



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2019**

History

**Assessment Unit AS 1
Historical Investigations and Interpretations**

[SHY11]

WEDNESDAY 15 MAY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that examinations are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for **GCE History**.

Candidates should be able to:

- AO1** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.
- AO3** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Type of mark scheme

Mark schemes for questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Levels of response

In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is basic.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Basic): The candidate makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 (Satisfactory): The candidate makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 (Good): The candidate makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (High Standard): The candidate successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Option 1: England 1509–1558

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Analyse the features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England. For example, there may be reference to the immoral behaviour of the clergy, which was particularly prevalent in the monasteries. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors relating to the features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England. For example, reference might be made to the clergy's abuse of power through simony, pluralism and absenteeism. The wealth of the Church was another focus of anti-clericalism, particularly in association with the selling of indulgences. After the Crown, the Church was the greatest landowner in England, and its opulence was in stark contrast to the poverty of most of the laity. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and

analysis of the features of anti-clericalism in pre-Reformation England. There were many abuses within the Church in terms of power and wealth. Many of the clergy were uneducated, yet often held more than one post which led to absenteeism and a neglect of parish duties. In addition to the problem of pluralism, nepotism was also evident, with many clergy appointing family members to roles within the Church. In general, there was an element of moral laxity within the pre-Reformation Church in England and an impression that the Church was exploiting its position of power and influence to extract money from the people, such as in the form of indulgences. The existence of Church courts furthermore created a barrier between the clergy and the people. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

(b) Analyse the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace. For example, there may be reference to opposition to the dissolution of the monasteries and defence of the old religion. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors relating to the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace. For example, after the dissolution of the smaller monasteries the people were fearful of what was to follow. There was also a dislike of Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was seen as one of the

principal reformers at the time. Answers may also mention economic reasons why the Pilgrimage of Grace occurred. At this time there was an increase in taxation, as well as a poor harvest. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace. Candidates may note that ordinary people were concerned about the old religion and feared that more radical change was to follow. For example, there were rumours that a tax would be imposed on the taking of sacraments. There were also fears that landlords were going to increase rents. Economic problems, such as the progressive expansion of enclosure, were exacerbated by the bad harvests of 1535 and 1536. Political causes were also at the heart of the rebellion. Many of the leaders were unhappy about the direction in which the government was moving and, as gentry, feared for their positions and influence with the King. There was also great opposition to the rise of Cromwell, both as a reformer and principal architect of the dissolution programme but also because of his low-born background. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the role of Thomas Cromwell in Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Aragon? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, they may observe that the source is a memorandum by Thomas Cromwell, the subject of the question.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, Source 1 reveals Cromwell's analysis of the dilemma facing the King at this time in relation to his quest for a divorce.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The author represents a key strength of the source, as it is a personal memorandum by Thomas Cromwell. Although the source is undated, it is likely to have been written quite close to the time of the interview in question and therefore is not an inhibiting factor. Arguably, the principal strength of the source is its content, as Cromwell presents a succinct analysis of the divorce issue and the impasse that had been reached at this point in negotiations between the Crown and the papacy. He argues quite forthrightly that not only should the Crown refuse to accept the orders of Rome, but that it should be made clear that the authority of the Crown is not to be diluted or compromised, posing the rhetorical question to Henry VIII, "Must you share your power with a foreign bishop?" Cromwell's solution to the problem of the divorce is a radical one – cut the ties to the papacy – but it is couched in nationalistic and patriotic terms, rather than religious phraseology, "Will you allow such a situation to continue, or will you become once more a king and govern your kingdom with your Lords and Commons? In future, let Englishmen alone decide matters concerning England". Cromwell concludes that the course of action he is proposing, although radical and even revolutionary, will ultimately be for the benefit of the King and the country as well. Candidates might consider that the mode and motive of the source enhance its value, as it is for the author's private and personal use, presumably to keep a detailed record of this most important advice to the King of England.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. It can be argued that the source has two weaknesses: first, it is undated, which means that a historian cannot be sure when it was written or

where it fits in the sequence of events relating to the King's divorce; second, its author being Cromwell, an extremely controversial figure in this period, will be considered by some as raising the possibility of the document being designed to serve some sinister purpose of the man who was to become Henry's chief minister. However, contextual knowledge may allow candidates to argue that any such limitations are far outweighed by the strengths of the source, principally the fact that the strategy suggested by Cromwell in the source to overcome the obstacles preventing the divorce was indeed the one that was followed to a successful conclusion in 1533. In March of that year, the Act in Restraint of Appeals was passed by Parliament, which established that the final authority in all legal cases, whether they were civil or clerical, resided in the monarch, and that it was illegal to appeal to an authority outside of the kingdom on any such matters. The divorce was subsequently ratified in May 1533. Furthermore, candidates may note not only that Cromwell had clearly been giving careful consideration to the "King's great matter", but that he had done so before actually entering the King's service. The emphasis in the source on the role of Parliament might also be noted, for this was indeed to be the foundation on which the divorce was achieved and the English Reformation – arguably Cromwell's ultimate goal – was constructed.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the Marian persecutions do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the Marian persecutions. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the Marian persecutions. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of Ackroyd in Interpretation A and Elton in Interpretation B. Interpretation A places the Marian persecutions in a wide context and, presented in this way, argues that this type of activity was equally carried out by Protestant authorities both in England and abroad, and that it was not a unique event. Elton's analysis in Interpretation B disagrees with Ackroyd. While acknowledging that people died for their faith in the reign of Henry VIII, Elton argues that what occurred in the reign of Mary was much more significant in scale and impact. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the Marian persecutions. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Interpretation A explains that both Mary I and Cardinal Pole believed that the presence of reformers in England was a threat to the whole community – the prospect of infecting “the whole flock” – and this conviction informed their subsequent policy and action. However, Ackroyd is at pains to point out that the Marian approach to dealing with what we might call religious dissent was nothing out of the ordinary, and specifically was a policy applied by such Protestant divines as the French theologian John Calvin and Thomas Cranmer during his tenure as Archbishop of Canterbury. According to Ackroyd, the controversy that is attached to the Marian persecutions can be attributed to Protestant propaganda spread by John Foxe in his Book of Martyrs. While Elton, in Interpretation B, is broadly in agreement with Ackroyd in relation to the motivation of Mary and Cardinal Pole, he is very much at odds with Interpretation A in arguing that Mary’s actions were quite without precedent in English history. While Ackroyd makes no reference to the number of victims of Mary’s policy, Elton points out that “hundreds of men and women were burnt for their faith”, and, while no one can give a precise figure, most authorities estimate a number around 300. Like Interpretation A, Interpretation B also makes reference to John Foxe’s memorialising of these Protestant lives lost. Elton argues that it was Mary’s actions – “the fires of Smithfield and similar places” – that seared themselves into the popular mind. He does not ignore the lives taken in the reign of Henry VIII, but argues that the Marian policy was far more significant, with scope here for candidates to add that this was not just because of the number burned but that the persecutions were concentrated in the years 1555–1557. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the Marian persecutions. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. A potential strength of Interpretation A is that Ackroyd does not confine his analysis of the Marian persecutions to the reign of Mary itself, but instead seeks to widen the focus and draw parallels with the reign of Mary’s father, Henry VIII. The principal thrust of his argument, however, is that the burning of religious dissenters was not a policy confined to Catholics, citing the examples of John Calvin and Thomas Cranmer. Candidates might elaborate on these references by noting, from their own contextual knowledge, that Cranmer served as Archbishop of Canterbury from 1533 until 1555 (when he was replaced by Reginald Pole in the reign of Mary) and was a leading light of the Reformation in England. Ackroyd also notes the lasting impact of Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, suggesting that this work transformed the true historical record into something like a Protestant myth. Candidates have some scope to construct an effective challenge to Interpretation A by noting that the examples of Protestant persecutors cited by Ackroyd do not really compare with Mary I. For example, in respect of Cranmer, the burning of Joan Bocher, which occurred in May 1550, was very much an isolated event in Cranmer’s career. Candidates might reasonably argue that if this is the best Ackroyd can come up with in defence of Mary’s actions, it is not a strong case. Perhaps, most critically, Interpretation A

AVAILABLE
MARKS

provides little detail on the Marian persecutions themselves. In contrast, Elton in Interpretation B provides some of that missing detail. He too makes mention of Thomas Cranmer – but as one of the victims of Mary’s attempted Counter-Reformation in England. He also notes other high-profile executions: John Hooper, Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer. But Elton notes that the vast majority of the victims were ordinary people (“humble folk”). Candidates might consider that the real strength of Interpretation B is that, while it acknowledges the lives lost in the name of religion under Henry VIII, and on a much greater scale elsewhere in Europe, the Marian persecutions were “unprecedented” in England and occurred in a narrow time frame. Elton’s point appears to be well made that the significance of this episode in English history was due not to the pen of John Foxe but rather the “permanent memory” of “the fires of Smithfield and similar places all over southern England”, alluding to the fact that most of the victims came from this area (over 100 of them from London). A challenge to Interpretation B might focus on the need for more consideration of Mary’s motives and perhaps the influence of Cardinal Pole. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

Option 1

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

60

Option 2: England 1603–1649

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Analyse the policies of James I towards Spain between 1603 and 1625.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the policies of James I towards Spain between 1603 and 1625. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the policies of James I towards Spain between 1603 and 1625. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of ways in which the relationship between England and Spain developed during James I's reign. Answers should discuss the terms of the Treaty of London, which ended the long Anglo-Spanish War, the building of positive relations after 1604 and the attempt to create a marriage alliance after 1614. They should also refer to the rupture in Anglo-Spanish relations after the breakdown of marriage negotiations in 1624. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of the policies of James I towards Spain between 1603 and 1625.

Answers will provide an analysis of the impact of the Treaty of London of 1604 on Anglo-Spanish relations. They will discuss the improvement in relations over the course of James I's reign and may refer to the English role in negotiating the Twelve Year Truce. The closeness between James and Gondomar may also be discussed. Answers will analyse the Spanish Match negotiations and the collapse of Anglo-Spanish relations after the Madrid Expedition of 1623. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

- (b) Analyse the impact of James I's policies on royal finances between 1603 and 1625.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the impact of James I's policies on royal finances between 1603 and 1625. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the impact of James I's policies on royal finances between 1603 and 1625. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of ways in which James I's policies affected royal finances, including the impact on the deficit and royal debt. They may refer to major policy initiatives, such as the failed Great Contract or the expansion of impositions after 1608. They may also refer to the positive reforms made by Lionel Cranfield. Candidates make a good selection and use of an

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis. For example, the positive impact of James I's reform of Customs and Impositions may be explained. Answers may also explore the impact of James I's reform of the Court of Wards, the sale of titles and the various retrenchment schemes implemented by his Lord Treasurers. Attention will also be given to the negative impact of James I's policies, such as the impact of the Cockayne Project on royal finances. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying opposition to Charles I's policies in the period 1625–1629? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. They may observe that the source provides evidence of opposition to Charles I's policies.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. Charles I provides a strong defence of his policies, particularly the collection of the Forced Loan and his policy of war against Spain and France. He portrays these as vital to the defence of religion and also the country. The source also shows us how Charles I considered his critics to be stubborn and treacherous. He refers to 'several people' who opposed the Forced Loan, but later refers to '150 people', which suggests opposition was more widespread. He shows no ability to understand their perspective and is determined to punish them ruthlessly. Charles I suggests that most people in Gloucester support his policy and refers to them as 'loving subjects'. The source also suggests that the king has the support of his Privy Council.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The authorship represents a strength of the source as it is extremely useful to see how Charles I interpreted opposition to his policies and responded to it. The source provides a unique insight into his thinking. It is contemporaneous to the period under discussion which enhances its utility. Candidates may observe that we see how Charles dealt with opposition 'in real time' and without the filter of hindsight. Candidates may observe that the intended audience – the gentry and nobility – were the class that was represented in Parliament, so it is particularly useful to see how Charles addressed them. In terms of motive, it is possible that Charles was motivated by a desire to appear firm and decisive in order to discourage further opposition.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. For example, Charles I was a rather isolated figure and may not have had a clear understanding of the extent and nature of the opposition to his policies. In terms of audience, the source is limited to the gentry of only one county and may not reflect Charles I's approach elsewhere. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. For example, candidates may point out that the letter clearly refers to the Forced Loan which Charles I decided to collect in 1626, after the dissolution of Parliament and his failure to obtain subsidies. This loan was seen by many as a form of illegal taxation. The king's willingness to punish harshly those who refused to

pay was unsuccessfully challenged in the Five Knights Case. Alternatively, candidates may point out that the enemies referenced in the source were France and Spain. The war had resulted in humiliating defeats and was thus a source of grievance for many of the king's subjects.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for Parliament's victory in the English Civil War of 1642–1646 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the reasons for Parliament's victory in the English Civil War of 1642–1646. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context, perhaps reflecting on the long-term advantages held by Parliament. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the reasons for Parliament's victory in the English Civil War of 1642–1646. Interpretation A emphasises the importance of Parliament's superior resources and military professionalism, whereas Interpretation B stresses the importance of the Self-Denying Ordinance. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates may comment on specific factors which contributed to Parliament's victory. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of John Morrill and Mark Kishlansky. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the reasons for Parliament's victory in the English Civil War of 1642–1646. Morrill argues that a Parliamentary victory was always likely, considering its long-term advantages – a reference perhaps to the superior resources controlled by Parliament. Morrill also praises the professionalism of the New Model Army and the methods employed to pay for it. Kishlansky contradicts Morrill, arguing that the introduction of the New Model Army made little difference to the outcome of the war. He is equally dismissive of the revenue system created by Parliament and considers the Parliamentary triumph unexpected and puzzling. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. They will explore the factors referred to in Interpretation

A and Interpretation B and explain why they contributed to a Parliamentary victory. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the reasons for Parliament's victory in the English Civil War of 1642–1646. Interpretation A argues that a Parliamentary victory was likely if not inevitable, as Parliament held long-term advantages. Morrill stresses the importance of the New Model Army's professionalism. This, he argues, was the product of superior organisation and resources. Responses may challenge the assertion in Interpretation A that 'alliances played little part in the outcome' of the Civil War by referring to the contribution of the Scots to the Parliamentary victory at the Battle of Marston Moor. They may also challenge Morrill's assertion that 'military factors' played 'little part in the outcome', by noting, for example, the role played by Cromwell's cavalry at Naseby. Interpretation B argues that Parliament's victory was far from inevitable, and plays down the significance of Parliament's long-term advantages. Instead, Kishlansky credits the Self-Denying Ordinance as an important factor in leading to Parliament's victory. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. Morrill dismisses the significance of the respective alliances, Parliament with Scotland and Charles I with the Irish. Candidates may explain that both sides formed alliances and may discuss the impact of these. Morrill also refers to the taxation system created by Parliament. Candidates may expand on this and provide examples of the measures used by Parliament to finance the increasing 'professionalism' of the New Model Army. Kishlansky refers to the significance of the Self-Denying Ordinance. Candidates may explain how this transferred control of the military to men who were more ruthless in their prosecution of the war, such as Fairfax and Cromwell. They may also explain the importance of Cromwell in delivering Parliament's victory at Naseby. Responses may challenge Interpretation B's assertion that a Parliamentary victory 'would hardly have been predicted' before the Battle of Naseby. They may also challenge Kishlansky's dismissal of Parliament's revenue system by referring to the efficiency of the county committees and the weekly assessment established by Pym. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

Option 2

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

60

Option 3: Britain in the Age of Reform 1830–1880

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Analyse how Peel transformed the Tory Party into the Conservative Party in the 1830s.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of how Peel transformed the Tory Party into the Conservative Party in the 1830s. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about how Peel transformed the Tory Party into the Conservative Party in the 1830s. For example, there may be reference to the role of Robert Peel's leadership on this issue. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors relating to how Peel transformed the Tory Party into the Conservative Party in the 1830s. For example, reference might be made to the Tamworth Manifesto, which Peel produced in December 1834 in advance of the general election of 1835 and which articulated the party leader's vision of a progressive Toryism or Conservatism. Peel believed that, with the passing of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832, the Tories had to change if they were to remain a viable political force. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of how Peel transformed the Tory Party into the Conservative Party in the 1830s. Two significant events in this process under Peel's leadership were the establishment of the Carlton Club as the party headquarters and the appointment of F.R. Bonham as the party's first election agent – in effect, its first manager or chairman – which created a structure of organisation to allow the party to respond to the challenge of an enlarged electorate. Undoubtedly, the transition from Toryism to Conservatism was also assisted by the fact that the party's new moderate and progressive image under Peel clearly proved popular with voters – as the improving electoral performance in the elections of 1835, 1837 and 1841 demonstrates – and hence the change became embedded. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

- (b) Analyse the role of William Gladstone in the creation of the Liberal Party between 1849 and 1859.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the role of William Gladstone in the creation of the Liberal Party between 1849 and 1859. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the role of William Gladstone in the creation of the Liberal Party between 1849 and 1859. For example, there may be reference to Gladstone's identification with the Peelite wing of the Conservatives after the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

AVAILABLE MARKS
10

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors relating to the role of William Gladstone in the creation of the Liberal Party between 1849 and 1859. For example, after the repeal of the Corn Laws, the Conservatives' free trade or Peelite wing – which included Gladstone and other supporters of Robert Peel – separated itself from the bulk of the party, which was protectionist or anti-free trade. The two sides never became reconciled, which meant that the Peelites were available in time to forge a new political alliance – and eventually a new party, the Liberals – with other progressive elements in the House of Commons. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of the role of William Gladstone in the creation of the Liberal Party between 1849 and 1859. Candidates may note that British politics was in a state of flux between 1849 and 1859 in the wake of the Corn Law crisis and that none of the three groups which would eventually comprise the new Liberal Party – the Peelites, the Whigs and the Radicals – was a viable national political party in its own right. The Radicals had always been essentially a fringe element in the Commons, while the Whigs had been convincingly beaten at the last general election (1841) before the Corn Law crisis. The roles of the likes of Palmerston and Russell might be acknowledged, but Gladstone is very significant in this process as his willingness to merge with the Whigs and Radicals influenced other Peelites. It might be argued that an important factor in pushing these former Conservatives into union with the Whigs and Radicals is that their old party had fallen under the influence of one of the men seen to be chiefly responsible for the overthrow of Peel: Benjamin Disraeli. In this context, candidates might consider the significance of the mutual antipathy that Gladstone and Disraeli developed for each other. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form of style and writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the methods used by the Anti-Corn Law League? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context. Candidates must use contextual knowledge in their answer.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. For example, they may observe that the source is a leaflet from Joseph Hicken, the secretary of the Anti-Corn Law League.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. For example, Source 1 is an appeal for people to join the Anti-Corn Law League, specifically reaching out to the working and middle classes.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The author represents a key strength of the source, as it is written by the secretary of the Anti-Corn Law League, Joseph Hicken. Although the source is undated, bearing in mind that the League was established in 1838 and the Corn Laws were repealed in 1846, it has to have been written in that brief time span and therefore the lack of a specific date is not necessarily an inhibiting factor. Arguably, the principal strength of the source is its content, as it demonstrates one of the principal methods employed by the Anti-Corn Law League to achieve its goal, namely by direct appeal to the general public. The leaflet argues that it is in the interest of both the working class and middle class to support the cause of repeal of the Corn Laws, suggesting that for working men the benefits will include “plenty of work, good wages and untaxed bread”, while the middle-class business interests will thrive as a result of the removal of the “restrictions placed on commerce”. Another important feature of the source is the detail of the fees attached to membership of the Anti-Corn Law League, ranging from one penny to one shilling, which Hicken justifies on the grounds that the money raised will be used to enable the organisation to continue its campaign for abolition of the Corn Laws, or as he puts it, “to maintain the struggle for free trade”. Candidates might consider the mode, motive and audience of the source to be positive elements, in that we see here the use of a leaflet (mode) to disseminate the League’s message (motive) to the general public (audience).

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. It can be argued that the source has one principal

shortcoming, in that it does not show the full range of methods employed by the Anti-Corn Law League to further its cause. Contextual knowledge may allow candidates to argue that other important elements in the League's strategy included the presentation of the case for repeal of the Corn Laws directly to the House of Commons through MPs such as Richard Cobden and John Bright, and the organisation of rallies and lectures across the country, where again Cobden and Bright among others spread the message of free trade. Furthermore, candidates may note that the League published its own weekly newspaper and was able to popularise its appeal by penning anti-Corn Law songs and hosting anti-Corn Law dances. Nonetheless, candidates may consider that the strengths of the source far outweigh its weaknesses in that it provides a fascinating insight into key methods used to advance its campaign, through a direct appeal to the general public to join the organisation and by doing so raise funds for further propaganda efforts. The appeal to "working men" and the offer of membership for as little as one penny is noteworthy as the League clearly wants to attract as broad a membership as possible. At the same time, the circular does not ignore the League's key support base among the merchant and business classes, not only with the reference to "manufacturers and tradesmen" but also by talking of free trade rather than just abolition of the Corn Laws. Candidates may also note that the offer of a membership card is testimony to the high degree of organisation within the League.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the consequences of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the consequences of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the consequences of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of Martin in Interpretation A and Murphy in Interpretation B. Interpretation A argues that the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 made little real difference to the political system in that, even though the vote was extended to the middle class, it was the landed

classes who remained firmly in control of Parliament. Murphy's analysis in Interpretation B disagrees with Martin. He points out that the Act resulted in the professionalisation of the two-party system but more importantly it set a precedent for reform that would result in the advance of democracy in Britain later in the century. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the consequences of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. While Interpretation A notes that the Act expanded the electorate – from about “one in ten men in England and Wales [to about] one in five” – and that prosperous middle-class men were enfranchised, Martin's ultimate verdict is that the change was essentially superficial. He lays particular stress on the fact that the Parliamentary Reform Act did not extend the franchise to the working class. The old system had been firmly under the control of the aristocracy and the landed elite, and Martin argues that this remained the case after the reform of 1832. He asserts that in the first election after the Act was passed (in December 1832), “over 70 per cent of the MPs represented the landed interest” and around 50 “seats were still controlled by individuals”, the so-called pocket boroughs. However, as Martin concludes, the Act was never intended to be revolutionary but rather was designed by the Whigs to prevent revolution. Murphy, in Interpretation B, does not share Martin's view that the Parliamentary Reform Act made little difference to the British political system, pointing initially to the significance of the introduction of the register of voters, which, as he argues, “increased the possibility of a two-party system”. Interpretation B is broadly in agreement with Interpretation A in relation to the essentially conservative objective of Earl Grey's government in producing the Act, but for Murphy that is not the key point. Reform had been effected and 1832 was not the end of the story but rather the “starting point on the road to democracy”. This was indeed Robert Peel's analysis of the situation at the time and provided the rationale for the progressive direction in which he steered the Tory Party after 1832. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the consequences of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. A potential strength of Interpretation A is that Martin clearly demonstrates the limited nature of the Act, concluding that it “maintained the power of the aristocracy and the influence of the landed classes”. His point about the working class remaining outside the political system is particularly well made, and candidates might note that the disappointment of the working class, who had played an important role in the popular campaign for reform, would turn to disaffection and ultimately the emergence of the Chartist movement later in the decade. Candidates, nonetheless, have some scope to construct an effective challenge to Interpretation A by noting that Martin fails to acknowledge that the Parliamentary Reform Act had arguably removed the worst defects and anomalies of the old political system. For example, although he refers to 50 seats remaining in the control of political

AVAILABLE
MARKS

patrons, he makes no mention of the 56 borough constituencies with 2000 or fewer voters which were abolished by the Act, or the 31 small boroughs which each lost one of their two MPs. Of the 20 new single-member and 22 new two-member constituencies which the Act created, many were in the previously under-represented North and Midlands (for example, Manchester, Leeds and Birmingham). Candidates might consider that the real strength of Interpretation B is that it looks at the Parliamentary Reform Act in a wider context, beyond the first general election after the Act referred to in Interpretation A. At the core of Murphy's interpretation of the Parliamentary Reform Act is the view that "it prepared the way for further political, social and economic change". He notes the creation of party machines in response to the registration of voters, and candidates might elaborate on this point by referring to the establishment of the Carlton Club in 1832 by the Tories/Conservatives and the Reform Club in 1836 by the Whigs as the respective party headquarters. It would be reasonable to emphasise the symbolic importance of the Act of 1832: the unreformed system had been in place for centuries, yet it was unreformed no longer, and that change had been effected peacefully. A challenge to Interpretation B might focus on the need for a more detailed consideration of the terms of the Parliamentary Reform Act, such as the unaltered size of the House of Commons (658 MPs). It might also be noted that one of the chief aims of reformers in this era did not form part of the 1832 Act, namely the introduction of the secret ballot. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

Option 3

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

60

Option 4: Italy and Germany 1815–1871

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Quality of written communication will be assessed in Question 1.

- 1 (a) Analyse Mazzini's contribution to the unification of Italy between 1815 and 1848.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding, to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of Mazzini's contribution to the unification of Italy between 1815 and 1848. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about Mazzini's contribution to the unification of Italy between 1815 and 1848, perhaps referring to "Young Italy", the nationalist organisation he founded in 1831. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors explaining Mazzini's contribution to the unification of Italy between 1815 and 1848. His importance properly began with his formation of "Young Italy" in 1831. The movement sought the removal of Austrian influence from the Italian peninsula, and its replacement by a republic based on the principles of liberty, democracy and universal suffrage. He wanted to remove the power of the papacy and individual Italian rulers by an uprising of the people. Mazzini was an unsuccessful revolutionary, and a series of revolts in the 1830s and 1840s failed disastrously. His real contribution to Italian unification was his power to imbue Italians with a belief in their country, and to inspire others to take up the baton. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a

good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of the contribution of Mazzini to the unification of Italy between 1815 and 1848. He recognised the weaknesses of the failed secret societies, and scorned outside help as an illusion. He had no time for regional loyalties or local rulers, although in 1831 he offered support to Charles Albert of Piedmont in the interests of a united country. His vision of Italian cultural unity, however, ignored the reality on the ground, where most Italians could not understand the speech of their compatriots. He believed in violent revolution, but also claimed that a Europe of nation-states would lead to lasting peace. Although he wanted mass participation in politics, he showed little interest in peasant needs. Young Italy grew rapidly, with a countrywide membership of 60 000 within a short time. He inspired many followers, notably Garibaldi, whose influence on Italian unification was critical. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

(b) Analyse the role of Cavour in achieving the unification of Italy.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding, to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the role of Cavour in achieving Italian unification. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about Cavour's role in achieving Italian unification, mentioning, for example, the importance of the part he played in securing the aid of France against the Austrians in 1859. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis of the part played by Cavour in the unification of Italy. In the 1850s his introduction of free trade and expansion of Piedmontese railways helped the country to prosper and appear to be a serious focal point for unification. Piedmont's participation in the Crimean War gave him the ear of Britain and, particularly, France. Cavour recognised the need for foreign assistance if Italy were to be united, and his resultant courtship of Napoleon III culminated in the Plombières Agreement, by which France promised to help Piedmont drive Austria out of northern Italy. To an extent it did, and Piedmont gained Lombardy in 1859, the beginning of a process which culminated in the declaration of the Kingdom of Italy. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of Cavour's role in achieving Italian unification. The increase in Piedmontese wealth and influence converted Italian patriots from other models of unity to that of an Italy ruled by the House of Savoy. His dealings with Napoleon III showed high diplomatic skill, and when France joined the North Italian War in 1859, unification on Cavour's terms seemed unstoppable. He had not expected Napoleon to withdraw prematurely, but, even after resigning, he kept contact with the National Society and was able to take advantage of the ferment in the duchies to further expand Piedmont. Finally, seeing the twin dangers of a South Italian republic and a Catholic reaction if the Pope were overthrown, he faced down Garibaldi and, even if reluctantly, oversaw the foundation of a united Italy in 1861. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying the causes of the Austro-Prussian War of 1866? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. They may observe that the source represents the government's explanation that Prussia had to go to war in order to defend its independence.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. They may note that the Prussian proclamation insists that Prussia desired only unity and a peaceful resolution of the situation, and that the war is solely the responsibility of the Confederation, and especially of Austria.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well, but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. Source 1 is an official public proclamation, presumably emanating from the Crown Council, justifying Prussia's actions, and shedding light on Prussian thinking during this crisis. The date is important, as Prussia and Austria have just gone to war. After Austria ended negotiations with Prussia over the future of Schleswig and Holstein, Prussia sent troops into Austrian-occupied Holstein on June 9. Bismarck then provocatively proposed a *kleindeutsch* national parliament elected by universal suffrage; on June 14 Austria persuaded the Diet to reject these proposals and mobilise against Prussia, so on June 15 Prussia invaded Hanover and Saxony, which was effectively the start of the war. Thus, the proclamation comes immediately after the escalating crisis led to war, and was issued when passions were at their height. The intended audience, as the title makes clear, is the German people as a whole, but especially nationalists. The motive is partly to protest Prussia's innocence of warmongering, partly to condemn the Confederation and its Austrian master, and, crucially, to promote Prussia as the champion of German nationalism. The tone is calm but firm, with a reasoned defence of Prussian actions, but there is a touch of steel in the insistence that Prussia will not back down, but fight for survival.

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer, such as the significance of the key decision of the Federal Diet on June 14, a rejection of Prussian proposals which Prussia could not take lying down. Bismarck's willingness to indulge in brinkmanship may also be considered in the light of how it increased the risk of war. The limitations of Source 1 are that this is essentially a piece of self-justification on the

part of the Prussian government. Thus, it fails to mention the invasion of Holstein, the exclusion of Austria from any future united Germany and the Prussian interest in increasing its territory and power. The proclamation, by definition, ignores the suspicion of Prussian ambition, widespread throughout Germany, and is not entirely accurate in its implicit claim that Prussia is acting only in the name of German nationalism. An historian might question why the proclamation refers frequently to the “unity” of Germany when in fact Prussia is now at war with most of Germany. A further limitation is that this source does not address Austrian concerns or consider why it felt driven to mobilise the Germanic Confederation against Prussia.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Germany do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate’s ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Germany. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two extracts. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Germany. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context surrounding the weaknesses and divisions of the revolutionaries and the strength of their opposition. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of both Farmer and Stiles, in Interpretation A, and Cowie and Wolfson, in Interpretation B. In explaining the failure of the revolutions, Farmer and Stiles emphasise the superior military might of the former rulers, as well as the key rôle of Austria in the counter-revolution, while Cowie and Wolfson point to the failure of the revolutionaries to unite in order to preserve their gains. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Germany. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context of the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions. Interpretation A emphasises the key factor

of the opposition's military and organisational superiority, without which, they concede, the revolutionaries might have survived in power, even in the crucial case of Prussia. It suggests that unification was not impossible, but that it had to be on the terms of the rulers of the 39 states, not those of revolutionaries or the liberals sitting at Frankfurt, the former unstable and chaotic, the latter well-meaning but impotent. But at the end of the day, Farmer and Stiles note, there would be no unity without Austrian permission, and that was increasingly unlikely as the government moved inexorably towards regaining its power. Cowie and Wolfson, on the other hand, place much of the responsibility for failure on the divisions and weakness of the liberals in the Frankfurt Assembly, referring to their sense of entitlement as middle class intellectuals. They note the radical presence, but also their failure to win over the artisan class. The authors also make the argument that the peasant majority, once they had their own grievances satisfied, were uninterested in supporting the liberal and nationalist aims of the liberal majority in the Assembly. Finally, Interpretation B argues that the emergent manufacturing class, seeking above all else stability in which to expand business, wanted an end to the unstable atmosphere of the revolutions, and were now inclined to throw in their lot with the conservative groups. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the reasons for the failure of the 1848 revolutions in Germany. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. Candidates may elaborate on the indecision of the Frankfurt Assembly, agonising over whether to include Austria in any future Germany, and its disdain for working class demands, which lost it support in cities like Berlin. It lost face when it was unable to stand up for Schleswig and Holstein against the claims of the Danish king. Frederick William IV's vacillating character affected his credibility as a possible future leader of Germany, and he and his fellow princes were never going to collaborate with those they regarded as upstarts. In support of Interpretation B, reference might be made to divisions among the revolutionaries: the demands of the radicals scared the property-owning middle class, while the interminable debates over the constitution's finer points lost the Frankfurt Assembly its initial impetus. Peasants could not see beyond their own grievances, were more easily satisfied with modest reform and thereafter uninterested in revolution. Farmer and Stiles in Interpretation A argue that the key to the failure of the 1848 revolutions lay, not in revolutionary weaknesses, but in the military might of the conservative forces, and especially the restoration of the Habsburg Empire, which ensured a return to a German *ancien régime*. Interpretations A and B could both be challenged. Although Farmer and Stiles emphasise the military might of the rulers, they might be challenged for failing also to stress their political and administrative experience, which contrasted starkly with the inexperience of their opponents. Cowie and Wolfson suggest that the new bourgeoisie turned away from politics to money-making, but could be challenged on the grounds that this fails to take into account the continuing growth of the German liberal movement, essentially bourgeois, in the following decades. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [30]

Option 4

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

60

Option 5: Germany 1919–1945

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Answer question 1(a) or 1(b) and question 2.

- 1 (a) Analyse the development of the Nazi Party between 1923 and 1929.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of how the Nazi Party developed between 1923 and 1929. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about how the Nazi Party developed between 1923 and 1929. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors to explain how the Nazi Party developed between 1923 and 1929. After the failure of the Munich Putsch in November 1923, Hitler changed the strategy of the party. An armed coup was no longer an appropriate tactic and the only way to succeed was to work within the Weimar Constitution and gain power by parliamentary, legal means. The adoption of a legal strategy necessitated the creation of a national party structure. At the Bamberg Party Conference in 1926 Hitler re-established a degree of unity within the Party and mobilised sufficient support to re-establish his supremacy. A reorganisation of the party structure followed. The Nazi Party would no longer be a small provincial party in Bavaria but would become a national party. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of how the Nazi Party developed between 1923 and 1929. Gregor Strasser was mainly responsible for building up an efficient Party structure and this was reflected in an increasing Party membership of 108 000 by 1928, partly due to the creation of associated Nazi organisations that were geared to appeal to specific interest groups. Joseph Goebbels increased support for the Party in Berlin and showed a real interest in propaganda, creating the newspaper *Der Angriff* (The Attack). Despite a disappointing performance in the Reichstag election of 1928, the Nazi Party made significant gains in state elections in 1929. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

AVAILABLE MARKS
10

10

- (b) Analyse the economic achievements of the Nazis in Germany in the period 1933–1939.

This question targets AO1: the candidate's ability to demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse the key features related to the periods studied, and explore concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding in an episodic or largely inaccurate manner. The answer is in narrative form with limited understanding, explanation and analysis. Responses at this level will demonstrate a superficial understanding of the economic achievements of the Nazis in Germany in the period 1933–1939. Candidates make a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that the intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding with some degree of relevance and clarity, though there are occasional lapses. The answer contains some explanation and analysis. Responses will be more detailed and provide some coherent information about the economic achievements of the Nazis in Germany in the period 1933–1939. Candidates make a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 3 ([5]–[7])

Answers at this level demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and effectively. Points are developed and substantiated, showing clearer explanation and analysis. Answers will begin to analyse a range of factors concerning Nazi economic achievements in Germany in the period 1933–1939. At the heart of the economic recovery lay a major revival of public investment by the state itself, which embarked on a large-scale increase in its own spending in an effort to stimulate demand and raise national income. Investment was directed towards work creation schemes in transportation and construction. By 1936 unemployment had fallen to 1.5 million, industrial production had increased by 60 per cent since 1933 and the Gross National Product had grown over the same period by 40 per cent. Due to the New Plan Schacht reduced the balance of payments deficit. Candidates make a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 4 ([8]–[10])

Answers at this level consistently demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding relevantly, clearly and concisely. Points are very well developed and substantiated, showing sound explanation and analysis of Nazi economic achievements in Germany in the period 1933–1939. The drive for rearmament was accelerated from 1936 with the introduction of the Four-Year Plan. The economy was to expand production of vital war materials, develop substitutes for imports and train the workforce in skills transferable to war production in order to make Germany ready for war. Germany had to be made as self-sufficient as possible – a policy known as autarky. The success of the plan was mixed and the production of a number of key materials, such as aluminium and explosives, expanded. The Four-Year Plan had some success in the sense that Germany's reliance on imports had not increased. By 1939 the German economy was on a war footing, with 17 per cent of Germany's Gross National Product devoted to military expenditure. Candidates successfully select and use the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 2 (a) **Study Source 1.** How useful is Source 1 as evidence for an historian studying propaganda and morale in Nazi Germany in the period 1939–1945? You must use contextual knowledge in your answer.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

This question targets AO2: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers may, typically, paraphrase or quote at length from the source but fail to comment explicitly on relevant points in the light of the question. They may observe that the source is a public speech by the Nazi Propaganda Minister in February 1943, soon after the surrender of German troops at Stalingrad.

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

Answers may, typically, confine themselves to the content of the source and assess its usefulness with reference only to the information it provides. Goebbels portrays the surrender at Stalingrad as a potentially positive event which would mobilise the German people to make greater sacrifices. He emphasises that the German people need to maintain loyalty to Hitler, work longer hours, support the government in ensuring that women help in the war effort, give a commitment to maximise the war effort and endorse the strategy of "Total War" in order to achieve victory.

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

Answers will utilise the source more comprehensively. They will not only discuss the content of the source well but also highlight its strengths by focusing on its mode, author, date, motive, audience and tone. The author represents a key strength of the source. As Goebbels is the Nazi Propaganda Minister, the source provides an insight into his propaganda strategy towards the German people after the surrender at Stalingrad. After a frank description of the seriousness of the situation, Goebbels attempts to rally public morale with rhetorical questions which call for radical measures to intensify the population's efforts for victory. The source exemplifies an important technique of Nazi propaganda. The use of the spoken word is shown in a public speech by an experienced Nazi orator to a large audience of Nazi supporters. Through the medium of the radio, the speech is broadcast potentially to the whole population of Germany with the motive to raise public morale. The content, the mode, the motive and the audience of the source can therefore be considered as potential strengths. With regard to the tone of the extract, Goebbels on the one hand acknowledges the seriousness of the situation by February 1943, but also attempts to restore public confidence in eventual victory with statements such as "a people which has the strength to cope with such a setback and to overcome it cannot be conquered."

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

Answers will not only discuss the merits of the source, but also its limitations. Any plausible limitations should be rewarded. Answers will fully exploit the source and show full appreciation that its value does not just lie in its content but comment on its date, author, mode, motive, audience and tone. To obtain a mark at Level 4, candidates must include relevant contextual knowledge in their answer. For example, they may point out that after this speech the demand for the waging of "Total War" became one of the main themes of Nazi propaganda during the last phase of the war and Hitler appointed

Goebbels as Reich Plenipotentiary for Total War in July 1944, effectively placing him in overall command of the domestic war effort. The speech signified that the regime realised that the total mobilisation of labour was required. A decree of January 1943 forced all women between the ages of 17 and 45 to register for work. A limitation of the source is the date, as it only provides evidence of one form of Nazi propaganda on one occasion in 1943. It does not give the historian an insight into the nature of Nazi propaganda in the periods 1939–1942 or 1944–1945. Another limitation is Goebbels' statement that "the people at home are behind them, and their morale is high." The fact that it was necessary for Goebbels to make such a speech and have it broadcast to the whole nation suggests that he knew that morale was not high.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

20

- (b) Study Interpretation A and Interpretation B.** Historians have different views about particular issues. Using both interpretations, and your understanding of the historical context, which of these different interpretations of the reasons for the Nazis' rise to power from 1930 to 30 January 1933 do you find more convincing?

This question targets AO3: the candidate's ability to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

A mark of zero will be awarded when the candidate produces no creditworthy material.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

Answers at this level will display a limited understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will reveal a limited analysis of the interpretations of the reasons for the Nazis' rise to power from 1930 to 30 January 1933. Answers at this level will display little or no understanding of the historical context. Responses may discuss only one of the interpretations. Candidates will not identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing or will reach an unsubstantiated judgement.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

Answers at this level will display a satisfactory understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will begin to analyse the two different interpretations of the reasons for the Nazis' rise to power from 1930 to 30 January 1933. Answers at this level may display some understanding of the historical context. Candidates will reveal a satisfactory understanding of the views of Sharples in Interpretation A and Lee in Interpretation B. Interpretation A argues that the consequences of the depression were significant in the process by which the Nazis rose to power from 1930 to 30 January 1933, while interpretation B argues that "ultimately" political intrigue was the important factor. Candidates may identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide some evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 3 ([15]–[22])

Answers at this level will reveal a good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a good analysis of the different interpretations of the reasons for the Nazis' rise to power from 1930 to 30 January 1933. Answers at this level will display a good understanding of the historical context. Sharples in Interpretation A emphasises the significance of the economic and political

consequences of the depression. Interpretation A refers to the withdrawal of American loans, the decline in industrial production, the increase in unemployment and the unpopularity of Brüning's economic policies. As a result of the economic crisis "political extremism began to take hold" and in September 1930 the Nazis made their "electoral breakthrough." However, Lee in Interpretation B argues that the Nazis rose to power when "the impact of the depression was beginning to lessen" and Hitler's appointment as Chancellor on 30 January 1933 was ultimately due to the factor of political intrigue. Lee points out that, even when the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag in the summer of 1932, the President did not appoint Hitler as Chancellor. The Nazis lost electoral support in the autumn of 1932. Political intrigue by right-wing conservative politicians was crucial, as von Papen persuaded President Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor on 30 January 1933. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide good evidence in support of their judgement.

Level 4 ([23]–[30])

Answers at this level will reveal a very good understanding of the ways in which the past has been interpreted in the two interpretations. Responses will present a very good analysis of the different interpretations of the reasons for the Nazis' rise to power from 1930 to 30 January 1933. Answers at this level will display a very good understanding of the historical context. In support of the arguments of Sharples in Interpretation A, responses may point out that, due to the depression, 50 000 businesses went bankrupt between 1930 and 1932, while five major banks closed down. Candidates may elaborate on the references to political extremism and the electoral breakthrough and discuss the results of the elections to the Reichstag in September 1930. The left-wing Communists (KPD) obtained 77 seats, while the right-wing Nazis became the second largest party in the Reichstag, winning 107 seats. The depression acted as the trigger for the rise of the Nazi Party. Mass electoral support after the depression put the Nazis in a position to challenge for power. In support of Lee's arguments in Interpretation B, responses may point out that, although the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag with 230 seats in the election of July 1932, their support fell to 196 seats in the election of November 1932. The appointment of Hitler as Chancellor was at a stage when the Nazis were declining electorally. The Nazi Party's electoral support brought it only to the brink of power. The misjudgement of von Papen and Hindenburg in believing that they could use Nazi electoral support to give themselves legitimacy for a new authoritarian government was ultimately crucial for the Nazis' rise to power. The interpretation in each extract could also be challenged. With regard to Interpretation A, it could be pointed out that the Nazis did not assume power at the height of the economic crisis. They did not have a majority in July 1932 and Hitler's attempt to become Chancellor in August 1932 failed. The intrigue of von Papen was crucial in persuading President Hindenburg to change his mind and appoint Hitler as Chancellor in January 1933. With regard to Interpretation B, it could be suggested that President Hindenburg was compelled to ask Hitler to form a government in January 1933 because the Nazis were still the largest party in the Reichstag and there were no alternative potential Chancellors left. The surge in the Nazis' electoral support was a consequence of the depression. Candidates will identify which of the two interpretations they find more convincing and will provide very good evidence in support of their judgement.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [30]

Option 5

Total

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

60

60