the report to please its Catholic audience, and the information might be inferred to have come from the Catholic Norfolk faction at the English court. Cromwell has been charged with heresy as well as treason, hence the reference to correspondence with ‘the Lutheran German princes’ for the Cleves marriage and treaty now repudiated. Such knowledge might be used in evaluation of Source B. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. It is likely that Source A is seen as the more reliable and useful evidence for these reasons, but no set conclusion is expected.
2 b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Sources may be grouped by interpretation. Sources A, B and D are most likely to be used to support the interpretation, but some might infer factional rivalry also in Source C. Sources C, D and E suggest personal ambition is responsible and there are also specific family reasons in Sources A and D. 	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources A, B and D support the interpretation that factions were at least partly responsible for charges of high treason at court. Source A and B can be used together and give quite strong evidence for factions being responsible for the treason charges. Anne Boleyn cites her ‘enemies’ as giving the King bad advice, accusing and judging her. <p>(viii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge might be used to confirm that Anne had quarrelled with Cromwell over advising the King. Cromwell provided the evidence to try Anne and oversaw the torture of her associates. The Seymour faction supplied a replacement wife in Jane, but Source A makes it clear that Anne saw her enemies as Henry’s ‘instruments’, so ultimately she considered that the responsibility for the charges lay with the King himself. Similarly, in Source B Cromwell’s comment on ‘reward for his good services’ refers to his loss of favour with the King. <p>(ix)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge might be used to confirm that again it was Henry’s dissatisfaction with a wife, Anne of Cleves, which had caused Cromwell’s fall from favour, with Norfolk and the Howard faction supplying the attractive young Katherine Howard as a pawn in the struggle for power. <p>(x)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source B is useful for establishing Norfolk’s repudiation of Cromwell, and Cromwell asks him and his supporters on the Privy Council to search their consciences, suggesting they are involved in his fall from favour. In evaluation, it might be added that both Anne and Cromwell had themselves contributed to their fall. Some might pick up on the reference to Cromwell’s 1534 Treason Act in Source B. Source D 		<p>much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below. • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>is less strong as evidence for factional reasons, but the Admiral is said to have bribed members of the Privy Chamber and tried to stir up disloyalty against Somerset, implying factional rivalries.</p> <p>(xi)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provenance of this group of Sources is varied. Source A is more reliable and primary than Source B, which has a French author and is based on hearsay, but Source B has the strengths of objectivity rather than Anne's direct involvement and purpose to persuade Henry against executing her. Source D at face value seems reliable, as proceedings of parliament, but its contents show the evidence to have been provided by Somerset, and family issues play a part in limiting its value as evidence, as it also does in Source A. Sources C, D and E suggest that personal ambition is responsible for the charges of high treason. Norfolk and Surrey in Source C might be linked with the Seymours in Sources D and E in that the former are taking advantage of a dying king and the latter a very young king. Although we cannot infer that the 'two gentlemen' who had provided evidence against Norfolk and Surrey in Source C represent factions at court, some candidates may do so and should be credited. <p>(xii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge might be used to confirm Surrey's execution but Norfolk's escape from execution, as it was planned to take place on the day after Henry's death. Knowledge of the Admiral's marriage to Catherine Parr and alleged affair with her stepdaughter Elizabeth might be used to confirm his attempts to marry her. An earlier incident, in which the 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Admiral attempted to seize Edward from his bedchamber, allegedly killing his pet dog in the attempt, might be added to extend source content. The King's approval of the deaths of both Seymours might also be known, suggesting some responsibility lay with Edward VI, linking to this same point on Henry's responsibility for the deaths of Anne and Cromwell.</p> <p>(xiii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source E is the best evidence of personal ambition and faction causing charges of high treason, as there is considerable evidence in the source to suggest that Northumberland himself drove Somerset's trial. Parliament rejected the charges against him and questioned Northumberland's role in driving the hearing. <p>(xiv)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of Somerset's return to the Council after his fall in October 1549 might extend this Source and confirm his earlier misjudgement. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point. • Sources D and E share a similar reliable provenance so might be judged more valuable as evidence. No set conclusion is expected

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3	a	<p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>The Sources have some key similarities. Both suggest that the previous commanders of parliamentary forces were weak. In Source A, Whitelocke recalls that the New Model Army had to be created because some noble commanders were more interested in making peace or prolonging the war than winning a decisive victory. Similarly, in Source B, Baxter suggests the Army was formed to remove 'self-esteeming men who boasted of their own exploits', but, in contrast to Source A, names the Earls of Essex and Manchester as noble commanders excluded by the Self-Denying Ordinance. Knowledge might be added to confirm and explain their failures by 1644 and the significance of the Self-Denying Ordinance in creating a professional army. Source A mentions feuds between the commanders which 'prevented vigorous actions' which Cromwell feared might lead to a 'dishonourable peace'. Both Sources also suggest that religious liberty was a factor in its formation. Source B states one purpose to be the establishment of religious liberty for the sects and Source A confirms this with references to parties of Independents as well as Presbyterians among the army officers. Both Sources suggest that Cromwell played a significant role in the re-modelling of the army – in Source A by addressing parliament and in Source B by being the real force behind the New Model Army despite Fairfax holding command of it.</p>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focus must be comparative. Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. • No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02) • The comparison must be for the key Issue – as evidence for reasons why the New Model Army was formed. • If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded. • The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer. • Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation. • Provenance may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'. • Stand-alone knowledge is not rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use context to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse. • Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>However, the Sources also have differences. In Source A, Whitelocke implies that Cromwell removed Essex because he was jealous of Cromwell's popularity as leader of the Independents. In conspiring with the Scots, Essex forced Cromwell to pre-empt a challenge to him by suggesting the army be re-modelled so that he could remove Essex from command. Cromwell's excuse was that the people would not continue to bear the costs of war and would force parliament into a 'dishonourable peace' with the King unless a more efficient army was formed. Source B, on the other hand, implies that forming an army based on religious liberty might have been a cloak for military control of church and state. Baxter mentions 'some hot-headed Independents' who thought the King a tyrant had gained the highest commissions and would take the war in an uncompromising direction.</p> <p>In discussing provenance, the Sources are similarly unreliable as memoirs published 40-50 years after the event with the benefit of hindsight. The author of Source A, as an M.P, emphasises parliamentary matters including relations with the Scots and gives insider views of Essex's attitudes towards Cromwell. On the other hand, the puritan preacher and army chaplain in Source B emphasises religious issues and divisions within the army itself and takes a more negative view of some more extremist Independents, making both Sources rather subjective, but perhaps Source B is better informed about reasons for the formation of the New Model Army.</p> <p>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgements, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. Judgement on the topic rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone. • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. • It is likely that Source A is seen as the more reliable and useful evidence for these reasons, but no set conclusion is expected.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
3 b	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected. All five sources can be used for both sides of the argument, so grouping is flexible. Perhaps this might be by provenance. The authors of Sources B, D and E are all puritan army chaplains so are likely to stress religious issues, whereas Source A is written by a statesman with a more political emphasis and Source C by a Colonel of the New Model Army with a military approach.</p> <p>Sources B, D and E, written by puritan army chaplains, are all likely to be subjective and support the view that religion was the driving force of the New Model Army. Richard Baxter, in Source B, states that the New Model Army was formed to give religious liberty to the sects, especially Independents who 'gained the highest places'. This suggests that religion was the key to officer status. Joshua Sprigge, in Source E, confirms that the officers were 'better Christians than soldiers', 'spending time in prayer and reading scripture'. Sprigge overstates the importance of religion to the Army in saying that 'Men conquer better as saints than as soldiers' and that 'their mercy in battle won them the love of their enemies'. This is likely to be evaluated as exaggerated, unrealistic or rosy-tinted compared to Source B, where Baxter refers to 'those hot-headed Independent' officers. Thus religion drove the New Model Army forcefully. Knowledge of religious sects within the Army might be linked to the</p>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question is to assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge a given interpretation. The focus must be on the sources, a use of their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below. • A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question. • Always award at the top of the Level unless there is good reason for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise. • Bolt-on knowledge is not to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is unbalanced. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance). • It follows that knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01. • Evaluation of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>introduction of Source D which states that the author is a 'fiery preacher', perhaps similar to the 'hot-heads' in Source B. Hugh Peter confirms this in Source D, where he explains the reality of the New Model Army killing 75 people, plundering and destroying Basing House. He calls this 'God's just and righteous ways of punishing 'sinners'. The content mentions killing 'an ungodly papist' and 'rewarding the godly'. Similarly Sources B and C refer to the Army seeing victory as 'God's Providence'. These links question the reliability of Source E, where Sprigge states that the army 'took no plunder' and showed 'mercy', suggesting religion to have driven the New Model Army in a more humanitarian direction. The sources might be discriminated by their different emphases. Knowledge of the ruthlessness and tactical strengths of the Army might be used to extend the sources. Sprigge sees religion as unifying the New Model Army which had 'pious and peaceable opinions'. Baxter, in Source B, agrees that 'many common troopers and officers were honest, upright men, ready to hear the truth'. However Baxter distinguishes them from hot-headed Independent officers who saw the King as a tyrant, and 'intended to undermine Church and State'. Therefore, religion may have been seen by some as a cloak to cover their desire for power and plunder.</p> <p>Sources A, B and C are useful in support of the argument that Cromwell's influence and leadership were the driving forces of the New Model Army. Source A might be linked to Source B concerning the importance of leadership to the New Model Army. Baxter in Source B and Whitelocke, in Source A, both suggest that a reason for re-modelling the Army was weak leadership by Essex and Manchester, 'self-esteeming men who boasted of their personal exploits'. They also hint at rivalries and feuds which</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below. • To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the sources need to be grouped according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. Check that a grouping makes sense – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made. • A judgement based on the sources is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing or on the topic rather than the sources. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered. • Be impressed by cross reference within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but do not apply inflexibly. • If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the sources to illustrate an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is referencing. • It is not necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>undermined the previous army, suggesting that Cromwell’s leadership was vitally important to the New Model Army. Source A refers to Cromwell’s part in its formation, Source B confirms that it was ‘in his hands’ and Source C gives an insight into Cromwell’s active role at Naseby along with the leadership and tactics shown by Okey himself. Knowledge might be used to extend this source with regard to Cromwell’s strategies and tactics, and to develop Source E’s reference to the importance of pay and professionalism in the New Model Army.</p> <p>Sources A and B also suggest that political issues were an important driving force. Cromwell feared that Essex and Manchester were aiming for ‘a dishonourable peace settlement’ with the King instead of winning a victory. Baxter, in Source B, suggests that the Army would never make such a peace, as they saw the King as a tyrant and wished to completely transform religion and the state. Therefore, they wished to fulfil Cromwell’s aim in Source A to ‘pursue the war more vigorously’. An overall judgement is likely to support the interpretation in the question to an extent, but might balance this with the value of the sources for other views.</p> <p>A supported overall judgement is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of knowledge and Source limitations. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</p>		<p>automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates do not have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded – do not mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point. • Sources D and E share a similar reliable provenance so might be judged more valuable as evidence. No set conclusion is expected

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2015

