

# **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

## **Mark Scheme for June 2011**

---

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

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

**Notes related to Part A:**

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

## Marking Grid for Question (a)

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

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

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

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

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

**Notes related to Part B:**

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

## Marking Grid for Question (b)

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

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing.</li> <li>• There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28-34</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-27</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-20</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-13</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>• No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>• Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>• No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>• No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-6</b></p>

**The Normans in England 1066-1100****1 (a) Study Sources B and C**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the nature of William II's government.**

**[30]**

Focus: Comparison of Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for...' The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources are **similar** in content in that they both agree that William's government was rapacious, *harsh taxation* in **B** and *plunder* in **C**. Both also stress his greed. Both in part blame the delegation of power to Ranulf Flambard as William's chief adviser, but neither suggests that William in any way disapproved of Flambard's methods. Both concur that the nature of government was distorted by the delegation of power to the Bishop of Durham. Both imply that Ranulf, as a churchman, was especially to be blamed for these injustices. **C** has additional charges against Flambard; his low birth is castigated and even his cleverness, which could have been seen as a virtue, is undermined as being used to unworthy ends. **C** adds that the rapidity of the decline was another criticism. Both refer to church abuses.

The Sources **differ** in their focus. Henry of Huntingdon in **B** stresses the role of William himself, injustice and excessive taxation; William of Malmesbury in **C** instead puts the emphasis on the role of Flambard and Church issues. The detail of the criticisms they make is also different. Most of **B's** criticism is focused on William himself, '*an evil king*'. It mentions Anselm's forced exile, unlike William of Malmesbury in **C**, but the focus is on the King's greedy harassment and injustice, while **Source C** is primarily concerned with the burdens on the Church and its specific grievances (the selling of church positions to the undeserving, in contrast to the Conqueror's time). **Source B** outlines the reasons for William's excessive taxation – sheer evil, fortifications, great halls and cronyism - and implies that this was not worthwhile expenditure. It also mentions the problems of absenteeism in Normandy. **Source C** puts the nature of William's government into perspective – that William II was very different to his father, under whom such evils, it is alleged, would not have taken place and when deserving men were promoted. Henry of Huntingdon simply focuses on Rufus' reign, commenting that Rufus' friends robbed at will. Government and justice were no longer impartial.

The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both are church chroniclers, so William's attitude to the church would particularly annoy them, as would the alleged greed of Flambard who should, from their perspective, have been a defender of the church. **Source B**, especially in the final sentence, vividly describes the parlous state of affairs, although candidates could see this as both overdone and emotive. The criticism in **Source C** is more general and measured, although no examples are given to support his case. Henry of Huntingdon in **B** was a secular cleric, which may explain his wider perspective and specific knowledge on walls and the building of Westminster Hall (his links to Lincoln and Huntingdon, where he was Archdeacon, would have put him in the mainstream of information on the previous reign). It may also explain his greater focus on justice and taxation. In comparison William of Malmesbury was more of a scholar, concerned to write in judgement on the 'Deeds of the English Kings'. As a monk, linked to the Abbey of Malmesbury, his stress is on the injustice done to the Church in Rufus' time, in contrast to what he sees as greater morality in the time of the Conqueror. Both write at a time of judicial reform and stability in the reign of

Henry I and are likely to compare the previous and the contemporary reign favourably with that of Rufus. Neither attempt to give a balanced account of the nature of William II's government or of his problems with Robert of Normandy, but both lived through the reign of Rufus. Their tone is negative and their view highly slanted.

A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. Some may prefer the more specific evidence on government provided by Henry of Huntingdon in B or conclude that both are unreliable sources on the nature of government but no set conclusion is expected. Substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Norman government was concerned with justice for all.**

**[70]**

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, and limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question, but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The **supporting** view, that Norman government was concerned with justice for all, is mainly in **Sources A, D and E**, whereas the **opposing** view, that government was arbitrary is largely in **Sources B and C**, both of which focus on the reign of Rufus and suggest that justice under him declined rapidly. Candidates could question the evidence in these religious sources. **Source A** however, which does deal with William II, demonstrates that Rufus was prepared to take action against conspiring and powerful northern nobles like Earl Robert (who rebelled in both 1088 and 1095), thus implying justice was being maintained regardless of status. Rebellion is punished. **Sources D and E** are largely about the Conqueror, although Barlow in **E** implies that both Williams took its dispensation very seriously, apparently confirmed by Rufus' actions against Earl Robert's rebellion in 1095.

The **supporting** argument suggests that justice for all was a major concern of William I. In **Source D** William I is seen as an ideal ruler, even prepared, at a relatively advanced age, to try to learn English in the interests of promoting justice (is there any truth in this story?). The results are described and there are other passages in Orderic Vitalis about the peaceful nature of the country under William I that would support this view, although Orderic tends to take a favourable view of Norman England and William in particular. There is much evidence from land disputes to show that royal interests usually predominated in most cases. **Source E** praises William for the moderate changes he introduced to the law so that the Anglo-Saxons were not especially victimised. Ordeal by battle was not enforced on the Saxons, who might have been at a disadvantage, but apparently proved more popular than the other ordeals, even if it was not necessarily a more reliable form of proof. Candidates could question whether the forest law was an instance of justice and church courts could be seen as a way of extending royal power, rather than a serious quest for a fairer system. **Source E** does credit both William I and his sons with a desire to promote justice and **Source C**, although largely critical, backs this up with regard to the Conqueror, at least in terms of worthy Church appointments. **Source A** shows that Duke Robert de Mowbray had defied Rufus. Refusal to come to court was generally viewed as an act heralding rebellion so Robert's punishment was not unjust, given that he held a castle against William, had taken advantage of the king's absence in Wales and, indeed, had rebelled before. Candidates may know that what lay behind this was William's attempt to govern the North more effectively, controlling the powers of the new Earls. He had been summoned to Court to answer charges both because of conspiracy against the king (to put Stephen of Aumale on the throne) and because he had seized Norwegian vessels in the Tyne, the owners of which had complained to the King. In fact, faced with the threat of blinding, his wife surrendered Bamburgh and Robert was punished by imprisonment at Windsor, losing his vast estates and later becoming a monk at St. Alban's Abbey. In evaluative terms **Barlow in E** takes an overly favourable view of Norman justice, as does **Orderic Vitalis in D**. Perhaps more convincing evidence is provided by the contemporary **A/S Chronicle in A**, although one would expect firm action to be taken against rebels regardless, or perhaps because of, social and political status.

The **opposing** argument, that government was not about justice for all, is seen in **Sources B and C** with reference to William Rufus. They argue that he was not in the least concerned about treating people fairly, but simply in extorting money from them and allowing his followers free reign. His rule 'half-killed the English' with taxation, wringing all he could from his unfortunate subjects. **Source B** specifically states that justice had disappeared. Anselm, a possible source of more just policies, was in hopeless exile and the king's friends were able to escape justice for their misdeeds. **Source C** continues the theme with the promotion in the Church of those with money regardless of merit. **Source A** shows William threatening Duke Robert with personal violence in order to get him to surrender his castle. However both sources neglect the context of threats to Rufus' rule, particularly his struggle to wrest Normandy from his brother Robert. This may explain his need to delegate to Flambard, to secure the Tower and to tax heavily. Both **B and C** are very slanted sources, more attuned to a new age of religious reform that frowned upon Rufus's more traditional approach to the Church. For obvious reasons they were more inclined to draw a veil over the Conqueror's attitude, although Rufus lacked his father's interest in conciliar reform

**Contextual and comparative knowledge** relating to William I's and William II's punishment of rebels and to justice in general could be discussed. However, William I's laws would support the more favourable view. William II's exploitation of the forest laws could be used to condemn him further. With regard to **provenance** candidates might suggest that William II's mistreatment of Anselm and promotion of Ranulf Flambard so horrified the later chroniclers, as **Source B** makes clear, that there was never going to be any suggestion that he was a just ruler. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is more measured in its attitude to William II and so may be seen as more convincing, given its potential hostility. Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. Candidates will probably agree that William I was more concerned with justice than his son as the Conqueror needed to consolidate his position in England but they need to be aware of the mixed provenance of Sources A, D and E, the context of both reigns and the religious antagonism against William II so evident in B and C. No specific judgement is expected.

2 **Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569**  
**The Problem of Female Rule**

- (a) **Study Sources A and C**  
**Compare these Sources as evidence for views on a foreign marriage for a female ruler.** [30]

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

Both Sources refer to Mary Tudor and are based on **similar** fears, if implicit in **Source C** which adopts a different view. **Source A** openly states the potential dangers of a female ruler marrying a foreigner while **Source C** admits those dangers by trying to lay down rules to deal with them - the loss of English laws and customs; the subversion of the 'common wealth' of the realm - which **Source C** develops using specific examples. The Sources **differ** in that **Source A** takes a wholly negative view that a foreign marriage for a female heir would utterly undermine the country whereas **Source C** takes the positive view that there are benefits for England - such as everlasting friendship with Spain. The problems which are seen as insoluble in **Source A** are dealt with by safeguards in **Source C** - by laying down the limitations to Philip's actions. However, the treaty does not specify how these rules shall be enforced, and they introduce new areas of concern, such as administrative offices, successors and foreign relations.

The **context** and **provenance** might explain these differences - **Source A** is from 1553, when Edward was dying and seeking to avoid the Catholic Mary succeeding him whereas Source C is passed by Mary's Parliament in the second year of her reign. Edward's Protestantism had led him to quarrel with Mary and Lady Jane Grey was a staunch Protestant, so could be entrusted to maintain his new Church, but she was female, like Mary and Elizabeth. However, she was married to Northumberland's son, Guilford Dudley. Hence the emphasis on dangers of a foreign marriage as an obstacle to succession - in the light of Mary's links to Charles V and Philip. Northumberland's part in the 'Devise' might be discussed regarding the value of **Source A** as evidence. Mary's determination to marry Philip of Spain, and the suppression of Wyatt's rebellion, suggest **Source C** is also government propaganda to reassure those who were xenophobic. The **tone** of the Sources is very different. **Source A** uses alarming language, for example that a foreign marriage would 'utterly subvert' the good of the realm, while **Source C** refers to 'honours' and 'benefits' it would bring, using positive and calming language, such as 'happily' to reflect Mary's joy in marrying Philip.

The practical nature of the content of **Source C** might suggest it is more balanced as evidence, but brief knowledge of the results of the marriage might be used to evaluate how realistic its terms were. A substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

- (b) **Study all the Sources.**  
**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that female rule was a serious problem in the 1550s.** [70]

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped by interpretation. The argument that female rule was a serious problem is shown in the content of **Source D**, whereas **Sources B and E** suggest it was a problem which could be overcome, and Sources **A and C** do not see it as a problem.

The **argument that female rule was a serious problem** is most prominent in the **content of Source D** but this Source might be cross-referenced with **Sources E** and perhaps **B**. In **Source D**, female rule is said to be unnatural and insulting to God. This is an extreme, perhaps misogynist, view of the subordination of women in Tudor times. Women are seen as emotionally and intellectually unfit for rule. Cross-reference with **Sources E** and perhaps **B** might reveal there some serious problems for female rulers in choosing a suitable husband, in childbirth, in status and the exercise of power.

The **provenance** and **context** of **Source D** make it unreliable. It is an untypical view. John Knox's Scottish Calvinist view might be evaluated using knowledge of the objects of his attack - Mary of Guise, Catherine de Medici and Mary Tudor, all of them Catholic queens. His tone is very emotive and unsupported, and his purpose might be to remove the Franco-Catholic influence in Scotland at a time of planned rebellion. However, his views that women were weak are reflected in **Sources B (introduction) and E**. Mary's appeal to Londoners has an emotional tone, as she could not lead troops against Wyatt's rebels. Camden's comments that Elizabeth would lose power should she marry and the perils of child-bearing and an unhappy marriage might be seen as weakening a female ruler's position, though of course, Henry VIII's personal life had similar problems. The provision of an heir, of course, was a prime duty of a female ruler, but **Source A** is evidence that Edward had also failed in this because of his age.

The **argument that female rule was a problem which could be overcome** is most prominent in **Sources B, C and E**. The content of **C** establishes marriage terms as a positive advantage for a female ruler and in **Source E** Elizabeth alone is recorded as having been seen as sufficient a ruler herself to provide for the 'commonwealth' or good of the country. Knowledge might be used to evaluate the impact of Mary's speech in **Source B**, which brought her loyal support and victory against the rebels, as had her leadership at the time of Lady Jane Grey's coup. Therefore it might be argued that weakness of personality rather than gender was a serious problem. **Source C** suggests that a treaty might solve the female marriage problem, yet knowledge might be used to evaluate the effectiveness of this - e.g. war with France and the loss of Calais, lack of a child. The **provenance** of **Sources B and C** might be used to discuss government persuasion, Philip's unpopularity and Mary's unhappiness. **Source A** suggests that gender itself was not a problem, as Lady Jane was female, but that this problem had been solved by her marriage to Northumberland's son, revealing the unreliability of this Source if taken at face value. A supported overall **judgement** is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious and political context. No specific judgement is expected.

**3 The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-1660  
The First Civil War 1642-6**

**(a) Study Sources C and E**

**Compare these Sources as evidence for the problems faced by Parliamentary and Royalist forces in controlling large cities. [30]**

Focus: Comparison of two Sources.

No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.

The Sources are **similar** in content, in that each refers to the economic situation in a port. **Both Sources** give general comments on the disruption of trade, while **C** has a specific reference to the scarcity of coal due to the loss of London's trade with the Tyne. Both Sources refer to the army having insufficient money to provide for its needs. In **Source C**, parliamentary forces are said to be unable to march or fight for lack of money while in **Source E** the castle hasn't enough musket-balls and bullets to withstand a vigorous assault. In addition **Source C** mentions that there is shortage of army pay. In **Source C**, Lithgow implies there are sufficient guards to protect merchant ships, while in **Source E** a shortage of numbers guarding Bristol is conceded. In both cases public morale is low - 'disheartened' in **E** and in **Source C** taxes are heavy and their use unclear.

The Sources are also **different** in content - **Source C** refers to London, which had been held by parliament, but **Source E** to Bristol shortly after its seizure from Parliament by the Royalists. Whereas mariners in **Source E** have gone over to the enemy, in **Source C** merchant ships are docked and 'well provided'. Pestilence and unemployment are reported in Bristol, whereas London and its surrounding area are said to be prosperous enough to contribute three million in taxes. The effects of economic problems are local in **Source E**, but have a general impact on parliamentary forces in **Source C**, explaining why they might be deterred from continuing to attack by one failed assault. Only **Source C** refers to corruption and hoarding of money. Knowledge of the importance of London in relation to Bristol might be used in evaluation of problems faced.

The **provenance** and **context** of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. **Source C** is a neutral traveller giving his immediate impression, whereas **Source E** has the purpose of justifying Prince Rupert's loss of Bristol, so may exaggerate the difficulties and attempt to portray him as a hero, offering to personally lead an assault. Some may mention the disputes between Rupert and Digby which had influenced Charles to dismiss Rupert, explaining why the situation was painted in such desperate terms to exonerate the Prince.

No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.

**(b) Study all the Sources**

**Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the quality of military leadership was the deciding factor in the outcome of the First Civil War. [70]**

Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.

Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.

The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped by interpretation. **Sources A and D** suggest that Cromwell's superior military discipline contributed to the parliamentary victory, while **Sources B and D** criticise Prince Rupert's poor tactics and **Source E** attempts to exonerate him. **Sources C, E** and to an extent **B** might be used to argue the significance of other factors.

The positive **argument** that Cromwell's strong military leadership was the deciding factor is in **Sources A and D**. His firm discipline in **Source A** is supported by his regrouping tactics at Naseby in **Source D**. The significance of the New Model Army in winning the First Civil War might be supplied from own **knowledge**. Prince Rupert's success in capturing Exeter is acknowledged in **Source B**, but his weak leadership is mentioned in the content of **Sources B and D**: for example his mistakes at Marston Moor and Edgehill. The **context** for his dismissal in the steer of **Source E**, such as disputes with Digby dividing the Royalist leadership, might be provided from own knowledge to evaluate the significance of his leadership to the outcome of the war. There is a counter argument, justifying his military leadership and bravery in **Source E**, but his ideas are said to be 'neither safe nor honourable' even by his Council of War. This positive argument does not detract from the ill discipline of his troops and his indecisiveness which feature in **Sources B and D**.

The negative **argument**, that other factors were decisive in the outcome of the First Civil War, appears in **Sources C, E** and, to an extent, **B**. The significance of parliament's control of the ports of London, Plymouth and Bristol is clear from their prosperity and importance in funding the war. **Source E** support this view, as Charles's anger at Rupert's loss of Bristol caused him to justify his surrender by arguing the importance of economic and social factors as well as problems of munitions. The **provenance** of **Source B** should be evaluated as subjective. As a parliamentary newspaper, it is likely to exaggerate Cromwell's success for propaganda purposes to keep up morale, in comparison to Fairfax's difficulties in Leeds. The biography of Cromwell written in 1724 seems supportive, but is more balanced. **Sources B and E** are written by Royalists, though the Council of War supports Rupert at the time, to help him regain his commission, while Clarendon is a historian, writing later with a more balanced view.

A supported overall **judgement** is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of knowledge and Source limitations. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

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

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

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

© OCR 2011

