



**GCSE (9–1)**

**History B (Schools History Project)**

**J411/19:** Migrants to Britain, c.1250 to present with Britain in  
Peace and War, 1900-1918

General Certificate of Secondary Education

**Mark Scheme for June 2019**

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

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










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

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

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

© OCR 2019

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
 1	Level 1
 2	Level 2
 3	Level 3
 4	Level 4
 5	Level 5
 6	Level 6
 SEEN	Noted but no credit given
 NAQ	Not answered question
	Extendable horizontal wavy line

## Subject-specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

### INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for 'what must be a good answer' would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates' answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate's thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

Section A: Migrants to Britain, c.1250 to present

<p><b>Question 1–3 marks</b></p> <p>(a) Give one example of a response to migrants in Medieval Britain.</p> <p>(b) Name one migrant group that came to Britain between 1750 and 1900.</p> <p>(c) Name one organisation set up in Britain in response to migrants since 1945.</p>	
<p><b>Guidance</b></p>	<p><b>Indicative content</b></p>
<p>1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)</p>	<p><i>For 1 (a), likely valid responses include: restrictions on where Jews could live, being property of the king, paying higher taxes or the Statute of Jewry 1275, forced conversion, accusations of blood libels, executions and mass-murder, forced to wear yellow badges, restricted from farming or buying land. Royal invitations to Italian Bankers 1250s, Flemish weavers 1270s, 1330s; Introduction of Letters of Denization 1370s and Aliens Subsidy 1440s.</i></p> <p><i>For 1 (b), likely valid responses include: Irish, Gypsies, Jews, Chinese, Italians, Africans</i></p> <p><i>For 1 (c), likely valid responses include: the Anti Nazi League; the National Front; United Against Fascism; British National Party; Rock Against Racism; the Commission for Racial Equality</i></p> <p>Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.</p>
<p>1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)</p>	
<p>1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)</p>	

Question 2–9 marks	
Write a clear and organised summary that analyses the migrant communities in Medieval Britain. Support your summary with examples.	
<p><b>Levels</b>  <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b>  <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 3 marks</b></p>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<p><b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b>  Demonstrates a well-selected range of valid knowledge of characteristic features that are fully relevant to the question, in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).  The way the summary is organised shows sustained logical coherence, demonstrating clear use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).</p>	<p><i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i></p> <p><i>Answers could consider the diversity of migrants from Europe (including French, Dutch; Scottish, Irish; Flemish, Italian), as well as North Africans and 'Indians'.</i></p> <p><i>Answers could include the underlying causes of migration such as the impact of the Black Death, the development of the English cloth trade, refugees from the Hundred Year War, the growth of towns and trade) or the diversity of migrant communities' experiences, either contrasting groups (e.g. Flemish acceptance and Jewish expulsion) or within groups (hardening attitudes towards Flemish migrants between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; changing attitudes towards Jews during the thirteenth-century).</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b>  Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1).  The way the summary is organised shows some logical coherence, demonstrating use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).</p>	<p><i>Use of conceptual understanding to organise the response might in this case involve dealing with similarity and difference e.g. contrasting different groups of people or different reasons or including explanations of causation or why groups differed. Alternatively change within the period might be used.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>  Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1).  The summary shows a very basic logical coherence, demonstrating limited use of at least one second order concept in attempting to find connections and to provide a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).</p>	<p><i>Answers may show use of second order concepts such as change and continuity, cause and consequence, similarity and difference.</i></p> <p><i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise their answer, but the concepts do need to be apparent from the connections and chains of reasoning in the summary in order to meet the AO2 descriptors (see levels descriptors).</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>  No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 3–10 marks	
Why did Protestants migrate to Britain between 1500 and 1750? Support your answer with examples.	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>	
<b>Level 5 (9–10 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well-supported explanation (AO2).	<p><i>Explanations could consider: the impact of conflict in continental Europe and the relative peace in England from the middle of the sixteenth-century; the arrival of French Walloons and Huguenots and German migrants, including Palatines; the increase in French Huguenot migrants following the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572; public support for protestant refugees and government willingness to offer denizen status to some, e.g. Charles II 1681.</i></p> <p><i>Answers may explain the change from largely economic migrants in the Middle Ages to refugees in the early modern, leading to other refugees – Jews and Gypsies - seeking refuge in England. Answers might also consider the later Hansa Merchants as protestants.</i></p> <p><i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of cause and consequence but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Answers which simply describe some migrants groups cannot reach beyond Level 1.</i></p>
<b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).	
<b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 4*–18 marks 'Since 1900 British governments have become more and more negative towards migrants' How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<p><b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b></p> <p><b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of migration to Britain in the period.</i></p> <p><i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT, to achieve the two highest levels, answers must identify and consider the alternative point of view.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of change and continuity, with strong answers identifying trends, turning points and the process of change, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: increasing controls on immigration, beginning with the Alien Act 1905; treatment of 'enemy aliens' during First and Second World Wars; increased restrictions in 1962 and 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Acts; the 1971 Immigration Act created work permits for specific time periods, making migrants only temporary; laws passed between 1996 and 2007 placed increasing restrictions on 'asylum seekers' (not allowed to work until given leave to remain; housed in specified locations).</i></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: the welcome by governments of refugees from Europe during the World Wars; the 1947 Polish Resettlement Act led to Poles staying; the 1948 Nationality Act gave all Commonwealth citizens the right to hold British passports and enter Britain; the UN Convention on Refugees in 1951; race relations were improved through the 1965 Race Relations Act and establishment of The Commission for Racial Equality in</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	



**0 marks**

No response or no response worthy of credit.

*1976; the establishment of Freedom of Movement within the European Union in 1973 and expanded in 2007.*

<b>Question 5*–18 marks</b>	
<b>'Economic forces were the most important factor causing migration to Britain between 1500 and 1900' How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of changing migration to Britain between 1500 and 1900.</i></p> <p><i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT, to achieve the two highest levels, answers must identify and consider the alternative point of view by explaining at least one other factor even if the response goes on to argue that economic forces have been the most important factor.</i></p> <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of change or causation but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: the growth of world trade in the early modern, leading to the development of Empire in the nineteenth-century, examples include the East India Company and the development of Asian communities in port cities such as Cardiff, Liverpool or London's East End or the slave trade to the West Indies leading to increased African presence in Britain.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: other factors - changes in communication (changes in transport, particularly shipping and railways, had a huge impact on migration); religious conflict in Europe lead to large scale migrations to Britain (e.g. Huguenots or Germans); Britain's connections with Ireland led to 1.1 million Irish migrants in the nineteenth-century coming to Britain; European refugees fleeing war in Italy after 1871 or Jews fleeing Russian persecution after 1881; Africans and Asians arrived in Britain for other reasons, e.g. eminent Indians such as Prince Ranjitsinghji, or African Americans who had fought for Britain during the American</i></p>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment	

on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	<i>War of Independence.</i>
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

**Section B: Britain in Peace and War, 1900–1918****Question 6a – 3 marks**

**In Interpretation A, the author tries to give the impression that young men were pressured into joining the army during the First World War. Identify and explain one way in which he does this.**

**Notes and guidance specific to the question set**

Points marking (AO4): 1+1+1. 1 mark for identification of a relevant and appropriate way in which the illustrator portrays wealth and comfort + 1 mark for a basic explanation of this + 1 mark for development of this explanation.

*Reminder – This question does not seek evaluation of the given interpretation, just selection of relevant material and analysis of this in relation to the issue in the question.*

*The explanation of how the author tries to give the impression that young men were pressured into joining the army during the First World War may analyse the interpretation or aspects of the interpretation by using the candidate's knowledge of the historical situation portrayed and / or to the method or approach used by the author. Knowledge and understanding of historical context must be intrinsically linked to the analysis of the interpretation in order to be credited. Marks must not be awarded for the demonstration of knowledge or understanding in isolation.*

**NOTE:**

- **One mark is for correct identification of a feature in the interpretation that relates to the question.**
- **For the second 2 marks, the candidate must either: pick out a specific feature in the image and develop the explanation by making two points about it;**
- **OR give 2 examples relating to a more general feature.**

*The following answers are indicative. Other appropriate ways and appropriate and accurate explanation should also be credited:*

*For example:*

- *The author describes the impression given by the soldiers and the band (1). The main character comments on their shiny uniforms and the patriotic symbols of the Union Jack. (1) This makes it seem like he is being swept up in the nationalistic enthusiasm of the moment. (1)*
- *The author depicts the sergeant major as intimidating (1). His voice is described as 'commanding' and he points his stick into the crowd (1). This gives the reader the impression that Tommo is scared of not doing what he says (1).*
- *The author gives the impression that everyone is in favour of getting the young men to sign up (1). The crowd all shout 'No' to the sergeant major's question and then an old woman accuses Tommo of being a 'coward' (1). This makes it seem like Tommo is being bullied into joining up (1).*

<p><b>Question 6b – 5 marks</b>  <b>If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand responses to recruitment during the First World War.</b></p>	
<p><b>Levels</b>  <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 2 marks</b>  <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 3 marks</b>  <b>Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO2 are equal in levels 1 and 2, AO2 carries greater weight in level 3.</b></p>	<p><b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (5 marks)</b>  The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a strong understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain clearly how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	<p><i>Answers may choose to put forward lines of investigation by framing specific enquiry questions but it is possible to achieve full marks without doing this.</i>  <i>Suggested lines of enquiry / areas for research may be into matters of specific detail or into broader themes but must involve use of second order concepts rather than mere discovery of new information if AO2 marks are to be awarded.</i>  <i>Examples of areas for further research include: reasons that men volunteered to join the army (causation); reasons for the introduction of conscription in 1916 (causation); reasons that men did not join up or refused conscription later on (causation); what happened to men who did not join up or who refused conscription later on (consequence); how typical this kind of approach was from the army (similarity/difference/diversity); how many men joined up or accepted conscription compared to those who did not (similarity/difference/diversity).</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b>  The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a general understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	
<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 mark)</b>  The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). It shows a basic understanding of second order historical concept(s) and attempts to link these to explanation of how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	
<p><b>0 marks</b>  No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p><b>Question 6b – 5 marks</b>  <b>If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand responses to recruitment during the First World War.</b></p>	
<p><b>Guidance and indicative content</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 3 (5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically identify an impression given in Interpretation A and suggest a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept into this area. They will explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War e.g.</p> <p><i>[Causation]</i>  <i>Interpretation A suggests that men only joined up to the army because they were bullied into it and influenced by propaganda. I would investigate whether this was the main reason that men joined up or whether there were other reasons too, such as wanting to help. This would help us to understand whether men actively supporting Britain's involvement in the war.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept to compare to an impression given by Interpretation. Indication of how this would improve understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War.</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b></p>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept and explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War e.g.</p> <p><i>[Consequence]</i>  <i>I would investigate what happened to men as a result of not joining up. This would allow us to see how they were treated by other members of society and therefore how much support for the war there was overall.</i></p> <p><i>[Causation]</i>  <i>I would look at the reasons that some men refused to join up. This would allow us to understand whether they were morally against the war or whether it was more for personal reasons such as not wanting to leave businesses or family behind.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept with indication of how this would improve understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War.</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b></p>	<p>Answers at L1 will identify a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept (2 marks) eg</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i>  <i>I would investigate how typical it was for men to actively volunteer compared to those who didn't want to join up.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry about responses to recruitment during the First World War based on second-order concept</b></p> <p>Alternatively, L1 answers may identify details from Interpretation A and suggest further investigation into them (1-2 marks) eg  <i>I would look for more information about the role of the sergeant major. It would be interesting to know what his role was in recruitment. [2 marks]</i>  OR  <i>I would find out how many men joined up in 1914. [1 mark]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Find out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A – not based on second-order concept</b></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p>	

<b>Question 7–12 marks</b> <b>Interpretations B and C both focus on the People’s Budget of 1909. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a very detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a convincing and valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a convincing and well-substantiated judgment of how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	<p><i>Answers could consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Comparison of provenance and source type alone, eg B is from a website for general public, C is by a political party.</i></li> <li>• <i>Individual points of similarity/difference in content eg B says the Budget was a trap for the Lords while C says historians do not think this; B says the revenue raised was not important while C says it gave the Liberals the means to pass their social reforms. Both sources discuss how the Parliament Act took away power from the House of Lords.</i></li> <li>• <i>Differences in the overall portrayal of motives of Budget eg B suggests it was entirely political to tame Lords whereas C suggests the primary aim was social reform.</i></li> <li>• <i>Developed reasons for differences – purpose / audience, eg B is a popular website, trying to generate interest by making the story seem controversial and dramatic; C is positive, less cynical and reverential because writers are talking about their heroes.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Marks for relevant knowledge and understanding should be awarded for the clarity and confidence with which candidates discuss features, events or issues mentioned or implied in the interpretations. Candidates who introduce extra relevant knowledge or show understanding of related historical issues can be rewarded for this, but it is not a target of the question.</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a generally valid and clear judgment about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers some valid analysis of differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and gives a reasonable explanation of at least one reason why they may differ, and a basic judgement about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Identifies some differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and makes a limited attempt to explain why they may differ. There is either no attempt to assess how far they differ, or there is an assertion about this but it is completely unsupported (AO4).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on the People’s Budget of 1909. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L4 will typically compare the overall message about or portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget. They will support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. They will use the <b>purpose</b> of one or both of the interpretations to explain reasons for different portrayals, e.g.</p> <p><i>As L3, plus: I think the reason that B focuses on the power struggle surrounding the Budget is that it is trying to generate public interest in Edwardian history by making the story seem controversial and dramatic. [10 marks] But C is more positive about the Liberals and less cynical about their motives because the writers are talking about their heroes and want them to appear in a good light. [12 marks]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C, with support. Difference explained with specific purpose of B or C</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Award 10-11 marks for candidates who use the purpose of <u>one</u> interpretation to explain difference in portrayals. Award 12 marks for candidates which use the purpose of <u>both</u> interpretations to explain difference in portrayals. Do NOT allow undeveloped comments about provenance at this level, e.g. B is negative because it’s a popular website for the general public OR C is positive because it’s on the Liberal Democrats’ website.</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically compare the overall message about or portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget. They will support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. Answers at this level may attempt to explain differences using undeveloped comments about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation B suggests the Liberals passed the 1911 Budget entirely for political reasons. It says that Lloyd George set a ‘trap’ for the Lords and basically gave them an excuse to tame the Lords’ power when they refused to pass it. It says this was Lloyd George’s ‘key aim’ and suggests the Liberals’ social reforms were a bi-product of this power struggle. However, Interpretation C suggests the Liberals were being driven by their battle to achieve social reform which ‘formed the foundation of Britain’s welfare state’.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C with support from one or both interpretations.</b> <b>NOTE: Answers with support from only one interpretation award 7 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically use the content of the interpretations to compare individual points of similarity and/or difference e.g.</p> <p><i>B says the Budget was a trap for the Lords while C says historians do not think this. Both interpretations discuss how the Parliament Act took away power from the House of Lords. B says the Budget was ‘controversial’ and C agrees it was ‘important’.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Selects individual points of similarity or difference</b></p> <p>Answers at L2 will typically make a valid comparison of the motives for the 1909 Budget but fail to develop this with relevant support, e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation B suggests that the Liberals passed the Budget simply to reduce the Lords’ power but C says that their main motivation was to get their reforms passed.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals with no support</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L1 will typically make simplistic comments about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>They are different because B is from a website for the general public and C is by a political party. They are similar because they are both modern interpretations.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Comparison of simplistic provenance</b></p> <p>Alternatively, answers will explain or paraphrase the portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget one interpretation only, with no valid comparison e.g.</p>



	<i>Interpretation C suggests the Liberals were being driven by their battle to achieve social reform which 'formed the foundation of Britain's welfare state'.</i> <b>Nutshell: Portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget in one interpretation explained with no valid comparison</b>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<p><b>Question 8*–20 marks</b>  <b>In his 2000 school textbook, <i>The Struggle for Peace in Northern Ireland</i>, author Ben Walsh argued that the main cause of the Home Rule crisis 1912–1914 was the fact that the Liberal government ‘needed the votes of the Nationalist MPs in order to pass their laws.’ How far do you agree with this view?</b></p>	
<p><b>Levels</b>  <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>  <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>  <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 10 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b></p>
<p><b>Level 5 (17–20 marks)</b>          Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).          Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2).          Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of British attitudes towards the Empire.          It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 4 and 5, this must involve considering both the issue of the 1910 election and another reason for the Home Rule crisis.</i></p> <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (why the Home Rule crisis arose); consequence (the results of these causes); and significance (relative importance of events/individuals in causing the crisis); but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: In the elections of 1910 the Liberals lost their majority and there was a hung Parliament. The Liberals were now dependent on Irish Nationalist support. This greatly increased the influence of the Nationalists. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. However, this led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and they rallied around Carson and Craig in protest, making it clear they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b>          Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).          Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b>          Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).          Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2).          Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b>          Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2).          Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).</p>	

<p><i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b>                  Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).                  Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2).                  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity.  <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: The importance of other prior or subsequent events in leading to the crisis, eg the growth of Irish nationalism by 1900 and the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond meant that more pressure was applied to the Liberals. Alternatively, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Larne gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat; the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation. Another possible argument is that Asquith could have dealt with two private armies had senior British Army officers near Dublin not said they would resign if they were ordered to enforce Home Rule in Ulster (the Curragh Mutiny) – this meant that Asquith could not rely on the British Army.</i></p>

<p><b>Question 8*–20 marks</b>  <b>In his 2000 school textbook, <i>The Struggle for Peace in Northern Ireland</i>, author Ben Walsh argued that the main cause of the Home Rule crisis 1912–1914 was the fact that the Liberal government ‘needed the votes of the Nationalist MPs in order to pass their laws.’ How far do you agree with this view?</b></p>	
<p><b>Guidance and indicative content</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also some evidence to go against this interpretation. For example, Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists. Also, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Larne gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat because the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation. Finally, it could be argued that it was really only the actions of the British Army that caused an actual crisis. Asquith could have dealt with two private armies had senior British Army officers near not said they would resign if they were ordered to enforce Home Rule in Ulster (the Curragh Mutiny) – this meant that Asquith could not rely on the British Army.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think it depends what we mean by ‘crisis’. The dependence of the Liberals on the Nationalist MPs certainly led to the Liberals agreeing to pass a Home Rule Bill. However, it was not inevitable that this meant danger of civil war until later events like the Curragh Mutiny followed.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 20 marks</b></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by at least three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also some evidence to go against this interpretation. For example, Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists. Also, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Larne gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat because the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</b>  <b>NOTE 1: Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three.</b>  <b>NOTE 2: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>I don’t agree because Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists. Also, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Larne gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat because the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation.</i></p>

	<p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also some evidence to go against this interpretation. For example, Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because after 1910 there was a hung parliament and so the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe the crisis/ other relevant events OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>The Unionists would not accept Home Rule and said they would use armed force to resist it.</i></p> <p><i>No, a crisis was inevitable anyway because Nationalists and Unionists disagreed with each other.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of the crisis or other related events without linking this to the question OR general, unsupported assertions.</b></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p>	

Question 9*–20 marks In her podcast on the Historical Association website, historian June Hannam said that in the period 1910 to 1914 ‘the government was reluctant to take the step of giving women the vote because of women’s militancy.’ How far do you agree with this view of government responses to the campaign for women’s suffrage?	
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b> <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 10 marks</b>	<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Level 5 (17–20 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of the nature and extent of support for women’s suffrage.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 4 and 5, this must involve considering both the issue of women’s militancy as a reason for the government not granting women the vote, plus another reason.</i>
<b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of causation (reasons that the government did not grant women the vote); change and continuity (in the methods women were using to campaign for the vote); consequence (impact of militancy and political beliefs); but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	<i>NOTE: Responses which describe/explain the impact of militancy upon public opinion only (as opposed to the government between 1910 and 1914) should be credited at Level 1.</i>  <i>Grounds for agreeing include: . From 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. There is evidence of a hardening government attitude as the campaign turned more militant, eg force feeding and the Cat and Mouse Act.</i>
<b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, so this cannot have been the only</i>

<i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	<i>reason for refusing women the vote; the Liberals were more concerned with pushing through their social reforms than with granting the vote to women; there were political concerns from the Liberal government that enfranchising women on the same basis as men would disadvantage the Liberals in elections as middle class women were more likely to vote Conservative; there remained ideological beliefs about giving women the vote, eg a women's sphere being the home, etc.</i>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b></p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p><b>Question 9*–20 marks</b>  <b>In her podcast on the Historical Association website, historian June Hannam said that in the period 1910 to 1914 ‘the government was reluctant to take the step of giving women the vote because of women’s militancy.’ How far do you agree with this view of government responses to the campaign for women’s suffrage?</b></p>	
<p><b>Guidance and indicative content</b></p>	
<p><b><i>NOTE: Responses which describe/explain the impact of militancy <u>upon public opinion only</u> (as opposed to the government between 1910 and 1914) should be credited at Level 1.</i></b></p>	
<p><b>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. This can be seen in the government’s hardening of attitude after the escalation of militancy, for example by passing the Cat and Mouse Act.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also lots of evidence to go against the interpretation. For example, Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, and they were rejected, so this cannot have been the only reason for refusing women the vote. One possibility is that the Liberal government were worried that giving women the vote on the same basis as men would disadvantage them in elections, as middle class women were more likely to vote Conservative.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I only partly agree with the statement. Whilst militancy was certainly not the only reason that the government did not enfranchise women by 1914, it is definitely the case that as long as the WSPU were carrying out a high-profile militant campaign, the government were never going to give in.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 20 marks</b></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by at least three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. This can be seen in the government’s hardening of attitude after the escalation of militancy, for example by passing the Cat and Mouse Act. However, there is also evidence to go against the interpretation. For example, Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, and they were rejected, so this cannot have been the only reason for refusing women the vote.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</b>  <b>NOTE 1: Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three.</b>  <b>NOTE 2: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public</i></p>



	<p><i>opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. This can be seen in the government’s hardening of attitude after the escalation of militancy, for example by passing the Cat and Mouse Act.</i>  <b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. However, there is also evidence to go against the interpretation. For example, Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, and they were rejected, so this cannot have been the only reason for refusing women the vote.</i>  <b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage.</i>  <b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b>  <b>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>No, I don’t agree because actually it was more to do with the Liberals thinking they would do badly out of giving women the vote.</i>  <b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe the campaigns/relevant events OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.  <i>The WSPU used direct action to get their point across. For example, they smashed windows and slashed paintings in art galleries.</i>  <i>No, women weren’t equal so the government were against it anyway.</i>  <b>Nutshell: Description of campaigns or related events without linking this to the question OR general, unsupported assertions.</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Responses which describe/explain the impact of militancy <u>upon public opinion only</u> (as opposed to the government between 1910 and 1914) should be credited at Level 1.</b></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p>	

<p><b>Question 6b – 5 marks</b>  <b>If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand the nature of Elizabethan society.</b></p>	
<p><b>Levels</b>  <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 2 marks</b>  <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 3 marks</b>  <b>Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO2 are equal in levels 1 and 2, AO2 carries greater weight in level 3.</b></p>	<p><b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (5 marks)</b>  The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a strong understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain clearly how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	<p><i>Answers may choose to put forward lines of investigation by framing specific enquiry questions but it is possible to achieve full marks without doing this.</i>  <i>Suggested lines of enquiry / areas for research may be into matters of specific detail or into broader themes but must involve use of second order concepts rather than mere discovery of new information if AO2 marks are to be awarded.</i></p> <p><i>Examples of areas for further research include: how representative this illustration is of Elizabethan society, ie comparison of housing and entertainment of different social groups (Diversity i.e. Similarity/Difference); reasons for the growing wealth and power of the Elizabethan nobility (Causation); the comparative status and lives of women in Elizabethan England (Diversity i.e. Similarity/Difference); whether the living standards of the nobility changed across the period (Change and continuity).</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b>  The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a general understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	
<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 mark)</b>  The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). It shows a basic understanding of second order historical concept(s) and attempts to link these to explanation of how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	
<p><b>0 marks</b>  No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p><b>Question 6b – 5 marks</b>  <b>If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand the nature of Elizabethan society.</b></p>	
<p><b>Guidance and indicative content</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 3 (5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically identify an impression given in Interpretation A and suggest a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept into this area. They will explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of the nature of Elizabethan society e.g.</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i>  <i>Interpretation A suggests that life was easy for rich women such as Bess of Hardwick, a life of ease and luxury. I would compare the lives of wealthy women like Bess of Hardwick to the lives of poorer women and see how different they were. This would help us to understand the challenges faced by poorer women, which Bess of Hardwick would not have faced. It would also help us to compare how much choice or freedom poorer women had compared to rich women.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept to compare to an impression given by Interpretation. Indication of how this would improve understanding of the nature of Elizabethan society.</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b></p>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept and explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of the nature of Elizabethan society e.g.</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i>  <i>I would compare the homes and lifestyles of people like Bess of Hardwick to other people in Elizabethan society. This would allow us to see how much difference there was between the gentry and the lives of merchants and labourers.</i></p> <p><i>[Causation]</i>  <i>I would look at the reasons for such wealth and extravagance amongst the nobility in Elizabethan England. This would allow us to understand whether wealth such as this was purely inherited along with titles, or whether it was possible to move up the social ladder.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept with indication of how this would improve understanding of the nature of Elizabethan society</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b></p>	<p>Answers at L1 will identify a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept (2 marks) e.g.</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i>  <i>I would investigate how different the homes were of different types of people in Elizabethan society.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry about the nature of Elizabethan society based on second-order concept</b></p> <p>Alternatively, L1 answers may identify details from Interpretation A and suggest further investigation into them (1-2 marks) e.g.</p> <p><i>I would look for more information about the musicians. It would be interesting to know what instrument he's playing and how much he got paid. [2 marks]</i>  OR  <i>I would find out more about what the food was like that at these banquets. [1 mark]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Find out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A – not based on second-order concept</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: DO NOT REWARD RESPONSES WHICH ANSWER THEIR OWN ENQUIRY USING CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE.</b></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p>	

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on the threat posed to Elizabeth by Mary Queen of Scots. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>	
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a very detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a convincing and valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a convincing and well-substantiated judgment of how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	<p><i>Answers could consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Comparison of provenance and source type alone, eg B is from a website, C is a history book.</i></li> <li>• <i>Individual points of similarity/difference in content: C says there were ‘real fears’ about a Catholic plot whereas B says there were only ‘empty rumours.’ C says that Mary’s letter is a source of controversy among historians and B also shows this by denying Mary plotted against Elizabeth. C says Mary plotted against Elizabeth; B says she did not. Both sources agree that Mary was planning escape. B suggests Walsingham lured Babington into a trap; C makes no mention of this.</i></li> <li>• <i>Differences in the overall portrayal of Mary Queen of Scots and/or the nature of the threat posed by her: C suggests there was real danger of a Catholic plot against Elizabeth and her spies were trying to save England from this threat. It portrays Mary as a true conspirator and treason plotter, discussing the evidence in the letter. According to C, Mary was guilty and the spies found the evidence of this. However, B downplays the Catholic threat, dismissing it as ‘empty rumours’ made up by ‘Protestant’ historians. It portrays Mary as a Catholic martyr who was not guilty of plotting to assassinate the Queen. It shows Elizabeth’s spies in a negative light, as agent provocateurs trying to get Babington to break the law.</i></li> <li>• <i>Developed reasons for differences – purpose / audience, eg B is from a Catholic website which is trying to exonerate Mary as a Catholic martyr, so it downplays her role in the plot. It sounds from C’s title like the book is more of a biography of Walsingham and written in praise of him, calling him the ‘Spy Master’ who ‘saved England.’ It’s therefore highly likely to argue that Walsingham was acting in the nation’s and the Queen’s best interests in taking the action he did against Mary.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a generally valid and clear judgment about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers some valid analysis of differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and gives a reasonable explanation of at least one reason why they may differ, and a basic judgement about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Identifies some differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and makes a limited attempt to explain why they may differ. There is either no attempt to assess how far they differ, or there is an assertion about this but it is completely unsupported (AO4).	
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	
	<p><i>Marks for relevant knowledge and understanding should be awarded for the clarity and confidence with which candidates discuss features, events or issues mentioned or implied in the interpretations. Candidates who introduce extra relevant knowledge or show understanding of related historical issues can be rewarded for this, but it is not a target of the question.</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on the threat posed to Elizabeth by Mary Queen of Scots. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Guidance and indicative content	
<b>Level 4 (10-12 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L4 will typically compare the overall portrayal of Mary Queen of Scots and/or the nature of the threat posed by her. They will support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. They will use the <b>purpose</b> of one or both of the interpretations to explain reasons for different portrayals, e.g.</p> <p><i>As L3, plus: I think the reason for the difference is that B is from a Catholic website which is trying to absolve Mary of any guilt, and portray her as a Catholic martyr, so it downplays her role in the plot. [10-11 marks] Whereas it sounds from C's title like the book is more of a biography of Walsingham and written in praise of him, calling him the 'Spy Master' who 'saved England.' It's therefore highly likely to argue that Walsingham was acting in the nation's and the Queen's best interests in taking the action he did against Mary. [12 marks]</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C, with support. Difference explained with specific purpose of B or C</b></p> <p><b>NOTE: Award 10-11 marks for candidates who use the purpose of <u>one</u> interpretation to explain difference in portrayals. Award 12 marks for candidates which use the purpose of <u>both</u> interpretations to explain difference in portrayals. Do NOT allow undeveloped comments about provenance at this level, e.g. B says she is innocent because it's a Catholic website OR C says she is guilty because it is a historian who has done more research.</b></p>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L3 will typically compare the overall portrayal of Mary Queen of Scots and/or the nature of the threat posed by her. They will support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. Answers at this level may attempt to explain differences using undeveloped comments about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>C suggests there was real danger of a Catholic plot against Elizabeth and her spies were trying to save England from this threat. It portrays Mary as a true treason plotter, discussing the evidence in the letter. According to C, Mary was guilty and the spies found the evidence of this. However, B downplays the Catholic threat, dismissing it as 'empty rumours' made up by 'Protestant' historians. It portrays Mary as a Catholic martyr who was not guilty of plotting to assassinate the Queen. It shows Elizabeth's spies in a negative light, as agent provocateurs trying to get Babington to break the law.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C with support from one or both interpretations.</b> <b>NOTE: Answers with support from only one interpretation award 7 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Answers at L2 will typically use the content of the interpretations to compare individual points of similarity and/or difference e.g. <i>C says there were 'real fears' about a Catholic plot whereas B says there were only 'empty rumours.'</i> <i>C says Mary plotted against Elizabeth; B says she did not.</i> <i>Both sources agree that Mary was planning escape.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Selects individual points of similarity or difference</b></p> <p>Answers at L2 will typically make a valid comparison of the overall portrayal of Mary Queen of Scots and/or the nature of the threat posed by her but fail to develop this with relevant support, e.g. <i>Interpretation C portrays Mary as a plotter who was guilty of treason but B makes her out to be more of an innocent just caught up in events.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals with no support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, L2 answers will use the purpose of one interpretation to explain its portrayal of Mary Queen of Scots and/or the nature of the threat posed by her but fail to compare to the other interpretation, e.g. <i>I think the reason that B is so positive about Mary is that it is from a Catholic website which is trying to absolve her of any guilt, and portray her as a Catholic martyr, so it downplays her role in the plot.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Purpose of one interpretation used to explain its portrayal of Mary/nature of the threat – no comparison.</b></p>

<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b></p>	<p>Answers at L1 will typically make simplistic comments about provenance e.g.  <i>They are different because B is from a website but C is a history book.</i>  <i>They are different because B is from Catholic website but C is a proper historian who has done lots of research.</i>  <b>Nutshell: Comparison of simplistic provenance</b></p> <p>Alternatively, answers will explain or paraphrase the portrayal of Mary Queen of Scots and/or the nature of the threat posed by her in one interpretation only, with no valid comparison e.g.  <i>B downplays the Catholic threat, saying there are only ‘empty rumours’ made up by ‘Protestant’ historians. It portrays Mary as a Catholic martyr.</i>  <b>Nutshell: Portrayal of Mary Queen of Scots and/or the nature of the threat posed by her in one interpretation explained with no valid comparison</b></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p>	

<p><b>Question 8*–20 marks</b>  <b>According to the book <i>Travel: London, Elizabethan theatres</i> ‘had the support of everyone from the Queen to the peasants.’ How far do you agree with this view of people’s attitudes towards theatres between 1580 and 1603?</b></p>	
<p><b>Levels</b>  <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.  <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>  <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>  <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 10 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b></p>
<p><b>Level 5 (17–20 marks)</b>  Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).  Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2).  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of popular culture in Elizabethan England.</i>  <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 4 and 5, this must involve considering both the issue of the popularity of theatres and their opponents.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b>  Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).  Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of similarity and difference (diversity of support for / opinions of theatres across society); and causation and consequence (what created these views) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b>  Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).  Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2).  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: There were numerous new theatres built during this period which is a reflection of their popularity – eg <i>The Theatre, The Curtain, The Rose, The Swan, The Globe</i>. Plays on Bankside attracted thousands of Londoners and visitors. The plays were popular with all social groups loved the comedies, tragedies and histories written by Shakespeare. People were also attracted to the additional songs, dancing and jokes at the end. Theatres were popular with the poorer classes because ‘groundlings’ only paid a penny. The audiences were often noisy and engaged with the actors which shows they were popular. Concerns about crowds and distraction (see below) reveals how popular the theatres were. Elizabeth enjoyed</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b>  Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2).  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).</p>	

<p><i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b>                  Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).                  Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2).                  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity.  <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	<p><i>watching plays at court and some of her courtiers sponsored a theatre company to win her favour. She and her Privy Council ignored challenges to the theatres by the Puritans and London authorities. The theatres remained open apart from during outbreaks of Plague.</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b>                  No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: Some Elizabethans complained that jigs were vulgar. Fights sometimes broke out. Others saw the theatres as a threat to society. The London authorities had concerns about the theatres and asked the Privy Council to close them. They were worried about the theatre crowds creating disorder and they argued that servants and apprentices were distracted from their work. They also said that the theatres attracted thieves and prostitutes. Puritans also opposed the theatres. Puritanism was strong in 16<sup>th</sup> C London and Puritans wrote pamphlets attacking the theatres. They associated play with paganism and also with Catholicism. Preachers argued that the theatres and the places where they were situated on Bankside and Shoreditch – near to brothels – led people into sin.</i></p>



<p><b>Question 8*–20 marks</b>  <b>According to the book <i>Travel: London</i>, Elizabethan theatres ‘had the support of everyone from the Queen to the peasants.’ How far do you agree with this view of people’s attitudes towards theatres between 1580 and 1603?</b></p>	
<p><b>Guidance and indicative content</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to support the interpretation. We know that Elizabeth did support theatres as she enjoyed watching plays at court and some of her courtiers sponsored a theatre company to win her favour. She and her Privy Council ignored challenges to the theatres by the Puritans and London authorities. Secondly, the plays on Bankside attracted thousands of Londoners and visitors which shows how popular they were, especially with the poorer classes who bought up the penny seats.</i></p> <p><i>However, it’s not true that ‘everyone’ supported the theatres. The London authorities had concerns about the theatres and asked the Privy Council to close them because they were worried about the theatre crowds creating disorder. As well as this, Puritans opposed the theatres and they wrote pamphlets attacking the theatres. They associated plays with paganism and also with Catholicism, and argued that the theatres led people to brothels and into sin.</i></p> <p><i>In conclusion, I think that although there were exceptions such as the Puritans, overall the interpretation does give the right impression because the concerns from the authorities about crowds and distraction in itself reveals just how popular the theatres were.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 20 marks</b></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by at least three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to support the interpretation. We know that Elizabeth did support theatres as she enjoyed watching plays at court and some of her courtiers sponsored a theatre company to win her favour. She and her Privy Council ignored challenges to the theatres by the Puritans and London authorities. Secondly, the plays on Bankside attracted thousands of Londoners and visitors which shows how popular they were, especially with the poorer classes who bought up the penny seats. However, it’s not true that ‘everyone’ supported the theatres. Puritans opposed the theatres and they wrote pamphlets attacking the theatres. They associated plays with paganism and also with Catholicism, and argued that the theatres led people to brothels and into sin.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</b>  <b>NOTE 1: Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three.</b>  <b>NOTE 2: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to support the interpretation. We know that Elizabeth did support theatres as she enjoyed watching plays at court and some of her courtiers sponsored a theatre company to win her favour. She and her Privy Council ignored challenges to the theatres by the Puritans and London authorities. Secondly, the plays on Bankside attracted thousands of Londoners and visitors which shows how popular they were, especially with the poorer classes who bought up the penny seats.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to support the interpretation. The plays on Bankside attracted thousands of Londoners and visitors which shows how popular they were,</i></p>

	<p><i>especially with the poorer classes who bought up the penny seats. However, it's not true that 'everyone' supported the theatres. Puritans opposed the theatres and they wrote pamphlets attacking the theatres. They associated plays with paganism and also with Catholicism, and argued that the theatres led people to brothels and into sin.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b>  <b>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because the plays on Bankside attracted thousands of Londoners and visitors which shows how popular they were, especially with the poorer classes who bought up the penny seats.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b>  <b>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>No, I don't agree because Puritans opposed them.</i>  <b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe theatres/relevant events OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.  <i>Elizabethan theatres included the comedies, tragedies and histories written by Shakespeare. There were also songs, dancing and jokes at the end. The audiences were often noisy.</i></p> <p><i>Yes, the theatres were popular with all social classes.</i>  <b>Nutshell: Description of theatres or related events without linking this to the question OR general, unsupported assertions.</b></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p>	

Question 9*–20 marks According to the website <a href="http://www.elizabethan-era.org.uk">www.elizabethan-era.org.uk</a> , Elizabethan adventurers were motivated by the belief that ‘new discoveries could bring untold riches.’ How far do you agree with this view of the motives of adventurers between 1580 and 1603?	
<p><b>Levels</b>  <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>  <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>  <b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 10 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b></p>
<p><b>Level 5 (17–20 marks)</b>  Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).  Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2).  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of the nature and significance of England’s connections with the wider world.  It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 4 and 5, this must involve considering both the motivation of wealth and at least one other reason for exploration.</i></p> <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of cause and consequence (what motivated the explorers and what this led to); and similarity and difference (diversity of motivations) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b>  Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).  Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: Wealth motivated many, eg Francis Drake plundered many Spanish and Portuguese ships in the Caribbean and West Africa, bringing back vast quantities of treasure in 1580; Humphrey Gilbert hoped to claim vast territory in North America and sell much of it to wealthy Englishmen who invested in his voyage; Walter Raleigh knew that gold and silver mines in Central and South America had brought the Spanish great wealth and he hoped that the discovery of gold in North America would do the same for England (and himself); Raleigh also led an expedition to Guiana in 1594 in search of ‘the city of Gold’.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b>  Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).  Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2).  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: The adventurers were also motivated by other reasons. eg: There was rivalry with Spain who had built up a huge empire in Central and South America, eg Humphrey Gilbert was driven by his hatred of Catholic Spain. Trade was a reason in many cases, eg Ralph Fitch sailed to Syria in 1583 to establish trade links between England and the Mughal Empire; and James Lancaster sailed to the East Indies</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b>  Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2).  Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of</p>	

<p>ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).  <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	<p><i>seeking opportunities for trade – English merchants were keen to import things like spices, cotton, silk, jewels and perfumes from East Asia. Adventure was another reason, eg Francis Drake was a daring adventurer who wanted to achieve sailing all the way around South America. In 1579–80 he claimed several islands in the Strait of Magellan, and later California ('New Albion') for Queen Elizabeth. He sailed into the Pacific where no English sailor had been before. After 1580, more Elizabethan adventurers set off on voyages because they had been inspired by Drake's adventures.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b>          Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).          Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2).          Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity.  <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<p><b>0 marks</b>          No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p><b>Question 9*–20 marks</b>  <b>According to the website <a href="http://www.elizabethan-era.org.uk">www.elizabethan-era.org.uk</a>, Elizabethan adventurers were motivated by the belief that ‘new discoveries could bring untold riches.’ How far do you agree with this view of the motives of adventurers between 1580 and 1603?</b></p>	
<p><b>Guidance and indicative content</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid <b>clinching argument</b> e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence that to support the interpretation. Wealth did drive explorers such as Francis Drake, who plundered many Spanish and Portuguese ships in the Caribbean and West Africa, bringing back lots of treasure in 1580. Walter Raleigh was also motivated by wealth – he knew that gold and silver mines in Central and South America had brought the Spanish great wealth and he hoped that the discovery of gold in North America would do the same for England.</i></p> <p><i>However, there were also many other reasons that the adventurers went exploring. For example, trade was a reason in many cases. Ralph Fitch sailed to Syria in 1583 to establish trade links between England and the Mughal Empire and James Lancaster sailed to the East Indies seeking opportunities to import things like spices, cotton and silk. Adventure was another reason. For example, Francis Drake was a daring adventurer who wanted to achieve sailing all the way around South America. He sailed into the Pacific where no English sailor had been before.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think wealth was probably the main reason as stated by the interpretation. This is because some of the other reasons can also be linked back to wealth; for example, trade was a motivation because of profit and being a daring adventurer brought fame, status and wealth alongside it.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 20 marks</b></p>
<p><b>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by at least three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence that to support the interpretation. Wealth did drive explorers such as Francis Drake, who plundered many Spanish and Portuguese ships in the Caribbean and West Africa, bringing back lots of treasure in 1580. Walter Raleigh was also motivated by wealth – he knew that gold and silver mines in Central and South America had brought the Spanish great wealth and he hoped that the discovery of gold in North America would do the same for England. However, there were also many other reasons that the adventurers went exploring. For example, trade was a reason in many cases. Ralph Fitch sailed to Syria in 1583 to establish trade links between England and the Mughal Empire and James Lancaster sailed to the East Indies seeking opportunities to import things like spices, cotton and silk.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support</b>  <b>NOTE 1: Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three.</b>  <b>NOTE 2: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</b></p>
<p><b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence that to support the interpretation. Wealth did drive explorers such as Francis Drake, who plundered many Spanish and Portuguese ships in the Caribbean and West Africa, bringing back lots of treasure in 1580. Walter Raleigh was also motivated by wealth – he knew that gold and silver mines in Central and South America had brought the Spanish great wealth and he hoped that the discovery of gold in North America would do the same for England.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence that to support the interpretation. Wealth did drive explorers such as Francis Drake, who plundered many Spanish and Portuguese ships in the</i></p>

	<p><i>Caribbean and West Africa, bringing back lots of treasure in 1580. However, there were also many other reasons that the adventurers went exploring. For example, trade was a reason in many cases. Ralph Fitch sailed to Syria in 1583 to establish trade links between England and the Mughal Empire and James Lancaster sailed to the East Indies seeking opportunities to import things like spices, cotton and silk.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</b>  <b>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</b></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree wealth did drive explorers such as Francis Drake, who plundered many Spanish and Portuguese ships in the Caribbean and West Africa, bringing back lots of treasure in 1580.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</b>  <b>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</b></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b></p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>No, I don't agree because there were other reasons such as wanting to find trade routes.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</b></p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe adventurers/expeditions/relevant events OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>In 1580 Francis Drake became the first Englishman to circumnavigate the globe. In 1585 there was an attempt to set up an English colony in Virginia.</i></p> <p><i>Yes, riches were important because the voyages brought wealth back to England.</i></p> <p><b>Nutshell: Description of adventurers/expeditions or related events without linking this to the question OR general, unsupported assertions.</b></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p>	

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019

