

A LEVEL

Guide

HISTORY A

H505

For first teaching in 2015

Guide to assessment for A Level History Units 1, 2 and 3

Version 2

Contents

Overview of the A Level Examination for H505	3
Unit 1 Assessment Overview	4
Using sources in Unit 1	5
Features of strong answers	5
Answering Essay Questions	8
Features of strong answers	9
Likely problems with Unit 1 responses	13
Unit 2 Assessment Overview	14
Answering Short essay questions	15
Features of strong answers	15
Answering Essay Questions	17
Features of strong answers	18
Likely problems with Unit 2 responses	22
Unit 3 Assessment Overview	23
Answering Interpretation Questions	23
Features of strong answers	24
Answering Thematic Essay questions	24
Features of strong answers	25
Exemplar responses	26
Using the mark schemes to improve performance	32

Introduction

Please note, the material found in this document has been produced by combining information from INSET courses, candidate style answers and other materials presently available. The intention of this document was to place all these in one location for ease of accessibility. Material from all INSETs can be freely downloaded at www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk.

Overview of the A Level Examination for H505

Learners will be examined on **ONE** Unit Group One Topic, chosen from 13 Units **ONE** Unit Group Two Topic, chosen from 24 units and **ONE** Unit Group Three Topic, chosen from 21 units. There is also a Topic based essay unit, which is internally assessed and moderated by OCR.

Unit Group One is the British element of the course and consists of a Source based study, which either precedes or follows chronologically a Period Study, creating a substantial and coherent element of British History. These are identified in the Specification by the codes Y101 to Y113.

Unit Group Two is the non-British element of the course and consists of a Period Study. These are identified in the Specification by the codes Y201 to Y224.

Unit Group Three is the Thematic Study and Historical Interpretation element of the course. The Interpretation element consists of the evaluation of two passages by historians about one of the three named topics. The Thematic essays require learners to consider developments over at least 100 years and make comparisons between different aspects of the topic. These are identified in the Specification by the codes Y301 to Y321.

The examination at the end of the Course consists of three papers. The examination for Unit 1 is 1 hour 30 minutes in length and is worth 25% of the A Level, Unit 2 is examined by a 1 hour paper and is worth 15% of the A Level and Unit 3 is examined by a 2 hour 30 minute paper and is worth 40 of the A Level. The topic based essay makes up the other 20% of the A Level.

Unit 1 Assessment Overview

This Unit tests Assessment Objective (AO) 1 and Assessment Objective 2 (AO2).

AO1 is the analysis and evaluation of issues in order to reach supported judgements about them. This is examined through Section B, the Period Study element of the paper. In this section 2 essays will be set, each drawn from a different Key Topic, although some questions may be drawn from more than one Key topic, and learners will be required to answer **ONE** essay.

AO2 is the evaluation of primary source material and is examined through the Enquiry element, which is Section A. Learners will answer one question on a topic chosen from one of the three Key topics for Enquiries. There will be no choice of questions in this Section.

The Enquiry element [Section A] will carry 30 marks.

The Period Study element [Section B] will carry 20 marks.

Section A

Regardless of whether the Enquiry topic chronologically precedes or follows the Period Study it will always be Section A on the examination paper.

In Section A, the Enquiry element **four** primary sources will be set and there will be **one** question.

The following question stem will be used:

Question 1

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that

An example of this might be:

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that Asquith should bear the responsibility for splitting the Liberal party in 1916.

Question 1 will carry 30 marks

Although learners will be required to apply own knowledge to the sources in order to evaluate them, all marks will be awarded against AO2.

Section B

This is the Period Study element of the Unit and will be assessed through an essay. Two essays will be set and learners will be required to answer one. The essay will be worth 20 marks and will test AO1.

Using sources in Unit 1

The sources used in Unit 1 will all be written sources; there will **NOT** be any cartoons or visual material. The sources will all be primary or contemporary to the period being studied.

The questions require learners to analyse and evaluate the sources, linking the analysis and evaluation to the actual question set and not in isolation. Therefore, in the example above in Question 1:

Answers would analyse and evaluate the four sources as **evidence as to how far Asquith should bear the responsibility for splitting the Liberal party in 1916.**

In other words, to reach the higher levels, the analysis and evaluation must link to the actual question set.

What does this mean?

Answers should consider the provenance of the source; this might involve some or all of the following:

- Who wrote the source?
- When was the source written?
- Was the writer in a position to know?
- What is the tone or language of the source?
- What is the purpose of the source?
- What is the nature of the source?

Answers should also consider the content of the source:

- What is the view of the source about the issue in the question?
- How typical is the view of the source?
- What own knowledge do I have that supports the view in the source?
- What own knowledge do I have that challenges the view in the source?

In light of responses to these questions learners should be able to make a judgement about the source as to its utility.

It is also important that candidates have a clear grasp of what the actual source is saying – what is its view about the issue in the question and therefore it is worthwhile giving candidates plenty of practice at reading sources so that they are accustomed to understanding sources about the period they are studying. Using at least one source per lesson when doing this element of the course and not seeing them as a bolt-on is recommended.

In answering the question there is no need for candidates to group the sources, they can work through them sequentially and still reach the top level.

It may help them in constructing their argument if they are grouped but it is not a requirement.

Features of Strong Enquiry Answers

Do remember that this is a source based section and therefore responses should be driven by the sources and that the question asks how far they support the view.

Candidates do need to consider both the provenance of the source and the historical context if they want to score well on Question 1.

In order to score well on the question responses must consider provenance and use own knowledge. It is using, not simply deploying own knowledge that is crucial. That means linking the knowledge to the source to show how the view offered in the source is either valid or invalid.

This is the crucial part of using own knowledge – what is the purpose of bringing in own knowledge – it is to judge whether the view offered by the source is valid or invalid. Does what I know about the point made in source support or challenge the source? It is therefore vital that the own knowledge is clearly linked to the source so that this is clear. Own knowledge, even if it is about the topic or issue and is not linked to a source will not score well.

In answering the question, if candidates demonstrate some evaluation they are likely to reach Level 3, but if the evaluation is based on what might be termed 'stock' comments, such as it is a primary source and is therefore likely to be reliable or the person who wrote it was there and would therefore know and goes no further it will reach only Level 2. However, once the candidate applies some OK and considers the provenance in relation to the issue in the question they will reach Level 4. To go higher will depend on the quality of the evaluation. In order to reach the very top level responses will evaluate all four sources and reach a supported judgement as to whether, in light of the evaluation, the sources support the view offered in the question. It is important that the judgement is about the sources and is not a judgement based on own knowledge.

However, in order to reach any level, there is no need for candidates to group the sources, they can work through them sequentially and still reach the top level. It may help them in constructing their argument if they are grouped but it is not a requirement.

Learners should be aware that A Level there is one more level than at AS. At the highest level at A Level examiners would expect that the analysis of the sources, evaluation and judgement is more developed than at AS.

The sample responses below are taken from the A Level Papers found on our website. The third sample response is taken from an AS paper, to help exemplify the difference between AS and A Level.

Sample responses

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that female rule was a serious problem in the 1550s.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/170319-unit-h505-y107-england-1547-1603-the-later-tudors-sample-assessment-materials.pdf>

Sources D and C suggest that female rule could be a serious problem, whereas Sources A and B do not consider it a serious problem, with Source A more concerned about the question of legitimacy, whilst Source B does not see female rule as problem because, according to Mary Tudor, her subjects promised to obey her at her coronation.

Source D appears to offer the strongest argument that female rule was a serious problem. Knox argues that female rule was 'unnatural and insulting to God' and subverts 'good order and justice'. Written in 1558 it could be argued that there was some validity to Knox's view as he had experience of the reigns of both Mary Tudor in England and Mary Queen of Scots and neither appeared to have brought stability to their countries. England had witnessed unrest in 1554 with Wyatt's rebellion and Mary Queen of Scots was driven out of Scotland. However, it is unlikely that Knox's view was typical of views in England as many, particularly those of a Protestant or reformist outlook supported Elizabeth. Moreover, many most expected Elizabeth to marry and therefore Knox's concerns in his last sentence that as a ruler her 'sight is blindness', 'strength, weakness', 'advice, foolishness' and 'judgement, frenzy' would not have applied as she would be guided by her husband.

Although Source C appears to suggest that female rule could be a serious problem given the need for Parliament to pass an Act of Parliament for a marriage treaty between Mary and Philip, it could also be argued that as Parliament was able to limit Philip's power in England it was less of an issue. There were obviously concerns about a female ruler being dominated by their husband, particularly a foreigner and one as powerful as Philip, hence the restrictions placed on his power with the Queen having 'total control of all offices, lands and revenues, and grant them to natural born Englishmen.' The Source also makes it clear that Parliament was concerned about being dragged into wars because of the marriage and again took measure to ensure this would not happen. However, despite the treaty England was drawn into war against France and Spanish influence did become a problem, suggesting that even with the Act female rule was a problem. Parliament might impose detailed restrictions, as Source C shows, but the problem was enforcing them. Therefore, although Parliament might attempt to impose restrictions, in practice they did not work, suggesting it was a serious problem.

However, Sources A and B are less concerned about the problem of a female ruler. Source A's focus is on the problem of the legitimacy of the ruler. The Devises is more concerned about the legitimacy of Mary and Elizabeth, although it also acknowledges the problems there would be if either came to

the throne and married a foreigner as he would 'practise his own country's laws' and 'subvert the commonwealth of this our realm'. However, the source has greater concerns than a female ruler as Lady Jane Grey is put forward as a possible heir, and when the Devises was later altered she was actually named as heir. However, the Source was written either by Northumberland, who had personal reasons to exclude Mary and Elizabeth so as to maintain his influence, or was written by Edward who, for religious reasons wanted to exclude Mary so that Protestantism would continue. This therefore raises questions about its reliability as its purpose was to justify excluding Mary and Elizabeth. Similarly, Source B does not see female rule as a problem, but the source was written by Mary herself and was designed to rally support for her when she was under threat from Wyatt's rebellion.

According to the source female rule was not a problem as not only had the people sworn at her coronation to 'obey me', but she also argues that 'we shall speedily overthrow these rebels', suggesting that even with a female ruler a rebellion could easily be put down. The source also challenges the view in Source D that a woman ruler was the equivalent of the weak leading the strong as in this instance it is Mary who is being strong and disregarding the Council's advice to leave London. There is also some justification in Mary's words as her speech did much to rally support and Wyatt was stopped soon after this speech at the gates of the city, suggesting that one of the concerns about female rulers – namely the problem of dealing with unrest – was unjustified. However, one of the causes of the rebellion was Mary's decision to marry and as Source C shows there were problems in having a female ruler as she was expected to marry but there was the problem of who she should marry and limiting their power.

The sources suggest that there were potential problems of having a female ruler, not simply as Source D argues because it was unnatural but because of who they should marry and the powers that the husband would have. However, as Source A suggests there were other problems, such as legitimacy which were also a concern and probably more so as it allowed Lady Jane to be named as a possible heir. The support there was from many for Elizabeth also suggests that D exaggerates the concerns about female rulers.

Commentary

The response is focused on the question of a 'serious problem' and reaches an overall judgement as to whether the sources support the view. The sources are evaluated and own knowledge is used to place them in context and evaluate the views they offer. The response is driven by the sources and their provenance is fully considered in reaching a judgement about their reliability. The response would reach the lower end of level 6, but would be a good A grade answer.

Using these four sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that Churchill was proposing unrealistic policies with regard to gaining international support against Hitler in the 1930s.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/170324-unit-h505-y113-britain-1930-1997-sample-assessment-material.pdf>

Both sources from Churchill himself see gaining international support as vital and realistic. A is written with hindsight in that a Grand Alliance did eventually defeat Germany and Italy and Japan and the British air force did play a big part in the outcome of the war. B is written in 1938 before Hitler had taken Austria and Czechoslovakia but when there was a distinct threat of German expansion. Churchill was appealing for some positive action and overstated the possibility of getting support. In both sources Churchill thought it possible for Britain and France to act jointly. In C the Franco-British link would lead the co-ordination of military planning with other nations under the 'honourable' role of the League. In A Churchill argued that Britain and France acting together could have deterred Germany. This does not seem realistic for despite their large army France was deeply divided politically and had constructed a great defensive line called the Maginot Line which indicated that they were more concerned with just defence than deterring Germany or leading any alliance. In A Churchill may have wanted to defend his pre-war warnings that action needed to be taken. In B he is not in government and did not have to consider how realistic his suggestions were; his aim was to push Chamberlain to taking action against a German threat.

Both A and B also refer to the role of the League of Nations, but by 1937 it was clear that the League of Nations could not prevent war. The USA was not a member. Italy, Germany and Japan had left the League and any action would depend on Britain and France who had not done much to help the League prevent aggression. This seems unrealistic and it was not very clear who the other nations in the world that would come together in a Grand Alliance were going to be in Source C.

Sources B and D are seemingly more realistic. The Chiefs of Staff were in a position to be able to know about Britain's defences and they advised that even with the assistance of France and other allies, Britain's forces were not enough to protect its territory, trade and empire. This might show that Churchill was being unrealistic about the hopes he placed in foreign support; on the other hand it might show how important it was to try and get foreign support since Britain could not defend itself alone. The view is supported by the steady disarmament (some of it resulting from Churchill's own policies in the 1920s) under the Ten Year Rule. Major rearmament had only started from the mid 1930s and then concentrated on defence rather than building up the army. However, the defence chiefs could have been exaggerating in order to get more money for the services. Source D seems also more realistic than Churchill. Chamberlain is not making a public speech but writing to his sister so says what he really thinks and that is that everything Churchill says seems to be right 'until you examine its practicality'. The USA was unlikely to join any peacetime alliance because public opinion was against war. The USSR was undergoing purges which were destroying the leadership of its armed forces and in

any case Chamberlain was opposed to communism and would not get support for an alliance with Stalin. France was not seen as a strong ally. Italy was an ally of Hitler. So Chamberlain was right to see the impracticability of a Grand Alliance and also to see that effective League of Nations action was unlikely.

A and C though consistent with each other in seeing international support as the only way to deter Hitler and prevent war seem to be unrealistic and they are by someone deeply involved who had made this issue a key part of their political career. The alternative views are also by people with vested interests. The Chiefs of Staff needed to point out dangers and to persuade the government to give them more resources. They dismiss the possible help of allies without explanation even though France had a very large army and if Germany had had to face even the threat of Russia and a two front war, this might have deterred German expansion. Chamberlain, too, had decided on a policy of appeasement, as the main solution so would not want to consider the alternative. In the end, Germany was defeated by a Grand Alliance, so even if there were difficulties in getting one in the 1930s as B and D suggest, it does not mean that this was unrealistic.

Commentary

There is a clear focus on the question here. All the sources are considered and all are analysed in terms of additional knowledge and also the provenance. The sources are tackled in a sensible order and an overall argument emerges. The historical context is well understood and used to make judgements.

AS EXEMPLAR

Using these three sources in their historical context, assess how far they support the view that the Factory Acts did more harm than good.
[20]

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/170534-unit-h105-y140-from-pitt-to-peel-britain-1783-1853-sample-assessment-material.pdf>

The view that factory legislation has done more harm than good is most strongly argued against in A. B notes some beneficial effects and C is against the whole effects that factories have on young women so may either be arguing that more regulation is needed or that mere regulation would not stop the bad effect

The northern factory owner in B who has more direct experience questions the assumption that all labour is severe and is concerned about what children excluded by law from factory work will do, suggesting that they might be driven to even worse employment in the mines. Mines were not regulated until 1844. By implication he is may be suggesting that children under 13 working only 8 hours may be an improvement, but they are still employed. Individual employers like this source may have tried to ensure that conditions were not too severe, but if cross-referenced with A, there is still a problem of neglect. The source may not reflect typical

conditions, but it may well be true that partial regulation of some aspects of child labour without more general regulation may simply have driven children to seek labour elsewhere in even worse conditions, such as mines or even in some homes where children worked long hours for little. Source A is from a source with a vested interest in factory reform and comes from an official report on factories. He sees a change for the better since 1833 with more acceptance of the benefits of regulation by employers. Cruelty and oppression by implication have become less of a problem and there are prosecutions which seem to show the Act is working.

By reference to the problems of 1833 in the last sentence, the source is implying that these problems are becoming less. The report would naturally wish to stress the success, since the whole idea of inspection and regulation was relatively new and had been challenged by many as oppressive and likely to cause rather than relieve hardship. The number of inspectors was small and there were not many successful prosecutions. The acceptance by owners of the principles of regulation may be exaggerated given the continuing opposition to later acts and the attitudes shown in B. The limited terms of the Act for example giving two hours of education after what was still a long day's work for nine to thirteen year olds may not have achieved the results suggested, but the source does show some good results. Source C is more an expression of middle class concern about the impact of factory work on young women than an analysis of the harm or benefits from actual legislation.

There had been a debate about the Ten Hour bill in 1846 and women's hours had been regulated in 1844, so this may have led to factory work being more attractive to women than domestic service which was less well paid. The idea of women not learning household management and skills seems to be importing some of the middle class values and concerns of the early Victorian era to working class areas where young female labour was essential for families. It reflects the type of concern about the moral and social damage done by factories common among Tory radicals of the time rather than considering the effects of factory work on health and the exploitation of female labour, say, in textiles to maintain low costs in the hard years of the 'hungry 40s'. As it was hard for younger women in many families not to work, then it was not a strong argument to say that more factory legislation would only encourage them to develop poor housekeeping habits.

Overall the most compelling arguments come from the sources with direct experience of the impact of factories. They may not be typical as not all employers were as concerned about welfare as Mr. Greg and Mr. Horner and may be exaggerating the effects the legislation about and the inspection of factories. However, in the long term as legislation grew in the century and did offer valuable protection, the view of A seems more compelling even if in the short term there may have been disadvantages from a middle class perspective.

Examiner comment

All three sources are considered and the provenance of is taken into account.

The answer focuses on the issue in the question and does not merely describe or explain what the sources are saying generally. There is knowledge, which is used, and some of it is detailed. There is a sense of argument and a decision is made at the end about the issue. There is an awareness of the historical context.

What are the characteristics of the responses?

- **They reach a judgement,**
- **Own knowledge is used to evaluate and not simply deployed,**
- **The sources are clearly linked to the issue in the question and there is little evidence of drift.**

Answering essay questions

The following command words may be used:

- To what extent,
- How far do you agree,
- Assess,
- How successful,
- How effective,
- Compare.

Essays will be set on broad topics and will be drawn from one or more of the Key Topics.

Questions set may focus on one of the Key Topics or an element within it or may draw on more than one Key Topic.

Centres and learners are reminded that there are not separate levels or marks awarded for the quality of knowledge and the quality of argument, but that AO1 covers both elements.

All the questions set will require learners to make a judgement about the relative importance of issues. This may require them to weigh up the relative importance of factors in causing an event or to judge, for example, the extent of success or failure of an event, monarch or minister. Learners who simply list reasons without making supported judgements about the relative importance will not score as well, no matter how good their explanation is. It is also important that the judgements made are supported by historical evidence otherwise the answers will be no more than assertions and therefore will not score highly. Learners can also make links between the factors or issues they discuss and this will also help them access the higher levels of the mark bands.

It is important that learners focus on the issue in the question and do not write generally about the topic. This means paying particular attention to any dates in the question, or key words such as 'completely' or 'total' and stronger answers will link material back to these key words. In planning an answer learners should think about the opening sentences for paragraphs. These sentences should introduce an idea linked to

the question and not be descriptive. The plan should therefore not be series of dates or events that the learner thinks need to be in the answer as this type of approach will encourage a descriptive response. The opening paragraph should introduce the ideas that are going to be discussed in the main body of the essay and should also give a clear indication as to the direction of the argument, which should then be followed through in the main body of the essay. This means that planning is crucial as the learner will need to be clear about the line of argument they intend to pursue before they start writing their answer and should not change their mind during the essay. The opening sentence of each paragraph will introduce an idea and then, in the main body of the paragraph, both sides of the idea or argument should be considered, bringing in evidence to support or challenge the idea before reaching a judgement about that idea. The judgement will link the material back to the actual question. If this is repeated throughout the essay the learner will produce a very strong response. The final paragraph, or conclusion, should bring together all the ideas that have been discussed in order to reach an overall judgement about the issue in the question.

There are two key terms about which centres need to have a clear understanding. The first is the use of the term **evaluation**. For Period Study essays this is understood to be using own knowledge to explain, but more importantly weigh up the importance of a range of factors or issues. Learners may discuss a range of reasons as to why an event occurred, but evaluation requires them to consider their relative importance in causing the event. The second key term is **judgement**. This requires candidates to reach a conclusion as to the relative importance of a range of factors or the success of a particular monarch or ministry. Centres should also be aware that there is a significant difference between judgement and assertion. In order to reach the higher levels the judgement must be supported by precise and relevant knowledge. Where a learner claims that X is the most important factor, but provides no precise evidence to support the claim that is seen as assertion. At A Level judgement is required for the higher levels and there are a number of ways in which the quality of the judgement can be discriminated. The first is whether the judgement is fully developed and supported, or is little more than a sentence with basic support. At the higher levels it is likely that the judgements will be more nuanced, with learners showing links between factors or, in discussing success of a monarch or ministry showing that Y was successful in some areas, but not others before making an overall judgement.

The types of questions set at A Level will be similar to those at AS. However, as with the Enquiry section there is an extra level in the mark scheme, Level 6, and in order to reach this level examiners would expect there to be a more sophisticated analysis and evaluation of issues of factors than at AS. Similarly, judgements will be better supported and more developed, with a greater sense of sophistication. Learners should remember that all the A Level examination papers will be sat after two years of developing these skills and therefore examiners would expect to see that reflected in the quality of the analytical skills displayed in both sections.

Features of Strong Period Study Answers

Although there is no set structure required to an answer, it is helpful if learners set out their view in the opening paragraph and develop it through the essay – without changing their mind! This means planning before they start writing.

The strongest answers will have a series of interim judgements – a judgement about each issue or factor as it is discussed, whilst some may just show judgement in the conclusion

The mark scheme reflects the difference between sustained judgement throughout a response and a well-argued answer that has judgement solely in the conclusion.

There are a number of skills that learners need to develop if they are to reach the higher levels in the marking bands.

- Understand the wording of the question,
- Plan an answer to the question set,
- Write a focused opening paragraph,
- Avoid irrelevance and description,
- Write analytically,
- Write a conclusion which reaches a supported judgement based on the argument in the main body of the essay.

It is important that learners focus on the issue in the question and do not write generally about the topic. This means paying particular attention to any dates in the question, or key words such as ‘completely’ or ‘total’ and stronger answers will link material back to these key words. In planning an answer learners should think about the opening sentences for paragraphs. These sentences should introduce an idea linked to the question and not be descriptive. The plan should therefore not be series of dates or events that the learner thinks need to be in the answer as this type of approach will encourage a descriptive response. The opening paragraph should introduce the ideas that are going to be discussed in the main body of the essay and should also give a clear indication as to the direction of the argument, which should then be followed through in the main body of the essay.

This means that planning is crucial as the learner will need to be clear about the line of argument they intend to pursue before they start writing their answer and should not change their mind during the essay. The opening sentence of each paragraph will introduce an idea and then, in the main body of the paragraph, both sides of the idea or argument should be considered, bringing in evidence to support or challenge the idea before reaching a judgement about that idea. The judgement will link the material back to the actual question. If this is repeated throughout the essay the learner will produce a very strong response. The final paragraph, or conclusion, should bring together all the ideas that have been discussed in order to reach an overall judgement about the issue in the question.

In summary

Strong answers will:

- Show a consistent focus on the question, learners will link their material to the important words or phrases in the question.
- These answers will focus on the issue in the question and not write about the topic in more general terms.
- Answers will focus on the key terms in the question, this may be on issues such as 'consistently', 'always' or 'mostly'.
- Strong answers are likely to establish a set of criteria, such as the aims, against which to judge issues such as success or failure.
- Strong answers will often have a focused opening paragraph which outlines the view of the learner about the issue in the question and the factors or issues that will be covered in the response.
- Strong answers will consider a range of issues and will certainly discuss those that are central to a particular issue or topic.
- The answer will have a clear and consistent argument; the learner will clearly explain their view about the issue in the question and support their argument by reference to precise, accurate and relevant material.
- Answers will consider a range of issues or factors and reach a balanced and supported judgement about the issues or factors they have discussed in relation to the question.
- Answers will be balanced, considering alternative views before reaching a conclusion, in this way learners will ensure that their answers are balanced.
- Judgements should be about the issue in the question, linking the material back to the actual question and they will avoid introducing new ideas.
- Where learners are discussing a range of factors they will have weighed up the relative importance of those factors and reached a supported judgement about their relative importance. In assessing the relative importance of a factor or issue answers will explain why a factor or issue is more or less important, it will not simply be asserted.
- A supported judgement will be deemed to have been reached only if the judgement has been supported by relevant and accurate material, not simply asserted.
- The final paragraph will bring together any judgements which have been made in the individual paragraphs (interim judgements) so as to reach an overall judgement about the issue in the question.
- Strong answers will not be descriptive and they will avoid irrelevance.

Sample Responses

Assess the reasons for William of Normandy's victory at Hastings in 1066.

William's victory at Hasting in 1066 was largely the result of his skill, which included both his preparations but also his military leadership. This skill allowed him to take advantage of the luck that presented itself and Harold's mistakes throughout the early autumn of 1066.

William was fortunate that Harold faced simultaneous attacks from both Normandy and the Viking force of Harald Hardrada. Harald's invasion came first and this meant that Harold was drawn north to face the Viking force, allowing William to land unopposed in the south of England and establish his base at Pevensey. Even this unopposed landing was fortunate as the peasant levies which made up much of the Saxon force were obliged to serve for only two months and had been disbanded on 8 September, just before William was able to set sail. The same was true of the Saxon navy, which meant that William was able to cross the Channel unopposed. Moreover, William was also fortunate that he was able to cross the Channel at the very time Harold was drawn north. He had been waiting for the wind to change direction for some time and he was therefore lucky that the change in direction coincided with Harold having to move north. The northern invasion was also fortunate for William as the march north and back again not only tired Harold's forces, but also depleted them as the battle at Stamford Bridge was particularly severe. However, despite these developments victory depended upon William's ability to take advantage of the situation.

The invasion from the Vikings inadvertently helped William. Hardrada's attack on York killed many Saxons and deprived the Saxon ears, Edwin and Morcar, of providing Harold with support later. In coming north to deal with the attack, Harold had also left the south undefended and although some historians have argued it was a mistake to move north, it can also be argued that Harold was unfortunate that the direction of the wind changed, allowing the Norman invasion. Although Harold was able to defeat Hardrada, the battle was long and large numbers were killed, with the Viking requiring only 24 of their original 300 ships to take them home. Not only had the march north been tiring, but Harold had also lost many men, particularly his strongest fighters, the housecarls, which weakened his force.

However, the northern invasion only helped William because of Harold's mistakes. Firstly he hurried back south and did not allow his soldiers to rest. In doing this he also failed to wait for reinforcements to arrive from other shires, which according to some accounts would have given him a force of up to 30,000 with which to confront William. Instead, perhaps because of his success against Hardrada, he was over-confident and thought that the same tactic of a surprise attack on William in the south would also be successful. In defence of Harold's actions he may have hoped to confine William to the area around Pevensey and thus protect the rest of Wessex from Norman rampage.

William was therefore very fortunate that the force he met at Hastings was both tired and depleted, however the length of the battle, unlike most Medieval battles suggests that it

was close and therefore William's skill played a crucial role in securing victory. Not only had he prepared meticulously, but he also led his forces with skill. Even before the invasion, William had embarked on a propaganda campaign to assert his right to the throne and this culminated in gaining papal support, which encouraged many from across other areas of France, such as Aquitaine, to join his force and boost the numbers. The military preparation were also thorough, with large numbers of ships being built, soldiers were well provisioned, weapons made and a pre-fabricated castle built so it could be assembled quickly to offer protection after the landing. It was William's skill on the battlefield at Hastings that was crucial. The Saxon force was on the top of Senlac Hill and was protected by a shield wall, which if it remained intact would exhaust the Norman attacks and secure Harold victory or at least ensure another battle would be fought when Harold had all his forces. It was ultimately William's ability to take advantage of circumstances that allowed the wall to be broken, having failed in attacks against it on numerous occasions. Rumours of William's death had resulted in the Norman forces falling back and being pursued by many less well-trained Saxon peasants, which started to weaken the wall. It was this that led William to use the feigned retreat on at last two occasions which drew more poorly trained Saxons from the front line and broke the solidity of the wall and allowed the Normans to cut down the peasants and the Norman cavalry attack the Saxon line. It is likely that if the front line of the Saxon forces had been composed of housecarls they would have had the experience not to be tricked and realised the importance of maintaining the wall. Instead, it allowed the Norman forces to get close to Harold and probably hack him to death, which meant there was no one left to rally Saxon forces, resulting in their ultimate defeat.

William had been lucky that he faced a weakened Saxon force, but it was not their lack of numbers that was crucial as the length of the battle shows, but their inexperience which led them to pursue the Norman forces. However, it was William's skill as a leader which allowed him to exploit this through the feigned retreat and break the shield wall. William was fortunate that the change in direction of the wind and the Viking invasion coincided, but he still had to be able to take advantage of these developments and it was his skill and preparedness that allowed it.

Commentary

Consistently focused on the question, there is detailed support and argument. The factors are analysed and there is evaluation of the role played by each factor. A supported judgement is reached and therefore the answer would be placed in Level 6. The argument is sustained throughout and the view offered in the opening paragraph is developed and sustained throughout. There is a clear and well-structured argument.

To what extent did Walpole owe his long period in office to royal support?

Although royal support was important for Walpole's tenure as principal minister from 1721 to 1742, it was not the most important reason for his domination. His domination was the result of a combination of factors, which was the result of

support in parliament due to his management of it and the success of his policies. This is apparent from the fact when he lost control of parliament over his war policies in the 1740s he fell from power.

Royal support was a factor in Walpole's domination of politics. He was aware of its importance as he ensured that he maintained both George I and George II's favour by making certain that their financial needs were met by the House of Commons. However, this meant that he had to be able to manage the Commons, suggesting that his skills there were just as important, if not more. Walpole was also aware that his policies had to appeal to the king. George I had initially not been a supporter of Walpole, but his success in covering up the South Sea scandal and in preventing the Atterbury plot won him royal approval and this continued throughout the period by persuading parliament to increase the Civil List when George II came to power and by not interfering in the appointment of military officers. Walpole was aware that royal support was important and to achieve this he also controlled, as far as possible, access to the king and used the monarch's mistresses to influence them so that only his view and policies were conveyed to the king. Although, he was therefore aware of the need to remain in favour with the king, he was also aware that royal ministers also had to have the support of parliament and therefore followed policies that appealed to both the king and parliament.

Walpole's management of parliament was crucial in remaining in power. This was achieved through two methods; firstly by popular and successful policies and secondly through managing parliament. The importance of popular policies was particularly important. He dropped unpopular measures, such as a bill to punish Edinburgh for the Porteous Riots and the Excise Scheme. Walpole was also determined to maintain the support of dissenters and therefore passed annual indemnity acts, which freed them from dismissal for failure to take Anglican Communion. Walpole had also brought the country stability and peace, which meant that taxation was low and that trade and prosperity increased, benefiting those in power. The importance of popular policies in keeping Walpole in power became even more evident in the late 1730s and early 1740s. His failure to assert British dominance overseas, through his desire to avoid unnecessary war, allowed him to be challenged. Ultimately he was forced into the War of the Austrian Succession, suggesting that he was losing his control and his resignation following the inept handling of the war is a clear demonstration that when his policies failed his position was vulnerable and that parliamentary, rather than royal support was vital for his survival.

He had been able to maintain that support for so long not just because of his policies, but also because of his skill in managing parliament. Walpole developed a 'court party' of loyal supporters by using bribery and patronage, which gave him a secure base of support, but even if this 'party' reached 180 MPs as some historians have argued, it did not give him a majority in the Commons. He also needed the support of 'country MPs' who did not seek office and he was able to achieve this by explaining his policies to them at private meetings and dinners and by using his friends to persuade them to support him. However, it was not just his management of these MPs that gave him

a majority. The amount of patronage available was increased as minor appointments in government were brought under his control. He was also able to influence elections as many seats were controlled by the Treasury and Admiralty, or by his political allies such as Newcastle. Walpole was also skillful at managing debates, using delaying tactics to prevent measures he opposed being passed and through a close relationship with the speakers, who despite their supposed independence, usually supported him.

He would not have remained in power for so long without pursuing policies that were popular with both parliament and the monarch. This was evident with his fall from office in 1742. He was politically astute and realised when to abandon unpopular policies so that his position was not challenged, as over the Porteous riots and the Excise. George I and George II maintained their support for him as, although they were able to choose their own ministers, he was able to control parliament and negotiate the passage of policies they supported. Only when his ability to manage parliament, even though he still had royal support, did he fall from power supporting the view that it was popular policies and the ability to manage parliament that were the most important reasons for his long tenure of office.

Commentary

The answer is consistently focused on the question and pursues a consistent argument throughout. It explains why royal support was important, but argues that other factors were more important and supports this view through the evidence of his fall from power. The argument is well supported and although events are not described in detail, the answer suggests that knowledge and understanding of them is strong. The judgement reached in the conclusion follows logically from the rest of the response and has been supported and is reinforced. The answer was therefore placed in Level 6.

'The most important reason for Conservative political domination 1979-1997 was the weakness of Labour.' How far do you agree?

Labour weakness was apparent for much of the period. Thatcher had come to power in 1979 because many voters thought that Labour had failed to control the trade unions during the 'winter of discontent' and had allowed Britain to decline. Divisions in the party prevented them from responding effectively in subsequent elections and they suffered from some weaknesses in leadership. However, the Conservatives under Thatcher did have considerable appeal. Leadership seemed stronger and many policies were popular. The country was undergoing a period of social change which helped the Conservatives and the Falklands Factor was important in rallying support to Thatcher. Labour did recover with the establishment of more control over more radical elements in the party and with a declining belief in Thatcher. However John Major managed to offer change and Labour had to wait for Tony Blair to offer significantly distinctive policies and leadership style to gain power. Though the factors were linked, the main factor was the weakness of Labour because there were many criticisms of

the Conservatives but Labour could not exploit them effectively enough to take power.

The major weakness of Labour in opposition was its failure to remain united. The split between Labour and the SDP Alliance was to prove damaging in the election of 1983. Leading respected members of Labour's leadership, Roy Jenkins, Shirley Williams, David Owen and Bill Rodgers were disillusioned with Labour's move to the left. The SDP gained 11.6% of the vote in 1983 taking 3.5 million votes from Labour. At a time when the Conservatives were very united behind a dynamic leader, Labour seemed very divided. However this factor must not be exaggerated. It would not have occurred without Labour choosing an unsuitable leader and moving too far from what many voters wanted. The total SDP and Labour votes did not exceed those cast for Thatcher and they only won six seats. The split was more damaging in 1987 when Labour and SDP votes did exceed the votes for the Conservatives.

The 1979 result had left to a shift to the left in Labour signified by the election of the veteran radical Michael Foot to be leader in November 1980. The Labour election manifesto in 1983 appealed to traditional Labour voters much more than to the electorate as a whole and it has been described as 'the longest suicide note in history'. Foot for all his intellectual ability was ineffective on television. His policies of nuclear disarmament, industry nationalization and government economic planning and control seemed to be old fashioned. The Conservatives made effective play of these elements, but they can be exaggerated. By 1983 Thatcher's policies were controversial and she had come in for a lot of criticisms as unemployment rose. What maintained her support in 1983 may have been more the popularity of the victory over Argentina in the Falklands War.

This element was not present in 1987, though when the Conservatives won slightly more votes, though slightly fewer seats. Labour no longer represented outdated policies and under Neil Kinnock's leadership had rejected their militant wing. Kinnock was no match for Thatcher in debate and was inclined to be long-winded in debate. However the long term effects of Labour's split were still being felt even though the SDP gained rather less support.

Labour's leadership decisions, its association with traditional socialist ideas which seemed out of keeping with the developments of the 1980s, its reputation as allowing trade unions to get out of control in the 1970s and the concerns about the trade union violence seen in the miners' strike may have contributed to its long period out of office. However, the other factors were the positive appeal of the Conservatives.

Thatcher made a distinctive appeal with her conviction politics and clear policies. She showed considerable determination in pursuing policies and offered an end to consensus politics which had seemed to lead to Britain suffering from inefficient industry, inflation and lower growth rates. Though this made little impact in industrial heartlands in the Midlands, the South and London it had considerable appeal. She made effective use of incidents such as the Falklands War and the Miners Strike to reinforce the view of an 'iron Lady' which was in contrast to less striking Labour leaders. Even after her fall in 1990, leadership was still important as John Major offered a

more sympathetic leadership style while being able to take advantage of economic success. Voters could have the essence of Thatcherism without Thatcher who had become increasingly abrasive. The importance of the leaders' television image had become important, but this can be exaggerated as a factor. The rise in unemployment, the shift to indirect taxation, signs of urban decline and poverty were making the government unpopular despite Thatcher's commitment and strength. If Labour had been able to capitalize on these problems more and had it remained united, then even the 'Falklands Factor' might not have been as effective, especially as the war had not been a party issue. Also by 1987 even with more obvious signs of economic prosperity and the creation of a vested interest in the country through the sale of shares in nationalized industries and council houses, Thatcher still divided opinion. However with the split in Labour and a failure to offer a credible alternative policy and the difficulty of reversing the changes made by the Conservatives, it was difficult for Labour to gain the key marginal seats that would have swung the election. When that did happen it was under a different type of leader – Tony Blair in 1997 with a clearer vision – New Labour, stronger policies and a more divided Conservative policy.

Thatcher had been a major world leader; she had led a successful war over the Falklands, reduced inflation, rescued the power of the unions, taken responsibility for economic growth and maintained a strong personal image of strength. It may be that these positive qualities more than Labour weaknesses best explain the long period of Conservative domination. They may have been enough to ensure that Major at least got a victory, even with a reduced majority. The changing society of the 1980s and the collapse of the Liberal vote in the period, which benefited the Conservatives were also factors. However the key reason remains the weakness of Labour. Moving to the left meant that they could not take advantage of Liberal decline. It also meant that the new middle classes outside Labour's industrial heartland did not swing to Labour. The division of the Labour vote ensured that even when Thatcher became less popular, Labour could not take advantage of it and the failure to develop leaders whose style and image were persuasive enough to overcome the vivid personalities of the Thatcher era was also important. By 1992 Labour had done much to recover but it took a more radical change in leadership, style and policy for them to win in 1997.

This is clearly focused on the question and deals with some Labour weaknesses as well as considering alternative explanations.

There is a lot of judgement and the essay established links between factors and also quite a strong overall judgement which is defended and not merely stated.

The answer does have some supporting evidenced which is detailed, but obviously in such a long period cannot deal with every aspect. The conclusion offers a strong view.

The judgements may not be totally supported and with such a controversial topic, the view may not be one that all would agree with, but the answer has engaged fully with the question and shown consistent argument and analysis.

Commentary

These answers are mostly analytical and have judgement. There is a strong focus on the actual issues in the question. There is detailed knowledge to support the argument. The strong answers show a good range of issues being discussed.

Likely problems with Unit 1 responses

Question 1

- Learners fail to deal with all Four sources.
- Sources are described rather than analysed and evaluated.
- Learners fail to consider **BOTH** content **AND** Provenance.
- Learners fail to reach a judgement about the issue in the question.
- Own Knowledge is not linked directly to the source being considered.
- They fail to link their answer to the actual issue in the question.

Questions 2 and 3

- Failure to focus on the issue in the question and write generally about the topic.
- The answer does not analyse or evaluate the issues or factors discussed.
- The answer fails to reach a judgement, but relies on assertion.
- The answer covers only part of the period set.
- The answer considers domestic policy when the question was on foreign.
- Analysis and argument is based on incorrect factual material; this undermines the credibility of the argument.

Unit 2 Assessment Overview

This Unit tests Assessment Objective (AO) 1.

AO1 is the analysis and evaluation of issues in order to reach supported judgements about them. This is examined through a short and long essay. In this paper 2 questions will be set and learners will be required to answer both parts of ONE question. Each part of the question will be drawn from a different topic area.

The short essay element will carry 10 marks.

The long essay element will carry 20 marks.

The short essay will require learners to consider the importance or significance of two events or issues and reach a supported judgement as to which event or issue was more significant.

The following question stem will be used:

Which of the following was of greater importance/significance in X.

(i) A

(ii) B

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

The following are examples of the type of long essay questions and the commands that will be used:

- How successful was the rule of Kublai Khan?
- 'Postal stations were the most significant factor in the development of the Silk Road.' How far do you agree?
- 'Napoleon was a military genius.' How far do you agree?
- Assess the reasons for Napoleon's downfall in 1814.
- Assess the reasons why the overthrow of the Tsar in March 1917 was followed by a second Revolution in November 1917.
- Assess the reasons why Saladin was able to conquer Jerusalem in 1187.
- Assess the reasons for the failure of the Second crusade (1147-1149).
- How successful was Charles V in dealing with the power of the princes during his reign?
- 'Charles V's wars with France were a failure.' How far do you agree?
- Assess the consequences in Eastern Europe, outside the former Soviet Union, of the overthrow of communist governments after 1989.
- How effectively did the Soviet Union deal with the threats to its authority in Eastern Europe in the 1950s and 1960s?

Answering short essay questions

Learners will always be required to consider the importance of **TWO** issues or factors and reach a supported judgement as to which of the issues or factors is of greater importance or significance in relation to the event in the question.

The issues or events in the short answer questions will be central or mainstream to the Key Topic and questions will not be set that require learners to know details about minor or insignificant events or issues.

This is a short essay question and learners are advised to spend about 15 minutes on it. There is no requirement for learners to write an introduction or set the scene, nor are learners required to adopt a comparative approach to their answer. Learners will be able to achieve any mark by writing an analytical paragraph which explains the importance of the first issue and then a second paragraph that analyses and explains the importance of the second issue. However, they must then write a concluding paragraph which reaches a supported judgement as to which issue is of greater importance. Explanations of each factor, no matter how good the explanation, will not score highly unless a judgement is reached. Learners should also ensure that they analyse both factors.

Centres and learners should also be aware from the mark scheme that unless both issues are analysed the answer will be placed in Level 1.

Given that these are short answer questions learners are advised to consider two or three points for each factor. However, assessors will not expect that these points are fully developed, but the response does need to demonstrate a clear explanation as to why the event, issue or individual is important or significant.

Learners are advised to ensure that the final paragraph reaches a clear judgement and that it is consistent with the rest of the argument. The judgement needs to be supported rather than just asserted and therefore there should be evidence as to why the learner believes that X is more significant than Y. As with the long answers, both learners and centres should be aware of the difference between assertion and judgement. It is only a judgement when a claim is supported by relevant and accurate evidence. In arriving at a judgement no set answer will be expected and learners may argue that either of the events or issues is more important or significant provided that they support their argument.

The same advice about the meaning of the two key terms in the mark scheme, **evaluation** and **judgement** applies to the short answer question as to the long answer and this is fully explained on [Page 18](#).

Features of strong answers

Although there is no set answer or structure required for this question it might be helpful for learners if they adopt a three paragraph approach. In the first paragraph the importance or significance of the first issue is explained. The learner may draw attention to the limitation of the issue or factor in its impact as

well as explaining its importance. In the second paragraph the importance or significance of the second issue is explained. The learner may draw attention to the limitation of the issue or factor in its impact as well as explaining its importance. The third paragraph is vital as that is where the learner makes the supported judgement as to which issue is of greater importance or significance. The mark scheme makes it very clear that unless there is a judgement the answer cannot go higher than Level 1.

The mark scheme reflects the difference between a substantiated and developed judgement and judgements that are less developed or substantiated.

It is important that responses focus on the issue in the question and do not write generally about the factors and their significance. Learners do need to ensure that they relate the material they use to the actual issue in the question. This is particularly important given the limited amount of time available to do this question.

As with all good essays strong answers will:

- Show a consistent focus on the question.
- These answers will focus on the issue in the question and not write about the topic in more general terms.
- Strong answers will consider a range of issues and will certainly discuss those that are central to a particular issue or topic.
- The answer will have a clear and consistent argument; the learner will clearly explain their view about the issues or factors in the question and support their argument by reference to precise, accurate and relevant material.
- Judgements should be about the issue in the question, linking the material back to the actual question and they will avoid introducing new ideas.
- In assessing the relative importance of the two factors or issues answers will explain why a factor or issue is more or less important, it will not simply be asserted.
- A supported judgement will be deemed to have been reached only if the judgement has been supported by relevant and accurate material, not simply asserted.
- Strong answers will not be descriptive and they will avoid irrelevance.

Sample responses

Which of the following was of greater importance in causing Spain's financial problems during the reign of Philip II?

- (i) The inherited financial problems**
- (ii) Philip's expenditure**

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

Finance was probably the single biggest problem that Philip faced as ruler of the Spanish Empire. Much of this problem was the result of the financial position he inherited, most notably a debt of 36 million ducats. This is made most apparent by the fact that, having inherited the throne in 1556, he declared himself bankrupt only one year later and in 1560 he suspended interest payments on his debts. Although it could be argued that this was the result of his being at war with France from 1556 to 1559, it was more the result of the wars of his father's reign. Charles had spent much of his reign at war with either France, in the Habsburg-Valois wars, or with turkey or the German Protestant princes and these wars had placed a strain on Spain, which was contributing the most to the wars by 1556, which neither the economy nor the revenue from the New World could fund. Moreover, the taxation system that Philip inherited was a further factor in causing financial problems as the nobility were exempt from taxation and thus the wealthiest section of Spanish society were not contributing to crown revenues. There is little doubt that these were significant problems as Charles had already warned his son as early as 1543 to 'attend closely to finances and learn to understand the problems involved'.

Although Philip had inherited a very weak financial position, Philip's policies made the situation worse. He was at war for much of his reign and with the cost of warfare rising he put a burden on the Spanish financial system that could not be met. He was at war with France from 1556 to 1559 and again in the 1590's, with England from 1585 and with the Ottomans and North Africa, as well as having to deal with the Dutch rebels, with the latter costing some 80 million ducats alone. He had added to the problems by spending on his court, art collections and the building of the Escorial, but these costs paled into insignificance when compared with foreign policy – the Armada alone cost 10 million ducats. Moreover, his policy of 'deficit finance' to finance his foreign commitments was a disaster, reflected in bankruptcies in 1575 and 1596.

Philip had inherited a weak financial situation with the scale of the debt, but it was his policies that made the situation worse. He had inherited a debt of 36 million ducats but left a debt of 87 million and that despite exploiting every source of revenue, suggesting that it was his policies, particularly overseas, that were the main cause of his difficulties.

Commentary

The response did analyse both factors and reaches a developed and supported judgement. It is aware of the role of both factors and the links between them, but argues convincingly that it was Philip's expenditure that was more to blame. The argument is supported by very precise factual detail, making the argument more convincing. It covers a range of issues and their importance in causing the financial problems is discussed.

Which of the following was the more serious problem for Italian governments from 1918 to 1922?

- (i) Agrarian unrest**
- (ii) The seizure of Fiume by D'Annunzio**

Agrarian unrest was strong in Italy in 1919 as peasants returned from the war and expected a reward. There were land seizures and actions against large landowners by discontented peasantry. The high levels of rural violence in the South were accompanied by socialist activity in the North, particularly in the Po Valley and peasant grievances were represented by the Catholic Partito Popolare. This presented serious problems of maintaining law and order. The problem was made worse by the parallel growth of strikes in the industrial areas, by wartime inflation and by disappointment with the Treaty of Versailles. Fearing socialism and some sort of equivalent of the Russian Revolution, landowners often financed Fascist squads and the government faced civil disturbances between left and right. The support of the elites from landowners to police and army officers for the Fascist movement as a defence against communism so the threat from the right was added to the threat from the left.

The city of Fiume was not given to Italy but to the new state of Yugoslavia at the Treaty of Saint-Germain in 1919. This provoked fury among nationalists and under the poet and extreme nationalist Gabriele D'Annunzio a force of volunteers seized the city which was ruled as a sort of right wing dictatorship until Italian government forces regained control and gave it back to Yugoslavia. The problems were that the Italian government seemed to lose control to extremists who raised their own armed force. It gave encouragement to right wing opponents like the Fascists. It discredited Italy in international eyes as the city held out for some time. It led to disagreements between the left and the right and gave huge prestige to a dictatorial figure, in the tradition of Garibaldi and paving the way for Mussolini.

However, the underlying discontents were more important. Italy was still heavily rural and agrarian discontent on a large scale destabilised the whole country. D'Annunzio was an extravagant poetic figure rather than a possible national leader and while the Fiume occupation discredited the government it did not pose the physical threat to stability and law order and involve different regions of the country as was the case with agrarian discontent which represented much deeper-rooted grievances than a town desired by Italy but not given to it by the peace treaty.

Commentary

The contextual knowledge is effective in that there is some attempt to put the seizures into the more general context of unrest. The explanation is quite direct in both cases and there is not a merely narrative approach. There is some explained comparison of the relative importance of the factors.

Which was of greater importance in establishing the Nazi dictatorship?

(i) The Enabling Act

(ii) The Night of the Long Knives

Explain your answer with reference to both (i) and (ii).

The Enabling Act, passed in March 1933, was crucial in establishing the Nazi dictatorship as it transferred full legislative powers to the Chancellor, Hitler, and his government for four years, thus establishing a dictatorship. This Act therefore meant that parliament and parliamentary legislation became an irrelevance with the Reichstag virtually voting away its own existence. However, in actually voting it away, rather than having it imposed by force, it gave the establishment of a dictatorship the appearance of legality even though members of the Reichstag had been intimidated to ensure its passage. The Act also helped to strengthen Hitler's position within the Cabinet as the President's approval was no longer needed for passing legislation, further adding to Hitler's power. It also gave Hitler the power to revise the constitution and removed any doubts that the middle classes had about the legality of the Nazi take-over as everything appeared to have been done legally.

The Night of the Long Knives in 1934 secured Hitler's position within his own party as it removed potential opposition of the SA and its leader Rohm, which wanted the Nazi Revolution to become more radical. The destruction of the SA also pleased the army, who had feared the SA, but now supported Hitler with Blomberg's public vote of thanks and it led to the personal oath of loyalty to Hitler that the army took a few months later, thus removing the one group that might oppose him. It also removed many of the traditional such as Schleicher, who might have opposed some of his policies. Most importantly, it secured Hitler's personal supremacy as his decisions were accepted and he had been able to legalise murder, showing clearly that the regime was a personal dictatorship and he could get away with anything.

Although both events were important in establishing the Nazi dictatorship the Enabling Act was more significant as enabled Hitler to embark on a policy of co-ordination, or Gleichschaltung, and create the one-party state by early 1934. This allowed Hitler to remove potential opposition in nearly every walk of life, including trade unions and other political parties, thus it was more significant in removing a range of opposition than the Night of the Long Knives. The only exception to this was the army and the Night of the Long

Knives was the event that won Hitler their support, but this simply completed the task begun by the Enabling Act. It is also unlikely that Hitler would have been able to undertake the Night of the Long Knives without the power and confidence he had gained from the Enabling Act which again suggests that the Enabling Act was the most important as it was the basis of the dictatorship and helped take Hitler from the position of Chancellor to Führer.

Commentary

This answer;

- Analyses both factors thoroughly.
- The significance of both factors is evaluated.
- The supporting knowledge is detailed and accurate.
- There is a developed judgement.

Answering essay questions

The Essay questions set for the Unit follow exactly the same principles and have the same demands as those set in Unit 1. However, to reinforce this message the material about the Unit Essays is repeated below:

The following command words may be used:

- To what extent,
- How far do you agree,
- Assess,
- How successful,
- Compare.

Essays will be set on broad topics and will be drawn from one or more of the Key Topics.

Questions set may focus on one of the Key topics or an element within it or may draw on more than one Key Topic.

Centres and learners are reminded that there are not separate levels or marks awarded for the quality of knowledge and the quality of argument, but that AO1 covers both elements.

All the questions set will require learners to make a judgement about the relative importance of issues. This may require them to weigh up the relative importance of factors in causing an event or to judge, for example, the extent of success or failure of an event, monarch or minister. Learners who simply list reasons without making supported judgements about the relative importance will not score as well, no matter how good their explanation is. It is also important that the judgements made are supported by historical evidence otherwise the answers will be no more than assertions and therefore will not score highly. Learners can also make links between the factors or issues they discuss and this will also help them access the higher levels of the mark bands.

It is important that learners focus on the issue in the question and do not write generally about the topic. This means paying particular attention to any dates in the question, or key words such as 'completely' or 'total' and stronger answers will link material back to these key words. In planning an answer learners should think about the opening sentences for paragraphs. These sentences should introduce an idea linked to the question and not be descriptive. The plan should therefore not be series of dates or events that the learner thinks need to be in the answer as this type of approach will encourage a descriptive response. The opening paragraph should introduce the ideas that are going to be discussed in the main body of the essay and should also give a clear indication as to the direction of the argument, which should then be followed through in the main body of the essay. This means that planning is crucial as the learner will need to be clear about the line of argument they intend to pursue before they start writing their answer and should not change their mind during the essay. The opening sentence of each paragraph will introduce an idea and then, in the main body of the paragraph, both sides of the idea or argument should be considered, bringing in evidence to support or challenge the idea before reaching a judgement about that idea. The judgement will link the material back to the actual question. If this is repeated throughout the essay the learner will produce a very strong response. The final paragraph, or conclusion, should bring together all the ideas that have been discussed in order to reach an overall judgement about the issue in the question.

There are two key terms about which centres need to have a clear understanding. The first is the use of the term **evaluation**. For Period Study essays this is understood to be using own knowledge to explain, but more importantly weigh up the importance of a range of factors or issues. Learners may discuss a range of reasons as to why an event occurred, but evaluation requires them to consider their relative importance in causing the event. The second key term is **judgement**. This requires candidates to reach a conclusion as to the relative importance of a range of factors or the success of a particular monarch or ministry. Centres should also be aware that there is a significant difference between judgement and assertion. In order to reach the higher levels the judgement must be supported by precise and relevant knowledge. Where a learner claims that X is the most important factor, but provides no precise evidence to support the claim that is seen as assertion. At AS Level judgement is required for the higher levels and there are a number of ways in which the quality of the judgement can be discriminated. The first is whether the judgement is fully developed and supported, or is little more than a sentence with basic support. At the higher levels it is likely that the judgements will be more nuanced, with learners showing links between factors or, in discussing success of a monarch or ministry showing that Y was successful in some areas, but not others before making an overall judgement.

Features of strong period study answers

Although there is no set structure required to an answer, it is helpful if learners set out their view in the opening paragraph and develop it through the essay – without changing their mind! This means planning before they start writing.

The strongest answers will have a series of interim judgements – a judgement about each issue or factor as it is discussed, whilst some may just show judgement in the conclusion.

The mark scheme reflects the difference between sustained judgement throughout a response and a well-argued answer that has judgement solely in the conclusion.

There are a number of skills that learners need to develop if they are to reach the higher levels in the marking bands.

- Understand the wording of the question
- Plan an answer to the question set
- Write a focused opening paragraph
- Avoid irrelevance and description
- Write analytically
- Write a conclusion which reaches a supported judgement based on the argument in the main body of the essay.

It is important that learners focus on the issue in the question and do not write generally about the topic. This means paying particular attention to any dates in the question, or key words such as 'completely' or 'total' and stronger answers will link material back to these key words. In planning an answer learners should think about the opening sentences for paragraphs. These sentences should introduce an idea linked to the question and not be descriptive. The plan should therefore not be series of dates or events that the learner thinks need to be in the answer as this type of approach will encourage a descriptive response. The opening paragraph should introduce the ideas that are going to be discussed in the main body of the essay and should also give a clear indication as to the direction of the argument, which should then be followed through in the main body of the essay.

This means that planning is crucial as the learner will need to be clear about the line of argument they intend to pursue before they start writing their answer and should not change their mind during the essay. The opening sentence of each paragraph will introduce an idea and then, in the main body of the paragraph, both sides of the idea or argument should be considered, bringing in evidence to support or challenge the idea before reaching a judgement about that idea. The judgement will link the material back to the actual question. If this is repeated throughout the essay the learner will produce a very strong response. The final paragraph, or conclusion, should bring together all the ideas that have been discussed in order to reach an overall judgement about the issue in the question.

In summary

Strong answers will:

- Show a consistent focus on the question, learners will link their material to the important words or phrases in the question.
- These answers will focus on the issue in the question and not write about the topic in more general terms.
- Answers will focus on the key terms in the question, this may be on issues such as 'consistently', 'always' or 'mostly'.
- Strong answers are likely to establish a set of criteria, such as the aims, against which to judge issues such as success or failure.
- Strong answers will often have a focused opening paragraph which outlines the view of the learner about the issue in the question and the factors or issues that will be covered in the response.
- Strong answers will consider a range of issues and will certainly discuss those that are central to a particular issue or topic.
- The answer will have a clear and consistent argument; the learner will clearly explain their view about the issue in the question and support their argument by reference to precise, accurate and relevant material.
- Answers will consider a range of issues or factors and reach a balanced and supported judgement about the issues or factors they have discussed in relation to the question.
- Answers will be balanced, considering alternative views before reaching a conclusion, in this way learners will ensure that their answers are balanced.
- Judgements should be about the issue in the question, linking the material back to the actual question and they will avoid introducing new ideas.
- Where learners are discussing a range of factors they will have weighed up the relative importance of those factors and reached a supported judgement about their relative importance. In assessing the relative importance of a factor or issue answers will explain why a factor or issue is more or less important, it will not simply be asserted.
- A supported judgement will be deemed to have been reached only if the judgement has been supported by relevant and accurate material, not simply asserted.
- The final paragraph will bring together any judgements which have been made in the individual paragraphs (interim judgements) so as to reach an overall judgement about the issue in the question.
- Strong answers will not be descriptive and they will avoid irrelevance.

Sample answers

'Muslim disunity was the most important reason for the success of the First Crusade.'

Although there were a number of factors, such as the leadership and military skill of Bohemond and the aid given to the Crusaders, the most important reason for their success and the capture of Jerusalem was Muslim disunity. The importance of this factor becomes even clearer when the Second and Third Crusades faced a much more united Muslim force and were defeated at Damascus and Jerusalem respectively.

Disunity among Muslim forces meant that the Crusader army did not have to face the full force and weight of a Muslim army, instead they faced only the forces of local emirs whilst other emirs often gave aid and gifts to the invading Crusaders, or even made alliances, such were the divisions. The Muslim forces were further weakened and divided by the death of the Sultan Malik Shah in 1092 and other caliphs and viziers in 1094. This meant that there was a power vacuum in Anatolia in which petty rulers were fighting for control, whereas a united force under a leader, such as Malik Shah would probably have been able to stop the Crusader forces. Local rivalry between Kilij Arslan and the Danishmends further weakened Muslim resistance, as each seemed more concerned by their own position and unaware that the Crusaders were intent on taking Jerusalem, rather than simply retaking lost Byzantine lands. There were also divisions between Sunni and Shi'a Muslims and these groups hated each other more than they hated the Crusaders and were also willing to form alliances with the Crusaders to make gains at the expense of their fellow Muslims, which made it much easier for the Crusaders to take both Antioch and Dorylaeum. This division also meant that the Shia caliph in Cairo did not come to the aid of the Sunni caliph in Baghdad, further reducing the size of army that the Crusaders faced.

Although the early victory at Nicaea against Kilij Arslan was due to the aid and help of the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius Comnenus, later victories owed as much to Muslim disunity as Crusader strengths. The capture of Nicaea was vital as not only was it the main land route to Syria, but it also convinced the Emperor that lands lost at the Battle of Manzikert in 1071 could be recovered and thus gave greater meaning to the Crusader oath of loyalty to him. Whereas, when the Crusader army arrived in Constantinople he was concerned by the large numbers and feared that they might turn on him. However, it was not just aid from the Emperor that helped the Crusaders, Italian states, such as Genoa supplied siege engines which would prove crucial in the capture of Jerusalem.

Religious zeal was also important in driving the Crusaders on. The Crusaders believed that in fighting against the Muslims they were guaranteed a place in heaven and the Pope had promised them remission of all the sins they had committed. This meant that they were willing to put up with many hardships on their long and difficult journey, during which many died either from the conditions or in battle. By the time their forces laid siege to Antioch their numbers had been greatly reduced. It was during these hard times, with the siege lasting eight months, that their religious conviction played

an important role in their success as was seen in the Miracle of the Holy Lance at Antioch. The discovery of this gave the Crusaders hope and they sent out a delegation asking the Muslim leader to withdraw, when that failed Bohemond led the Crusader army to a great victory, inspired by religious zeal; they forced the Muslim defenders inside the citadel of the town to flee. Similarly, at Jerusalem it was religious zeal that helped in the capture with fasting and a barefoot walk to the Mount of Olives, which helped to inspire them to victory after initial failings. However, had aid come from other Muslims it is unlikely that the Crusaders would have been able to take Jerusalem, as they would have been outnumbered, as they had already been driven back by Iftikhar's forces. Therefore, although religious zeal drove them on they were only able to defeat the Muslim forces because they were divided.

The leadership of the Crusader forces was also important in the success of the Crusade. After the death of the papal envoy, Adhemar, it was Bohemond who played the crucial role, maintaining Crusader morale at Antioch and arranging the betrayal of the city to his forces and then leading Crusader troops to victory over Kerbogha. However, he was fortunate in that he did not have to face a much larger Muslim army, which would have defeated Bohemond's much weakened forces after the famine that had afflicted them during the earlier siege of Antioch.

Both the Muslim and Crusader armies had powerful fighting elements, particularly their cavalry. The light cavalry of the Muslims, with their archers, caused the Crusaders serious problems in the initial encounters. However, the heavy cavalry of the Crusaders terrified the Muslim forces and played an important role in the victory at Dorylaeum and gave them a psychological advantage in future battles. However, it was not just the use of heavy cavalry that was important, the Crusaders also made good use of siege engines in their capture of both Jerusalem and Antioch, allowing them to enter both cities.

Although the leadership of Bohemond and the military skill of the Crusaders allowed them to defeat the Muslim forces, it would not have been possible to defeat a united, and much larger, Muslim force. The Crusaders were fortunate that, given their vastly reduced numbers, they were faced only by mostly weak, individual Muslim leaders and that the political situation in the region was such that they did not face a leader such as Malik Shah or Saladin.

Commentary

The answer explains the role of a number of factors, but also reaches a judgement that Muslim divisions were the most important factor. This argument is supported both by comparing, albeit briefly with later Crusades, and by arguing that given the reduced Crusader numbers they would not have been able to resist a full-scale Muslim assault. The depth of knowledge is good and is used to support the argument. The answer would reach the bottom of Level 6.

'Charles V's wars with France were a failure.' How far do you agree?

Charles V was at war for most of his reign, much of the time with France, but also with the Ottomans. In assessing whether his wars against France were a failure it is essential to understand his aims. As the foreign policy pursued by Charles was very much his own it is important to remember that his main concern was to recover his ancestral land, which belonged to his family, and it was this that drew him into wars against France in Navarre, Naples, Milan and a series of duchies and counties between Switzerland the Channel associated with the duchy of Burgundy. Charles was also particularly concerned to protect the dynastic interests of the Habsburgs, believing that their interests had to be asserted and defended. How far he was able to achieve these aims and prevent French encroachment on his lands will determine the extent of his failure. It appears that in the first part of his reign it is much harder to argue that his wars against France were a failure when compared with later period.

In the Italian Wars it certainly appears that Charles was initially, at least, successful. Charles had driven the French from Milan in 1521 and although it was briefly retaken, he then captured the French king, Francis I, at the Battle of Pavia in 1525 when the latter was trying to retake Milan and the resulting Treaty of Madrid appeared to give Charles victory. It was not just in Italy that the treaty appeared to have secured his position, but also in his struggles over Burgundy and the Pyrenees. However, this success was only short term as once Francis was released he rejected the Treaty arguing that he had been forced to sign it against his will. Renewed warfare broke out, but again the French suffered a humiliating defeat at Landriano in 1529. It would therefore be wrong to argue that his wars in Italy were a failure as by the 1530s Charles was the master of the peninsula and later attempts by Francis I and Henry II failed in their attempts to take back the lost lands and Charles retained control of Milan and Naples.

However, if Charles was successful in Italy, the results of the wars in eastern France and the Netherlands were far less successful and Charles was unable to protect the dynastic rights of the Habsburgs. This was even more of a failure for Charles because he had been brought up in the Netherlands and therefore the Burgundian inheritance was particularly important to him. However, at first it did not appear as if Charles' wars were a failure as in the 1529 Treaty of Cambrai Francis I gave up his right of overlordship over both Artois and Flanders. This was significant as lordship was central to feudal politics and it meant that Charles was no longer a subject of the French king and could not be open to charges of treason when he was at war with him. However, his invasion of Champagne in 1544 achieved little, but the greatest disaster was in 1552 when Henry II took the strategically important bishoprics of Metz, Toul and Verdun.

This was a failure as all three lay well inside the Empire and Henry also took control of the child duke of Lorraine, which gave him control of a major border state, with some historians arguing that 1552 was the nadir of Charles' fortunes. Charles also failed in his attempt to regain Metz, with some arguing that the campaign was a greater disaster than the failure at Algiers in 1541 and can be compared with the scale of defeat

suffered by Francis at Pavia. The last few years of the period were less of a failure as Henry II's attack in Artois was stopped as new style fortifications meant he could not capture well-fortified towns. Moreover, victory was achieved against the French at St Quentin, in Picardy in 1557. This was probably the greatest defeat inflicted on the French since Pavia and is further evidence that not all the wars were a disaster. This is further confirmed by the Treaty of Cateau Cambresis in 1559 when the imperial frontier was moved south to incorporate Flanders and Artois and the French confirmed promises made since 1482 that the Burgundian lands belonged to the Habsburgs. The wars had therefore secured Artois and Flanders for Charles, although he failed to regain the original duchy of Burgundy, which remained in French hands. As a result, Charles had been partially successful in his wars in the region, however this should be balanced against the cost and the development of new fortifications which meant that future gains were highly unlikely.

The French also had some success in developing alliances with German princes which weakened Charles' position and made it more difficult to recover lands on the French border. Charles was unable to stop the loss of the strategically important Wurttemberg in 1534; this was a valuable stepping stone between the Habsburg Tyrol and the Burgundian province of Franche-Comte and made the successful defence of the Burgundian inheritance much harder. However, he was able to defeat Cleves in 1540 and weaken the alliance that Francis had built up with Duke William and the Danish king. Therefore, although these disputes were not directly against the French they did have implications for Charles strategic position which was partially weakened.

Charles' wars were not a total failure, he had inflicted a number of defeats on the French, but because of the changing nature of warfare and the financial costs neither he nor his successor would not be able to secure a complete victory. He had been able to defend much of his inheritance, but he had not been able to recover the duchy of Burgundy. Although he had been largely able to preserve his inheritance, an important consideration, it had been at the cost of virtual bankruptcy and despite significant victories in 1525, 1529 and 1557, he had also suffered a significant defeat, which he could not reverse in 1552, suggesting that although his wars were not a complete failure, nor were they an overwhelming success.

Commentary

A well-argued and very thorough response. The argument is very well supported with accurate and relevant detail. The response is well focused and judgements are made throughout the essay. The response would reach the top of Level 6.

Assess the reasons for the policy of appeasement followed by British and French Governments towards Germany in the 1930s

There are many reasons for the policy of appeasement. The losses of the First World War made the prospect of another European war unthinkable for many and were a major influence on public opinion. In Britain, more people voted in 1918 so

politicians had to be more responsive to the public mood, but this was probably not the main reason for the policy. Britain did not have, by the 1930s, the defence resources available to meet all the commitments it faced. Its empire had to be defended against Japan in the Far East and Italy in the Mediterranean. The service chiefs told the government that it should try to avoid a war against Germany, Italy and Japan. Also a war would involve air power and Britain needed more time to build up her air defences and new fighter planes. France had a much larger army so this may not have been the main consideration. There, the main motive may well have been fear of lack of support for a war given internal divisions.

Defence factors were of greater importance than factors like public opinion or the economy in Britain. Even when public opinion had changed quite considerably after the Munich crisis, the Chamberlain government was still anxious to avoid war and delayed declaring war on Germany in September. The government had managed to build up more air defences, but was still conscious that it would be hard pressed to defend the Empire in a war which involved all of its potential enemies, and this proved to be the case in 1940-41 when Japan easily overran the British colonies in Southeast Asia. Economic factors were important but the costs of a substantial rearmament were met in 1938-9 so they were probably not the main factor. Before that, British defences were dangerously weak and this led Chamberlain to seek to avoid war at all costs in 1938. Britain by then had not developed radar stations or built up its fighter squadrons. It would have been vulnerable. There was no conscription and no effective expeditionary force. Most senior service leaders were opposed to war. France could have used its army, but its defence planning was focused on the Maginot Line rather than on sending forces to help Czechoslovakia.

Linked to defence was the lack of effective allies in the event of war with Hitler, making it imperative to have a policy of appeasement. The USA had been isolationist since 1920 and had passed Neutrality Acts forbidding the export of war supplies to belligerents. The First World War had shown the importance of supplies from North America and without these, Britain would not have been able to fight a war for long. The French had an alliance with the USSR, but did not want to involve Communist Russia in European affairs. This would have been unpopular at home and also have led to distrust by France's other allies in Eastern Europe. Neither Britain nor France thought Stalin could sustain a war because of the economic turmoil Russia was in during the 1930s and the purges of the leading generals. Also the British were not sure whether the Empire would support another war. These factors were important but would not have mattered so much if the British had not allowed its armed forces to run down so much in the 1920s and early 30s and had not faced the prospect of fighting not just Germany, but also Italy and Japan. German forces were not as strong as they seemed in 1938 and Britain would not have needed to appease so much if her own defences had been maintained better.

Public opinion was an important reason for appeasement in both France and Britain and there were terrible memories of battles in the First World War and a desire not to repeat the slaughter. There was every reason, too, to think that with airpower the war would be worse. France was politically

divided, with a strong section of the population being opposed to the left and the Popular Front. Britain was less divided politically but had seen expressions of anti-war feeling such as the east Fulham by election in 1933. There was a strong feeling, too, that Germany had been harshly treated after the war and had a right to remilitarize its own territory in the Rhineland in 1936 and to join with fellow Germans in Austria in 1938. However, public opinion did not support appeasement at any price and there was revulsion at the German occupation of Prague in 1939 and a feeling that Munich was quite shameful. Thus while public opinion was a factor, it was not a constant factor.

The most likely explanation is that a practical and logical leader like Chamberlain simply thought of appeasement as the most realistic solution given Britain's lack of military capability to meet all the demands it faced. When he took a strong lead in trying to avoid war by meeting German grievances, France followed suit because it could not act without Britain. Public opinion may have supported this, at least in 1938, but Chamberlain was not a man to simply follow opinion and was very clever in manipulating it. It was not just a matter of cost as Britain found the money to rearm when necessary. It is also unfair to blame it on moral cowardice or sympathy with Hitler. At the time Chamberlain was thought to be making brave decisions by flying to meet with a dictator whom he found hateful to serve Britain's best interests, and this policy was based firmly on a clear understanding of the resources which Britain could command and its wider defence obligations.

Commentary

This answer has a lot of judgement about the relative importance of different factors and argues throughout that the key element was defence resources. It compares different explanations and comes to a considered judgement. There is good understanding and while France is not dealt with as fully, it is considered and there is an understanding that French priorities might have been different. The answer is analytical throughout and does not go through a list of factors but does respond to the command to 'assess'.

Strong answers have a clear focus on the question.

A range of issues or factors are discussed and there is some judgement reached, often the judgement is present throughout the essay.

Factual knowledge is used to support the argument and it is accurate and relevant.

Likely problems with Unit 2 responses

Short answer questions

- Answers consider only one of the two named factors or issues.
- There is no supported judgement but the conclusion is based on assertion.

- There is no conclusion.
- The analysis and explanation of the factors is not linked to the issue in the question.

Long answer questions

- Failure to focus on the issue in the question and write generally about the topic.
- The answer does not analyse or evaluate the issues or factors discussed.
- The answer fails to reach a judgement, but relies on assertion.
- The answer covers only part of the period set.
- The answer considers domestic policy when the question was on foreign.
- Analysis and argument is based on incorrect factual material; this undermines the credibility of the argument.

Unit 3 Assessment Overview

Answering interpretation questions

The type of question set will require learners to:

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing in its view of

The Interpretations will always be from historians and will not be primary sources. The total length of the two passages is unlikely to exceed five hundred words, but this figure is for guidance and much will depend on the complexity of the passages.

Only one question will be set and this will be on one of the named three in-depth topics. It is advised that learners spend approximately an hour on this question and they might consider spending 15 minutes reading the two interpretations and 45 minutes writing their response.

It is important to remember that although this is an A Level paper it is not an historiography paper. The aim of this element of the Unit is to develop an awareness that the past has been interpreted in different ways. The question will require learners to assess the strengths and limitations of the two interpretation of an issue related to one of the specified in-depth topics. This should be done by the application of knowledge to the passages.

Learners should place the interpretation within the context of the wider historical debate on the key topic. However, learners will not be required to know the names of individual historians associated with the debate or to have studied the specific books of any historians and it may even be counterproductive to be aware of particular historians' views, as this may lead to simply describing their view, rather than analysing the given interpretation.

Learners will need to read the passages carefully and ensure that they are clear what each passage is saying about the issue in the question. Learners who simply explain the general view of the passage, rather than focusing on the view of the passage about the issue in the question will not score highly.

Although assessors do not have a set view as to how the question should be answered, it might be helpful for learners to think of a four paragraph structure:

- In the first paragraph explain the interpretations in the two Passages and place them in the wider debate.
- In the second paragraph apply own knowledge to Interpretation A to evaluate the validity of its view about the issue in the question. In doing this own knowledge should be used to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the view in the interpretation.
- Repeat the second point, but for Interpretation B.
- In the final paragraph reach a supported and balanced judgement as to which view you think is more convincing.

Although the Interpretations will be fully attributed, learners should not evaluate the provenance of the Interpretation and therefore comments on the author and their background will not gain marks.

Evaluation is a crucial skill for this element of Unit 3 and learners should be aware that this is understood to mean the application of own knowledge to the Interpretations in order to judge the strength and/or weakness of the Interpretation under discussion. The own knowledge will need to be closely linked to the Interpretation in order to show whether the view in the Interpretation is valid or not. The level of knowledge expected is similar to that which can be found in standard A Level texts on the topic being studied and does not require the depth that would be expected for University research.

The other important element to the Interpretation question is the requirement to reach a **judgement**. Learners should ensure that in their final paragraph they reach a judgement. All A Level questions require learners to reach a judgement if they are to access the higher levels. Learners might reach the conclusion that Interpretation A is stronger in some ways, but Interpretation B is stronger in others, and this perfectly acceptable provided the judgement is supported. Similarly, learners might conclude that although Interpretation B is the stronger Interpretation it still has limitations and provided this is supported and the learner has explained why the Interpretation is still stronger than Interpretation A this is also acceptable. It is important to remember that unless the judgement is supported by some evidence it is simply an assertion and not a judgement and will not reach the higher levels.

Features of strong answers

Strong answers will;

- Have a very good focus on the question throughout the answer.
- Assess and evaluate the two interpretations in the wider context of the historical debate about the issue.
- Apply knowledge of the topic to the interpretations in order to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses.
- Ensure that both Interpretations are considered.
- Reach a supported judgement as to which interpretation is more convincing.
- Have sustained evaluation of each Interpretation.
- Used to detailed, accurate and knowledge relevant to the question to evaluate the interpretations.
- Be consistently analytical.
- Show a developed and nuanced evaluative vocabulary.
- Display evaluation that is well supported by knowledge as this will make the argument more convincing.
- Use knowledge in an apposite manner and be aware that it is not its quantity that is important, but its quality and relevance.

Answering Thematic essay questions

Three questions will be set on each Unit within the group. Learners are required to answer two of the three questions and it is advised that they spend approximately 45 minutes on each essay, leaving approximately an hour for the Interpretation element.

The types of question that will be set for the Thematic essay include:

- 'X was the most significant turning point in Y during the period from A to B.' How far do you agree with this view?
- How far do you agree that X remained the same throughout the period from A to B?
- 'X was the main cause of Y throughout the period.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period from A to B?
- Quotation about the period. How far do you agree with this view?
- Assess the reasons for X throughout the period.
- To what extent was X the main factor in Y?

Questions set will require learners to cover the whole period,

although there may be greater emphasis on some part of the period than others. However, learners will also not be expected to cover the whole period in each paragraph, but there must be balanced coverage of the period in the full answer.

The skills are made very clear by the mark schemes, which emphasise that the answer must:

- Focus on the demands of the question.
- Be supported by accurate and relevant factual knowledge
- Be analytical and well structured.
- Reach a supported and developed judgement about the issue in the question.
- Demonstrate evidence of well-developed synthesis across the whole period.

These skills are the same as those have been developed for essay writing in Units 1 and 2. However, in this Unit there is a significant emphasis on **synthesis** across the whole period.

Stronger answers are likely to have a thematic structure, as is suggested by the title of the Unit, and avoid a chronological approach. A chronological approach will make it much more difficult for learners to demonstrate synthesis and as this is required for the higher levels it will be much harder to access those levels unless there is a thematic approach.

Each paragraph should deal with a theme, which is related to the issue in the question. Within each paragraph higher-level answers will display synthesis. Synthesis requires learners to bring together material from across the period and make links and connections between that material, explaining the similarities and differences and the continuity and change between the events being discussed so that a judgement as to, for example, whether a factor or issue retained the same significance throughout the period. It might be helpful for learners to think in terms of comparing a range of events linked to a particular factor in each paragraph. It is important that the events are linked together and that the similarity or difference between them is explained. Learners should be aware that simply bringing together events, or listing a range across the period, in the same paragraph is not synthesis; it becomes synthesis only when links and explanations are made between the events.

Learners should also be aware that when questions are set on 'turning points' the same thematic structure to an answer is required. It is very difficult to demonstrate synthesis if answers adopt a chronological approach and write a paragraph on each possible turning point considered.

Synthesis is the key feature of this element of this Unit and its meaning has been explained above. However, learners should study carefully the exemplar essays at the end of the material to ensure they are clear as to the requirements ([see Page 28](#)). Similarly, the ideas of evaluation and judgement have been explained in the Period Study essays and it will be seen in the same way in this Unit.

Features of strong answers

We have already emphasised that the features of good responses to essays in Units 1 and 2 still apply to this unit and therefore it is worth stressing those features.

A good answer will:

- Show a consistent focus on the question, learners will link their material to the important words or phrases in the question.
- These answers will focus on the issue in the question and not write about the topic in more general terms.
- Answers will focus on the key terms in the question, this may be on issues such as 'consistently', 'always' or 'mostly'.
- Strong answers are likely to establish a set of criteria, such as the aims, against which to judge issues such as success or failure.
- Strong answers will often have a focused opening paragraph which outlines the view of the learner about the issue in the question and identifies the themes or factors that will be covered in the response.
- Strong answers will consider a range of themes and will certainly discuss those that are central to a particular issue or topic.
- The answer will have a clear and consistent argument; the learner will clearly explain their view about the issue in the question and support their argument by reference to precise, accurate and relevant material.
- Answers will consider a range of themes and issues and reach a balanced and supported judgement about the issues or factors they have discussed in relation to the question.
- Answers will be balanced, considering alternative views before reaching a conclusion, in this way learners will ensure that their answers are balanced.
- Judgements should be about the issue in the question, linking the material back to the actual question and they will avoid introducing new ideas.
- Where learners are discussing a range of themes or factors they will have weighed up the relative importance of those factors and reached a supported judgement about their relative importance. In assessing the relative importance of a theme or factor answers will explain why a factor or issue is more or less important, it will not simply be asserted.
- A supported judgement will be deemed to have been reached only if the judgement has been supported by relevant and accurate material, not simply asserted.
- The final paragraph will bring together any judgements which have been made in the individual paragraphs (interim judgements) so as to reach an overall judgement about the issue in the question.

- Strong answers will not be descriptive and they will avoid irrelevance.
- In addition to the features found in good responses to Unit 1 and 2 essays, responses for Unit 3 will also need to demonstrate the following:
- Coverage of the whole period.
- Display a high level of synthesis throughout the response.

Likely problems with Unit 3 responses

In answering the Interpretation question the following problems might arise:

- Learners make use of only of the Interpretations.
- They write generally about the view of the Interpretation and not the view in Interpretation about the issue in the question.
- There is no judgement, or the judgement is not supported and is therefore simply assertion.
- The Interpretations are explained but their views are not evaluated using own knowledge, or the only knowledge used is from the other Interpretation.
- The view of the Interpretation about the issue in the question is misunderstood.
- The response focuses on the provenance of the passage or is dominated by historiography.

In answering the Thematic essays the following problems might arise:

- Responses do not cover the whole period.
- Synthesis is not shown, instead paragraphs simply list examples from across the period and there is no link made between the examples to show similarity or difference.
- Failure to focus on the issue in the question and write generally about the topic.
- The answer does not analyse or evaluate the issues or factors discussed.
- The answer fails to reach a judgement, but relies on assertion.
- The answer considers domestic policy when the question was on foreign.
- Analysis and argument is based on incorrect factual material; this undermines the credibility of the argument.
- The argument is not coherent or logical.
- Attempts at argument lack factual support.
- There is no comparative evaluation of factors.
- In turning point essay the turning points are listed.

Sample Interpretation and Thematic essays

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing about Savonarola's attitude to the Renaissance.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/170352-unit-h505-y305-the-renaissance-c1400-c1600-sample-assessment-material.pdf>

The two Interpretations agree that Savonarola destroyed many works of art and literature in the bonfire of the vanities, but Interpretation A is more negative in his view of his impact on the Renaissance. Interpretation A focuses entirely on the destructive impact of his rule on the art work of Florence, whilst Interpretation B, whilst acknowledging that considerable amounts of art were destroyed also comments on the fact that he saved the Medici library after they fell from power in 1494. Both Interpretations suggest that Savonarola's main concern was to destroy art which celebrated pre-Christian societies and values, but Interpretation A is much more explicit in this view, with interpretation B simply commenting that he supported art and literature provided it was used to support Christian purposes.

Interpretation A suggests that Florence lost a great deal of art, such was the value that the Venetian ambassador offered 20,000 ducats for the works that were to be burnt, which included paintings by Botticelli and writings by Boccaccio. This view is certainly valid as Botticelli himself surrendered paintings for the bonfire of the vanities. However, Interpretation A claims that Savonarola attacked humanism, but this view can be challenged as humanists became friars at San Marco during his period in power, which would have been improbable had his attack been on humanism as whole. However, the Interpretation is more valid when it claims that the bonfire of the vanities was directed against obscene literature, pornographic pictures and paintings. The Interpretation also suggests that there were groups of youths who went round collecting in the works and whilst this is partly true, painters such as Botticelli did surrender their works and there was also some opposition within the city to the actions as there was an attack on some of those who had carried out the burning as they returned to San Marco. The Interpretation also ignores the point made in Interpretation B that such burnings were not new and that they had been witnessed before as acts of contrition, suggesting that Savonarola was simply carrying on a tradition of Florentine life. The negative view of Savonarola's attitude towards Renaissance work in Interpretation A is further challenged by Interpretation B, which stresses how important a role he played in saving the vast Medici library after their fall from power in 1494, again hardly an action of someone who was completely opposed to the Renaissance. This action does reinforce the view in A that his main concern was to attack those who celebrated pre-Christian societies and not other elements of the Renaissance.

The view that Savonarola was not an enemy of all aspects of the Renaissance is given greater credence by Interpretation

B, which gives more attention to his actions in defending certain aspects of it, notably the Medici library. Interpretation A gave the impression that Savonarola attacked humanism as it challenged Christian thought, but Interpretation B qualifies this by mentioning the promotion of humanist scholars as friars at San Marco and this is given further support by his relationships with both Ficino and Mirandola.

Interpretation B is much clearer that his attack was on works of art which were out of sympathy with Christian values and did not encourage devotion and meditation and this is reflected in that he burnt only that which he considered 'indecent' and not everything. Moreover B is also more valid in its view that the bonfires were not a new occurrence used just by Savonarola to impose his views on the city. Interpretation B is therefore correct to argue that he was not completely opposed to the Renaissance; he wanted it to be used for Christian purposes, hence his attack on pagan writings.

Interpretation B is more valid in its view of Savonarola's attitude towards the Renaissance. It clearly sees the limits to his attack, which is less apparent in Interpretation A. Interpretation B offers a more balanced account of his views and this is most obviously reflected in his attitude and support for the Medici library, which is again ignored by Interpretation A. Although A is correct in its comments about what was burnt, this is not denied by B and therefore Interpretation B gives a more complete view of his attitudes towards the Renaissance.

Commentary

The response clearly explains the views of the two passages and is aware that they do not offer completely different views about Savonarola's attitude towards the Renaissance. Some own knowledge is used to test the views offered in both Interpretations, although the response would benefit from this being developed. There is good use made of Interpretation B to challenge some of the ideas put forward in Interpretation A. The judgement is clear and is supported and this would help take the response into the top level, albeit at the lower end.

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing about the impact of the domestic policies of Alexander II.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/170312-unit-h505-y318-russia-and-its-rulers-1855-1964-sample-assessment-material.pdf>

Both Passages A and B argue that the reforms brought in by Alexander II were urgently needed, particularly in light of the situation in the country revealed by the defeat in the Crimean War. However, although both argue that reforms were urgently needed they differ as to how far the reforms actually went in tackling the problems Russia faced. Passage A argues that the reforms had a significant impact and did much to change Russian society and that their impact should be seen alongside those of the French Revolution. However, Passage B argues that the impact of the reforms, particularly the Emancipation of the Serfs was disappointing and did little to modernise the state.

Passage A is positive about the impact of the reforms and argues that although the Emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 was the centrepiece of the reforms, releasing as it did 20 million peasants from bondage, it led to a series of other reforms which had a significant impact on Russia. The Passage is correct to argue that Emancipation led to other reforms as Alexander II oversaw reforms to the army, local government and the judiciary which helped to modernise Russia, although there was little political reform. The Passage is also correct to see the reforms as essential in preserving autocracy, which was an important element behind them, the Tsar was more concerned to see reform from above than Revolution from below, which was looking increasingly possible if changes were not made. In bringing about these changes he was able to make autocracy work more efficiently as there was more incentive for the peasantry to work the land if they owned it, although this view is challenged in Passage B. The Passage is also correct in arguing that the nobility were opposed to the reform, but they were struggling to maintain their estates before emancipation and the revenue they obtained from the redemption payments that followed Emancipation did help them repay debts. Although the Passage argues that Emancipation granted the peasants 'individual freedom and a minimum of civil rights' this is not completely true as the peasants still had to answer to the Mir; decisions about what was to be produced and how crops were to be cultivated had to be made by the village elders. Therefore, although it encouraged further reform Passage A is incorrect in seeing the changes as completely positive and it could also be argued that it appears to have little impact on Russia's ability to fight wars any more successfully given their performances in 1904-5 and in the First World War.

Passage B views the reforms, particularly the Emancipation as having a limited impact and in many ways this view is correct. The peasantry did not gain their freedom because of the role of the Mir. The Passage also argues that Emancipation failed to bring about the modernisation of agriculture or create the conditions for economic advance and this is certainly valid as one of the responsibilities of the Mir was to ensure the continuation of subsistence farming, which as the Passage argues ensured that obsolete agricultural techniques continued to be used. This also meant that more able peasant farmers had no incentive to produce surpluses and were reluctant to invest to improve the land, supporting the view in the Passage that there was little investment. Not only is the Passage correct to argue that Emancipation did not bring about an agricultural advance as such measure held back advances, but the passage is also correct to note that many peasants lost land as a result of the Edict, farming less and often poorer quality land than had been the situation beforehand. This also meant that many peasants struggled to earn enough from the land to meet the redemption payments they faced and this situation was made even worse by the rural poll taxes they had to pay. The Passage also argues that the negative impact of Emancipation is also reflected in the peasant unrest which followed and this is certainly true and is further supported by the need for further reforms in the later period. However, despite the limitations of the Edict, the Passage ignores the symbolic importance of the reform – it did appear to be a symbol of change – even if as the Passage correctly argues the economic impact was much more limited than had been hoped.

Although both Passages argue that the reforms of Alexander II were significant, Passage B offers the more convincing view about the impact of Emancipation. The impact on agriculture was limited as a view of Russian farming on the eve of the First World War, the lack of mechanization and the frequent famines reveals. Although Passage A is correct to argue that the nobility opposed the reform, Passage B is correct in arguing that for the peasantry little changed, they replaced the control of the nobility for the control of the village Mir and therefore did not gain their freedom as instead of paying dues to the noble they were paid to the village elders. However, the Passage does ignore the symbolic nature of the reform as it was the first major change to the system and did, as A argues bring about reforms in other areas.

Commentary

The answer is consistently focused on the issue in the question. The views of the two passages are clearly explained and analysed. Own knowledge is used to evaluate the views and this knowledge is clearly linked to the two Passages, helping to take the response into the higher levels. A clear and supported judgement is reached.

Evaluate the interpretations in both of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing in explaining why Mao launched the Cultural Revolution.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/Images/170311-unit-h505-y317-china-and-its-rulers-1839-1989-sample-assessment-material.pdf>

The two interpretations have a different emphasis on the reasons for the Cultural Revolution. The focus of Interpretation A is on Mao's desire to bring about a drab culture where the entire focus is on him and this is shown in the reference to the 'cult of Mao' and the publication and handout of the little 'Red Book'. However, the focus of Interpretation B is on the internal quarrels within the Chinese Communist Party. Mao was concerned that the party had lost its revolutionary zeal since the 1949 Revolution and that bourgeois developments were enveloping it, as had happened in the Soviet Union. His concern, therefore, according to Interpretation B was to rekindle the crusade for democracy and socialism, which had been there when the party came to power. However, both Interpretations also suggest that Mao was concerned about his own position and that he wanted to protect it, as Interpretation A suggests that there was a plot against him.

There is some merit in the view offered in Interpretation A that Mao wanted to create an arid society as the attack on art and culture, which as the Interpretation states was the first phase of the Revolution, did destroy centuries of art and closed down many theatres, bringing about what A describes as 'a life without entertainment and colour'. However, the Interpretation argues that the purpose behind this was so that the nation would be brain-dead and simply carry out his orders. This would, as the Interpretation suggests help establish the cult of Mao, which appears to underpin much of this and was made clear with the publication of the little Red Book, which

was given to everyone and stressed the wisdom of Mao, as opposed to that of his opponents, particularly Liu. Therefore the argument that the Cultural Revolution was for higher motives is incorrect, instead as the Interpretation emphasises, it was subordinate to Mao's personal gain. The Interpretation also argues that Mao feared Russia was involved in a plot to remove him and there is some justification for his concern given developments in the Soviet Union, particularly as he believed that the attack on Stalin's cult of personality in the late 1950s was a veiled attack on him and his leadership of China and this fear was added to with the fall of Khrushchev in 1964, supposedly for 'hair brained economic schemes', which could again be compared with events in China.

However, Interpretation B also has merit in explaining the reasons for the Cultural Revolution. The Interpretation stresses Mao's concern that he had been unable to implement all the changes and reforms he desired and that the party had lost its revolutionary zeal since taking power in 1949. The Interpretation is correct to stress that Mao was concerned about the party becoming bureaucratic and counter-revolutionary as many within the higher echelons of the party were more concerned with personal power. This view is reinforced by Mao's belief that revolution was a historical event but a continuous process and therefore the Chinese Revolution could not stand still if it was to be a genuine revolution. The Interpretation is therefore correct that Mao was worried that the achievements of 1949 would be destroyed and therefore the Interpretation is correct to argue that Mao appealed directly to the people in order to circumvent the vested interests in the party. The Interpretation also suggests that this is why Mao made his appeal to the young, but this could also be because the younger members of the party had not been tested by events such as the Long March or the war against the GMD. The Interpretation is correct to stress that Mao did not want affairs to be run by bureaucrats as he wanted to preserve the Revolution as essentially a peasant movement and therefore there was a gap between Mao and some of the other leaders, who had distrusted events such as the Great Leap Forward.

Neither Interpretation offers a complete explanation for the Cultural Revolution as there are weaknesses to both. Interpretation A is correct to argue that Mao wanted obedience to himself and did need to reassert his authority after the power struggles of 1961-6, it ignores Mao's constant emphasis on a continual Revolution, which is stressed in Interpretation B. The violence that accompanied the Cultural Revolution may undermine the view offered in B, but given Mao's constant concern about counter-revolution and his views about developments in the Soviet Union it offers a more convincing view for the reasons behind the Cultural Revolution.

Commentary

This is a very full answer which is consistently focused on the question. It shows a thorough understanding of the Passages and is able to explain the views they offer, acknowledging areas of similarity. Own and contextual knowledge are applied to the Interpretations in order to evaluate both the strengths and limitations of the views they offer. The knowledge is often detailed and there is a good awareness of the wider context

of the Cultural Revolution. There is a clear judgement, which is both explained and developed.

'The Viking capture of York in 866 was the most important turning point in the Viking settlement of England from 790 to 1066.' How far do you agree?

The Viking capture of York in 866 was undoubtedly a significant turning point in their settlement of England, but whether it was the most significant is debatable. Although it resulted in the first significant settlement following Viking raids, there were other events, such as the capture of London, probably in 871, which were also important. Similarly, it could be argued that it was the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865 and the later Great Summer Army which were the most important events as they represented a significant change from the Viking raids of the eighth century and early ninth to a process of settlement that led to the capture of places such as York. It might also be argued that it was the establishment of fortifications, such as Repton, or the establishment of the Danelaw that were more significant turning points as they provide clear evidence of the permanence of Viking intentions. However, there was not complete continuity to the Viking settlement and therefore the death of Eric Bloodaxe might be considered an important turning point as it started a Viking withdrawal from England, although victory at Maldon ended that withdrawal and witnessed a continuation of settlement, suggesting that victory might be seen as more significant. There are therefore a variety of incidents and developments that were important turning points, but it was the arrival of the great armies in 865 and 871 that were the most important turning points as they represented the most significant change in the nature and scale of Viking attacks on England and gave them the confidence to establish a virtual 'Viking state' in the east.

The capture of York was an important turning point in the Viking settlement of England as it resulted in the dramatic growth of the town and its establishment as both national and international trading centre, becoming one of the largest Viking settlements and one of the largest towns in Early Medieval Europe. Although the seizure by the Vikings of London in 871 could be considered more significant, it was used only as a winter base and by 886 there is limited evidence that their control of it was any more than weak, suggesting that the taking of York was a greater turning point as it was more permanent and saw them use it to establish control over Northumbria. Despite this, the seizure of London was still important because Alfred showed an increasing concern about the strategic value of the town once the Vikings had taken Rochester in 885 and there are suggestions that he attempted a siege in 882-3, as well as sending envoys to Rome to ask for a blessing in attempt to remove the Viking presence, suggesting that its capture was a greater concern to Wessex than the capture of York, which was beyond his potential control. Yet in terms of trade the capture of York was a significant turning point as it led to York becoming a major manufacturing centre, which had a great impact on the neighbouring area. It resulted in York becoming a centre iron, copper, silver and gold and this evidently led to the development of large scale trade as by 900 the Vikings were minting their own coins in York to meet the

high level of transactions that were taking place. Not only was that a clear indication of the development of a new trading centre following its capture, but also a sign that the Vikings had been able to use its capture to develop a strong economy in the region, suggesting that their presence was far more secure than in more southerly regions. The significance of this is made even more apparent by archaeological work at Coppergate in York, which has shown how the town was transformed as a centre of trade, further supporting the view that this was of greater significance than their temporary seizure of London. However, although York certainly developed under Viking rule, with its population reaching possibly 10,000 by 1000 and 15,000 by 1066, the impact of the Viking capture might be seen as less important as it was already a well-established political, religious and commercial centre and the Vikings simply revitalized it.

Although the capture of York was important, it might be argued that it was the capture of places such as Repton in 873-4 that were a more important turning point. It could be argued that militarily this was more important than York as not only was the Viking army over-wintering much further inland, but archaeological evidence suggests that they were establishing fortifications well inland from which to establish control and settlement over the countryside. This was also more significant as they were establishing settlements in Mercia, not just in the more coastal districts such as York. Such development set the pattern for future Viking advances in settlement in the region away from the coast where they had traditionally raided. It could also be argued that this was more important than the capture of York as such settlement in Mercia led on to the treaty that Alfred made with Guthrum at some time between 886 and 890 which gave Guthrum authority over Essex, East Anglia and parts of Mercia and Northumbria and established Danelaw, therefore confirming the initial gains and giving them a greater sense of permanence than their original capture suggests. The establishment of Danelaw was more significant than the capture of York because it recognized that there was more than a geographical area where the Vikings were present, but that there was an area with a distinct Viking economic, social, political and cultural character which emanated from Scandinavia. Moreover, even when land was recaptured by Edward, the area of Danelaw still retained a distinct Danish feel, which has led some to argue that it did not disappear until 1066, giving its importance even greater significance.

In terms of establishing settlements in England the capture of York was important, but it was not the most important turning point. It was the arrival of the Great Heathen Army in 865 and later, in 871 the Great Summer Army that were more important. Not only were they symbols of the change from raiding to seize moveable goods, but the scale of the invasions was such that settlements could be established, which had not been the case when earlier raids consisted of no more than 25 to 30 ships, but in 865 it was in excess of 250, allowing the development of settlements to occur. The sheer size of the invasion was the crucial turning point as it allowed the Vikings to defeat Saxon armies and gave them the confidence to establish permanent settlements rather than simply raid or even over winter. The importance of this event cannot be over-estimated as, although following the death of Eric Bloodaxe in 956 at Stainmore Viking withdrawal from Britain began, such a development was only short lived and permanent settlement started again following

the victory of Olaf Tryggvason at Maldon in 991. Therefore, it was the success of the Great Heathen Armies of 865 and 871 that were the most important turning point as without their success settlement would not have been possible.

The capture of York was a turning point, representing the seizure of an important English settlement in Northumbria and leading to the establishment of Viking control in the north, that is still evident through place names and even in its loyalties during the Norman period. It was however not the most important turning point, that was a year earlier with the arrival of the first large scale Viking invasion force which allowed the seizure of land and capture of towns such as York and resulted in a process of virtual continuous Viking settlement in the tenth and early eleventh centuries. The earlier Viking attacks, perhaps consisting of no more than a few hundred men had simply been raids, the scale of this invasion made settlement possible and the later development of Viking fortifications at places such as Repton is a clear indication of the change that had taken place.

Commentary

The answer is consistently focused on the question and there is a clear argument throughout the essay. The response is balanced with arguments for and against the capture of York as the most important turning point discussed. The importance of the capture of York is compared to a range of events and a convincing judgement is reached, which is well supported. The issues that are discussed are compared in importance with the capture of York and evidence is drawn from across the period. Although there is little reference to the period before 865 that is because there is no evidence of Viking settlement and the answer makes that very clear, but instead notes that 865 was a turning point away from the raids of that period. The supporting detail is good and is relevant to the question, with a good range of examples of both settlements and individuals. The response does show clear evidence of synthesis, with comparison and explanation and would therefore be reach the top level.

How far were dynastic and personal aims the main influences in shaping Tudor foreign policy?

Throughout the Tudor period dynastic aims were a considerable influence in shaping foreign policy and, although personal aims were important to some monarchs, particularly Henry VIII and Mary I, they were less important. Other factors, such as religion and finance also played a role in influencing foreign policy at various stages, but throughout the period the most important concern was national security.

All the Tudor monarchs were concerned by dynastic aims, with Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary Tudor anxious to secure the throne. Henry VII as a usurper was concerned to secure the dynasty by gaining foreign recognition and this led him to seek marriage alliances with both Spain, through the Treaty of Medina del Campo and Scotland through the Treaty of Ayton. Not only did these agreements give him security against pretenders but Medina del Campo gave him recognition and friendship with a powerful nation. Similarly Henry VIII looked to strengthen the Tudor dynasty by firstly marrying Catherine

of Aragon, continuing his father's policy of allying with Spain. However, later, although by divorcing Catherine and pursuing a series of marriages he abandoned the Spanish alliance, he still looked to secure the dynasty by allying with the German Protestant princes and marrying Anne of Cleves. Mary Tudor also pursued a similar policy, using marriage to secure her dynastic aims by marrying Philip of Spain and re-forging the alliance with Spain. It could also be argued that Henry VIII, through the policy of rough wooing, and then Protector Somerset sought to pursue a similar dynastic policy for Edward by trying to arrange his marriage to Mary Queen of Scots so creating a union between England and Scotland. Even Elizabeth's policy was influenced by dynastic aims as she sought to preserve her throne from invasion by a series of marriage negotiations with Philip of Spain and the French dukes of Anjou and Alençon. Dynastic aims were also seen as a major concern for both Henry VII and Elizabeth in that both were concerned to prevent the Channel coast falling under the control of one power. During Henry VII's reign he went to war with France to try and prevent Brittany being taken by the French, whilst Elizabeth allied with France in 1572 and Dutch rebels to prevent Spanish control of the Channel coast. This was obviously of vital concern to both monarchs as Henry VII lacked the financial resources for such an undertaking, but recognized that security was more important, and similarly for Elizabeth, despite war costing millions of pounds she maintained the conflict with Spain until the end of her reign because of the threat to security, showing just how important a concern it was.

Personal aims were also important, but this was more apparent during the reigns of Henry VIII and Mary, rather than other Tudor monarchs. Henry VIII's policy was influenced by his desire to claim the French throne and display his warlike qualities, hence the invasions of France in 1512, 1513, 1523-5 and again in the 1540s. Henry wanted to be seen as the equivalent of his hero, Henry V, even if it drained England financially as it would also make him appear powerful and chivalrous. Although Mary was also influenced by personal aims they were very different from her fathers as she wanted to re-establish Catholicism and a Catholic dynasty, hence her marriage in 1554 to Philip of Spain. Such was this influence on her policy that she was willing for England to be dragged into the Habsburg-Valois wars, which led to the loss of England's last French possession of Calais. However, personal aims were not as important as other factors. Henry abandoned his French campaign in 1525 due to a lack of financial resources, showing how they could influence foreign policy, whilst Mary became involved in the Habsburg-Valois struggle only because English security was threatened by French support for Stafford.

Securing the border with Scotland was a major influence on policy, particularly because of the Scottish alliance with France. All monarchs until 1560, when the Treaty of Edinburgh lessened the threat, were concerned to secure their northern border. Henry VII through marriage and the Treaty of Ayton was able to secure peace, whilst Henry VIII through more belligerent methods attempted to prevent Scottish incursions, defeating the Scots at Flodden and Solway Moss, then embarking on a policy of rough wooing to try and secure the marriage of his son to Mary Queen of Scots. This concern was also seen under Somerset, who continued Henry's war, defeating the Scots at Pinkie. However, under Elizabeth, although the goals remained

the same – securing the border – the methods changed once the French left and Elizabeth pursued a more friendly policy. Scotland was an important element in English foreign policy, but this was largely because of the threat it posed to security, by offering the French a back-gate to attack England.

Support for co-religionist was also a factor in shaping foreign policy, but this was really only apparent during Elizabeth's reign. Support was given to Protestants in Scotland, but more importantly to the Dutch Calvinists and French Huguenots in the period from the 1560s onwards. Both money and troops were sent to aid the rebels, further adding to the decline in relations with Spain. However, support for these rebels was less because of religious reasons, but because of the threat to the Tudor dynasty should Spain triumph and therefore control the Channel coast. It was therefore national security that encouraged Elizabeth to support the rebels.

Finally English policy was shaped by her relatively weak position both politically and financially. English policy had to be reactive and a lack of finances forced aggressive policies, such as Henry VIII's 1525 campaign to be abandoned with the failure of the Amicable Grant. However, even though England was often weak financially, it did not mean that when security was threatened the latter was sacrificed as was seen with Elizabeth's involvement in the long war with Spain at the end of her reign. This, and a willingness by Henry VII to sacrifice the financial gains of trade with Burgundy by his embargo in the late fifteenth century, are clear evidence that security was the most important factor shaping foreign policy throughout the period.

All monarchs were concerned by security, and even if other factors did influence policy at various stages, they were abandoned if security was threatened. In many instances marriage agreements were the most common way of securing the dynasty, but under Elizabeth it was war against Spain that was required. No monarch risked sacrificing security, whether it was the usurper Henry VII or Elizabeth I.

Commentary

The answer is constantly focused on the question. It approaches the question thematically and throughout the essay makes comparisons across the period. It does not simply assert that there are similarities or differences between the monarchs, but explains them clearly and with accurate and relevant support. Given that the candidate has only 45 minutes to answer the question it covers a good range of issues and avoids being drawn into long narrative accounts. There is a clear and consistent argument and the response does compare the importance of the named factor with other factors in order to reach a judgement. The answer would reach the top level.

'Opposition to African American civil rights remained powerful throughout the period from 1865 to 1992.' How far do you agree?

Opposition to African Americans civil rights was present throughout the period from 1865 to 1992, but the strength of that opposition varied considerably and it could even be argued that at certain points, such as during Reconstruction,

the Second World War and the 1960s in particular it was limited. Opposition came from a variety of groups, including the Federal Government, pressure groups and ordinary citizens, whose attitudes to political, social and economic equality varied across the period.

The hostility of the Federal Government towards African American civil rights suggests that there was strong resistance to equality. However, although some Presidents, such as Wilson, were opposed to civil rights and even praised the Klu Klux Klan for saving the south from black rule during Reconstruction, others such as Johnson and Carter were more supportive, with Johnson's presidency witnessing the passing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the appointment of the first African American, Thurgood Marshall to the Supreme Court. Similarly Carter appointed more African Americans to the judiciary, with the percentage of African American federal judges rising from 4 per cent in 1977 to 9 per cent in 1981. Despite supportive Presidents, there were occasions, as under Roosevelt, when Presidents were unable to do more to aid African Americans, who had been particularly badly hit by the Depression, because of opposition from Democrats in the Senate. However, although not specifically aimed at African Americans, federal aid during the Depression did benefit them as they were among the poorest in America and is further evidence that, even if inadvertently, the Federal Government was not consistently opposed. Kennedy went even further and took unprecedented interventionist action in the Southern states, using federal force and injunctions to get interstate buses and terminals and universities desegregated, but as with Roosevelt, he was also slow in promoting further change, not because he opposed or his party opposed it, but because many Southern Whites felt he was moving too fast. Even Presidents sympathetic to change had to tread carefully because of opposition.

The attitude of the Supreme Court, particularly in the early part of the period suggests that opposition was powerful. The Supreme Court did nothing about the Jim Crow Laws that legalised segregation and even argued in the *Plessy v Ferguson* case that separate but equal facilities were not against the 14th Amendment. Similarly, the Court did not uphold the 15th Amendment which said that African Americans should be able to vote, allowing the South to ignore the US constitution. However, opposition from the Court was not consistent and in 1944 the Supreme Court's decision in the *Smith v Allwright* case served to increase African American political rights in the South. It could even be argued that after the Second World War, the Supreme Court, rather than being a strong opponent of African American civil rights did much to enhance them with the *Shelley v Kramer* case in 1948 when they ruled against restrictive covenants to stop African Americans purchasing houses in white areas and, more importantly in 1954 when they went against the wishes of the President in the *Brown v Board of Education* and supported the view that separate education was psychologically harmful to African American children, culminating in the decision over Little Rock case which forced Eisenhower to enforce the *Brown* ruling. The Supreme Court's attitude changed over the period from being an opponent of civil rights to upholding them and even forcing a President to implement their rulings.

Popular opposition to African American civil rights was powerful for much of the period, reflected in the support for the Jim Crow Laws at the start of the period through to the attitude of the police chief, 'Bull' Connor in Alabama in 1963. This attitude was reflected in the support for the KKK, which was strong for much of the period, with a membership of 40,000 in Tennessee alone in 1871 and some half a million across the South. The strength of this opposition was also reflected in the number of lynchings that took place, with some 2700 between 1885 and 1917, showing that opposition was such that African Americans had no legal protection in the early part of the period. The strength of opposition is still evident in the 1950s when Emmett Till was murdered and the lawyer defending the men accused of his murder said that he was sure 'that every last Anglo-Saxon one of us has the courage to free them', as indeed they were. However, although support for the KKK did decline in the 1930s due to scandals and the cost of membership during the Depression, it recovered at the end of the period with membership tripling in the 1970s, suggesting that opposition was still quite numerous. Despite this, popular attitudes towards African Americans do appear to have changed over the period, further suggesting a decline in the strength of opposition. Some Southern Whites were opposed to the granting of civil rights to African Americans, whilst the police treatment of Rodney King suggests that racism still existed, but this was a minority movement. In contrast, there was much white support for the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, with significant numbers involved in the March on Washington. Even if there was still some support at the end of the period for racist pressure groups, there had been a significant change, which saw a substantial decline in the acceptability of racism, further supporting the view that opposition was not strong throughout the period.

There were periods when opposition was particularly strong, particularly in the period after Reconstruction, but even when opposition was not as openly strong African Americans still found it difficult to achieve civil rights. Although it would appear that opposition was less strong at the end of the period because they had obtained political rights and made progress in education, there was still hidden or indirect opposition as African American poverty had increased, a third lived below the poverty line and a third were working in low skilled jobs, whilst their housing was also of a poorer quality. Therefore, although open hostility seen in the actions of the KKK or lynchings may have disappeared, opposition was still able to prevent the achievement of full civil rights and equality.

Commentary

The question remains focused on the strength of the opposition. It adopts a thematic approach and the response makes comparisons across the whole period, analysing both similarities and differences. The argument is, in places, quite subtle, suggesting that although open opposition was less strong, there was still hidden opposition which was able to prevent full civil rights. The argument is well supported with relevant and accurate material. There is a well-supported judgement, which offers a more nuanced view to the overall argument pursued.

Using the mark schemes to improve performance

It might be helpful for teachers to consider where learners are in this hierarchy for each question type and then focus on them demonstrating the skills required for the next level. It would be unrealistic to expect a learner to move from Level 2 to Level 4 or above in one go.

Learners could use these simplified questions to help them identify at what level they are working, but highlighting evidence of evaluation, judgement etc. They could see areas within their written work where the key skills needed to lift them into the next level are missing and work on improving those paragraphs.

With Unit 1 Question 1, the following might be helpful for learners:

- Is there some evaluation of the sources? L3
- Is there evaluation using provenance and Own Knowledge? L4
- Is there evaluation using provenance and Own Knowledge to reach a judgement? L5
- Is the judgement, evaluation and analysis developed and sustained? L6
- Is there generalised (stock) evaluation? L2
- Is it about the topic or accepts sources at face value? L1

With Unit 1 and Unit 2 Essay Questions, the following might be helpful for learners:

- Is there some argument with support? L3
- Is there some argument and limited judgement? L4
- Is there some developed judgement? L5
- Is the judgement sustained and developed? L6
- Is there mostly description or very argument? L2
- Is the answer on the topic not the question? L1

With Unit 2 short answer Essay Questions, the following might be helpful for learners:

- Are both factors/issues analysed and there is some judgement? L3
- Are both factors/issues analysed and there is reasonable judgement? L4
- Is there sustained analysis of both factors/issues and substantiated judgement? L5
- Is there sustained analysis of both factors/issues and developed and substantiated judgement? L6
- Are the factors mostly described and the judgement is assertion? L2

- Is the answer more about the topic and judgement is absent? L1

With Unit 3 Interpretation Questions, the following might be helpful for learners:

- Is there any analysis of the Interpretations? If so it may reach Level 3.
- Is the answer simply describing the Interpretations? If so it is likely to be Level 2.
- Is the answer focused on the issue or the topic? If it is the topic it will reach Level 1.
- Is there any evaluation? If there is some evaluation it may reach Level 4.
- Is the answer consistently focused and evaluative of both Interpretations? If it is, it may reach Level 5?

With Unit 3 Thematic Essays, the following might be helpful for learners:

- Is there any synthesis? If so the response is likely to reach Level 4.
- Is the answer analytical, but with little or no synthesis? If so the answer is likely to reach Level 3.
- Is the answer descriptive about the issue in the question? If so it is likely to reach Level 2.
- Is the answer about the topic, rather than the issue in the question? If so it is likely to be Level 1.

In making decisions about the higher levels centres should consider the quality, rather than the quantity of synthesis. At the highest levels centres should expect to see high level synthesis in most, if not all paragraphs, and high levels of evaluation and judgement.

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our Customer Support Centre.

General qualifications

01223 553998

general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

Vocational qualifications

02476 851509

vocational.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/

ocr.org.uk

[/ocrexams](https://www.facebook.com/ocrexams)

[/ocrexams](https://www.twitter.com/ocrexams)

[/company/ocr](https://www.linkedin.com/company/ocr)

[/ocrexams](https://www.youtube.com/ocrexams)

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this



**Cambridge
Assessment**

OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2020 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.