

# **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

## **Mark Scheme for June 2013**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

**Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions****Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

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

**Notes related to Part A:**

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

## Marking Grid for Question (a)

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

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

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

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70**

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

**Notes related to Part B:**

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

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

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

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that they both agree that William took the initiative over the survey and that he consulted with his advisors. Both say that his own men were sent out to ask the questions, that the process was extremely thorough and that the results were reported in writing.</p> <p>The Sources also <b>differ</b> in that <b>Source A</b> attributes two motives to William: the quest for information and the desire to raise taxes. <b>Source D</b> agrees that information was a motive. <b>Source D</b> however, argues that William wanted to improve law and order by establishing land ownership clearly. <b>Source A</b> gives more precise detail and is critical of the precision of the questioning, arguing that it was a shameful business but that William did not appreciate this. <b>Source D</b> implies that William's motives were more worthy, in that maintaining law and order is a kingly attribute.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. <b>The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</b> is generally hostile to William and was convinced, not necessarily unreasonably, that the acquiring of information was bound to lead to higher taxes. <b>Source D</b> comes from the pen of a man who knew all about taxation, so would have been expected to suggest that revenue raising was the motive, if, indeed it was. Also he is writing well after the event and as he does not state that taxation increased after the book was put together, then the Chronicle may be exaggerating. Given hindsight therefore candidates may judge <b>Source D</b> to be the better evidence, although contemporary fears as to William's intentions are better conveyed in <b>Source A</b>.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....'</p> <p>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The <b>supporting</b> view, that William was intent on raising taxes is found in <b>Source A</b>, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, <b>Source C</b>, William of Malmesbury and mentioned, but refuted in <b>Source E</b>, the modern historian. The <b>alternative view</b> is reflected in parts of <b>Source A</b>, clear in <b>Source B</b>, the land grant, implied in <b>Source D</b>, the Dialogue of the Exchequer and argued in <b>Source E</b>.</p> <p>The <b>supporting</b> argument indicates William wanted money. <b>Sources A and E</b>, the one from the A-S Chronicle and the other referring to it, indicate that William was greedy for money. He was finding out all he could about England so he knew what it was worth. <b>Source C</b> argues most strongly that he was avaricious and the fact that it indicates that</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>this was his only major fault adds weight to the argument.</p> <p>The <b>opposing</b> argument that William was not always greedy and had other motives comes across in <b>Source B</b>. Here he is concerned for the fate of his immortal soul and ready to give up the taxes both in duties such as knight service and in money on the lands he is handing to Westminster Abbey. Moreover, these lands came from those he took over from Harold, so may represent a greater sacrifice. This grant was made after the Domesday Inquests had reported so perhaps William knew he could afford to be generous to the Abbey, a prime ecclesiastical foundation. <b>Source A</b> could be seen to consider that William wanted to know more about his kingdom and that this was laudable. <b>Source D</b> makes it clear that William was at the peak of his power, possibly because of his financial security, and so was insistent on the maintenance of law and order. His motives are seen as the promotion of stability, rather than greed, and the prevention of disputes over property, the most frequent cause of legal cases at the time. <b>Source E</b> points out the inconsistencies in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and implies that the taxation was not that harsh, but is a less convincing defence of William.</p> <p>Candidates may well conclude that the Sources tend to favour William as a wise and prudent ruler, rather than as one eager for revenue.</p> <p><b>Contextual knowledge</b> could be used to argue that William, in any case, had heavy expenses in defending England, as <b>Source C</b> suggests, from attacks, and in building castles and defeating rebels, so he was not increasing taxes to indulge in high living but to undertake the essential functions of a medieval king. If all else failed, he needed money to buy off invaders. His predecessors had taxed the country, notably with Danegeld, for that very purpose, but William's administration was probably more effective. With regard to <b>provenance</b> candidates might suggest that the critics are guilty of some extravagance of language in <b>Source A</b> where not one pig is omitted and that the outlook of the Chronicle is generally pessimistic. <b>William of Malmesbury</b> is imprecise in his accusations and gives no examples of William's shameful actions. He maintains that the impositions were continuing, which tends to imply that they were not that injurious. It is not clear why he thinks towns and churches should contribute less. He is generally even-handed about William, which could make his views more reliable. <b>Source E</b> shows how easily the king could be criticised on the one hand for his heavy exactions and then applauded for his firm government, suggesting William could not</p>		<p>terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected. Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>please everyone all the time. This is a modern view and the Chronicler writing in William's reign was not, perhaps, concerned about taking a consistent line. <b>Source D</b> shows William did not act alone but in consultation. The acquiring of information could be seen as a process likely to be upheld by a civil servant.</p>		
2	<p>(a)</p> <p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that they both discuss the accessions of young monarchs, though knowledge may confirm that in <b>Source B</b> Edward is 9 years old and in <b>Source C</b> Jane is 15. Both are Protestant accessions, as such untypical at that time. In both cases, the Privy Council plays a major role in fulfilling the wishes of the previous monarch: in <b>Source B</b> they carry out the terms of Henry VIII's will and in <b>Source C</b> they swear loyalty to Jane to carry out Edward's wishes. Both monarchs have acceded on the death of a previous monarch: Henry VIII in <b>Source B</b> and Edward VI in <b>Source C</b>. Both suggest their accession was unexpected: Edward is 'suddenly' proclaimed and Jane experiences 'sudden grief'. The difference in context is that Edward's death was kept a secret for three days. Both Sources refer to an atmosphere of sadness, but whereas in <b>Source B</b> this is Henry VIII's subjects mourning his death and fearing an unstable minority, in <b>Source C</b> the tears are Jane's own, troubled by her unexpected responsibilities. In both cases, noblemen take important roles in the accession: Somerset, Warwick and Thomas Seymour are named in Edward's journal while Jane records Northumberland's role in announcing Edward's death and proclaiming his wishes. Though not essential for the top levels, <b>knowledge</b> might be used of the Council members established by Henry's will, choice of Somerset to rule for Edward and Jane's marriage to Guilford Dudley, Northumberland's son. Thus neither monarch was acceding to royal <i>power</i> in practice. Both were therefore untypical accessions, though Jane's more so than Edward's, as she was female and her accession of dubious legality. In evaluating the authenticity of <b>Sources C</b> and <b>B</b>, <b>knowledge</b> of Northumberland's influence on Edward's Devise for the Succession and Letters Patent might be linked to Privy Council alterations of Henry's will. Dubious authenticity did not undermine Edward's right to succeed, unlike Jane.</p> <p>The content of the Sources also <b>differs</b>. In <b>Source B</b>, Edward's accession conforms not only to Henry's wishes in his will, but also to the law laid down in the 1543 Act of Succession. In contrast, <b>Source C</b> suggests that Jane's accession is announced on Northumberland's hearsay of Edward's wishes. While Edward talks of his coronation oath and general pardon, Jane was not crowned, but merely assumed the crown for only</p>	30	<p><b>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>nine days. Seen as a usurper, by Jane's own admission in her letter to Mary, Jane's accession was unlike that of Edward who was fully recognised as Henry's long awaited male heir. <b>Source provenance</b> is useful in explaining these differences. Edward's diary (<b>B</b>) records the youthful impressions of a young child, on the excitement of wearing the crown and presiding over the nobility who gave homage to him. Its matter-of-fact style contrasts with Jane's emotional response in <b>C</b> and her fears that her husband might gain some power against her wishes. Whereas Edward is free and has just been elevated to be monarch at the time of writing, Jane is recalling her accession while in the Tower, with the <b>purpose</b> of exonerating herself after Mary has acceded to the throne. She certainly hopes to escape the fate of her father-in-law. Thus <b>Source B</b> might be seen as more reliable and useful, though no particular judgement is expected. A substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources may be grouped by interpretation. The argument for choice of successor is in <b>Sources C, E</b> and to an extent <b>A</b>, whereas <b>Sources B, D</b> and possibly to an extent <b>E</b> suggest that monarchs were bound by the law or the people's acceptance of the direct male blood-line, so had little choice. The provenance and context of <b>C</b> suggests that the law and the blood line overrides the monarchs' choice.</p> <p><b>Sources A, C</b> and <b>E</b> might be used to argue the view that the monarch chose their successors. In <b>Source A</b>, Henry VIII has chosen to name his children as his successors, in line with the 1544 Act of Succession, despite previous Succession Acts of 1534 and 1537 declaring his daughters illegitimate. It might be inferred that the choice to pass or repeal a Succession Act reflected the monarch's choice. In addition, Henry VIII is selective in naming his successors beyond his children. He omits the Scottish branch of the Tudor family, his elder sister Margaret's successor Mary Queen of Scots. A link might be made to the introduction of <b>Source E</b> and perhaps, briefly, to its content. Frances and Eleanor themselves are not named as successors, only their children.</p> <p><b>Knowledge</b> might be used to explain that Lady Jane Grey, author of <b>Source C</b> was Frances's daughter, making her next in line after Elizabeth. The content of <b>C</b> refers to Edward's choice of Jane as his successor, mainly because of Mary's religion. This ran counter to the choice of Henry VIII, so Edward used his sisters' illegitimacy as an excuse to disbar them.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>A supported overall judgement is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious context. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>However, the <b>provenance</b> of <b>Sources A</b> and <b>C</b> are useful for evaluation. It might be known that the Dry Stamp was used to confirm Henry VIII's will, in <b>A</b>, less than a month before his death, and that Henry may have been too ill to know what it contained. The Seymour brothers and perhaps Henry Grey may have changed aspects of the will, in terms of the councillors and their respective powers, undermining its reliability. In contrast, Jane is writing a letter of justification, hoping for Mary's mercy in <b>C</b>, so she may exaggerate her grief and emphasise her unwillingness. <b>Knowledge</b> of her reserved and studious character, manipulation by her father and unwelcome marriage to Northumberland's son might balance the evaluation. <b>Source C</b> suggests Jane might choose whether to name Guilford Dudley as her successor, and certainly had no intention of sharing power with her husband (Guilford Dudley). Similarly, Elizabeth I in <b>Source E</b>, seems to have the choice in naming her successor. She resists Maitland's request that Mary Queen of Scots be named her heir for the practical reason of potential factional plots.</p> <p>However, <b>Sources B, D</b> and the <b>provenance</b> of <b>C</b> might be used for <b>the alternative view</b> that in reality the monarch had no choice of successor. <b>Source B</b> confirms that the next direct heir of the monarch's male blood-line was regarded by the people as the true successor, even if the monarch had passed no legislation to that effect. <b>Knowledge</b> of Henry's quest for a son might be used to confirm this point. Edward was accepted as Henry VIII's successor because he was male, despite being a minor. However, the accession of Somerset to power was not Henry's choice, as it ran contrary to his provision for a Regency Council in <b>Source A</b>. The provenance of <b>Source C</b> and authorship of <b>Source D</b> confirm that Mary was accepted as the rightful successor to Edward against his personal choice. However, it might be argued that Jane Grey, author of <b>Source C</b> is Henry's choice as part of <b>Source A</b>, if you allow for the <i>legitimate</i> blood line over-riding the monarch's choice of the bastardised Mary and Elizabeth. In <b>Source D</b> the childless Mary, in turn, has no choice but to accept Elizabeth as her successor, despite planning to allow her husband Philip to be regent if their children were minors on her death. Her choice would have been a Catholic successor, but she was forced by her father's will and the terms of the 1544 Succession Act to tolerate Elizabeth's accession, especially given Mary Queen of Scots, French, and anti-Hapsburg proclivities. Her unwillingness to name Elizabeth is similar to Elizabeth's unwillingness to name Mary Queen of Scots, for fear of factional plots such as that of Wyatt in 1554, implicitly referred to by Elizabeth in <b>Source E</b>. The people's choice of successor is referred to by</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Elizabeth, as this was invariably the direct male blood-line. James VI's accession in 1603 later proved the point. There might be comparative evaluation of the sources grouped for and against the interpretation in deciding which argument is more convincing.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content as both express a desire to uphold the Christian religion established by the scriptures and liberty of conscience. <b>Source A</b> states ‘those differing in Christian doctrine, worship or discipline shall be protected in the exercise of their religion’ and in <b>Source D</b> the Speaker tells Nayler ‘we mercifully desire to reform you not destroy you’. <b>Source A</b> states that ‘no-one shall be compelled by penalties to accept the official faith’, allowing freedom to Protestant sectaries, and in <b>Source D</b> Mr Robinson supports this attitude, claiming that, if the death penalty for heresy were to be imposed on Nayler, ‘we shall all be heretics’, thus agreeing that none of the many sects among Cromwell’s supporters would be safe. <b>Source A</b> states the condition that this liberty does not extend to ‘disturbance of the peace’ and that ‘accepted codes of behaviour’ shall be maintained, and likewise in <b>Source D</b> the charges against Nayler concern his unacceptable behaviour in re-enacting Christ’s entry into Jerusalem and disturbing the peace in Bristol.</p> <p>The Sources are <b>different</b> in content. <b>Source A</b> states that ‘all laws contrary to liberty [of conscience] shall be null and void’, while in <b>Source D</b> Major-General Boteler refers to the application of Old Testament law, ‘the law of Moses’ under which blasphemers were stoned to death. Also in <b>Source D</b>, Mr Ashe cites ‘recent common law’ requiring the death penalty for blasphemy and heresy. Mr Downing sees Nayler as a ‘wretch’ who should not be allowed to escape death by misuse of the Instrument of Government’s clauses on liberty of conscience. Major-General Skippon sees Nayler’s actions as outside the definition of ‘liberty of conscience’ established by the Instrument of Government. Therefore the religious attitudes of Parliament are divided, with the Speaker closing 11 days of heated debate on Nayler by sparing him the death penalty. <b>Knowledge</b> of Nayler’s fate might be used to evaluate this supposed leniency and its impact. (Though he escaped death, he was pilloried and whipped through the streets of London, was branded with the letter B on his forehead, had his tongue pierced with a hot iron, and was then transported back to Bristol to be whipped through its streets too, before enduring two years imprisonment at hard labour). Cromwell feared that harsh religious attitudes shown by Parliament made the Instrument unstable.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b> of the Sources should be integrated into the comparison. <b>Source A</b> is the constitution of the Protectorate, the Instrument of Government. It establishes religious rules at a time of diversity of Christian sects, such as Quakers, of whom Nayler in <b>Source D</b> was an influential member. His ecstatic supporters in Bristol</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources ‘as evidence for ...’. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>saw him as a messiah. <b>Source A</b>, the Instrument, aimed to establish rules of liberty which would allow them to co-exist peacefully. The Nayler case exposed serious differences of attitude, proving a dangerous precedent and undermining Cromwell's policy of 'healing and settling'. Thomas Burton, the author of <b>D</b> recorded in his diary the 11 days of parliamentary debate on Nayler. This is therefore only a small extract but a true record. It might be judged as more realistic practical evidence of attitudes compared to the idealistic Instrument. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped by interpretation. <b>Sources A</b> and <b>C</b> suggest that Protectorate policies were designed to heal divisions and there are some references to this design in <b>Sources E</b> and <b>D</b>. <b>Sources B, E</b> and elements of <b>C</b> suggest that Protectorate policies were designed for puritan improvement of people's moral behaviour and 'self-preservation', to defend the authority of Cromwell and his supporters from their opponents.</p> <p><b>Sources A, C</b> and in part <b>D</b> and <b>E</b> support the <b>argument</b> that Protectorate policies were designed to heal divisions. <b>Source A</b> attempts to impose an idealist 'liberty of conscience' fundamental to the constitution of the Protectorate, allowing Christian doctrine to be interpreted in differing ways as long as accepted codes of behaviour are followed. No existing law is to be allowed to undermine this liberty. In evaluation, however, this is not full religious liberty, as Roman Catholic followers of 'Popery' are excluded, so divisions remain. <b>Source C</b>, likewise, claims that the Major-Generals were created to heal divisions and have given their lives for peace and settled religion. <b>Own knowledge</b> might be used to evaluate these claims. The Major-General system established military rule of the localities of dubious legality and raised a decimation tax from royalists, which <b>Source C</b> refers to as 'justly paid the cost', to fund their rule. This hardly healed divisions and the Major-Generals became extremely unpopular with those of more moderate faith and supporters of the law. The <b>tone of Source C</b> is defensive, as Cromwell's purpose is to justify their existence against claims that they are unlawful. As the introduction to the source implies, existing local authorities, such as the Justices of the Peace, lost their local power and resented the system. This, far from healing divisions, the Major-Generals might be seen to have intensified them. <b>Source E</b> agrees that healing divisions was the design behind Protectorate policies, stating that 'schemes' which Cromwell and Parliament had 'insisted upon' had failed to 'settle the nation'.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Source E</b> is a report of Cromwell's statement to 100 army officers, so might be seen as an unreliable record. From Cromwell's reported <b>tone</b> in <b>Source E</b>, it might be inferred that he was frustrated by the failure of the Major-general experiment which he had supported, and had felt compelled to refuse the offer of the crown in the Humble Petition and Advice. <b>Source D</b> is useful for exposing the practical limitations of liberty of conscience but supports the idea of healing divisions in the decision by the Speaker not to allow the death penalty. These linked sources might be seen as only partially convincing as evidence for the interpretation.</p> <p><b>Source C, D and E</b> are useful in supporting an <b>alternative argument</b> that Protectorate policies were designed more to defend Cromwell and the Protectorate government. In <b>Source C</b>, Cromwell angrily justifies going beyond the law in using the Major-general system to 'preserve itself'. He claims that 'good government' might be hindered 'in extraordinary circumstances' by delaying by 'sending for someone to make a law'. He accepts that the Major-Generals were created after Penruddock's rising to remove wickedness. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to explain and evaluate this: their duties included maintaining law and order, and punishing royalist opposition such as the failed royalist uprising by Penruddock's supporters in various parts of the country in the spring of 1655. <b>Sources D and E</b> agree that Protectorate policies aim for 'self-preservation' of the various Christian sects by Robinson in <b>Source D</b> fearing that 'we shall all be heretics' if liberty of conscience is eroded. Cromwell states, as reported in <b>Source E</b>, that the attitudes toward Nayler 'might be someone else's case one day', justifying a change in policy. <b>Source E</b> is equally useful in revealing Cromwell's rejection of the crown offered by the Humble Petition and Advice, designed for the protections of Cromwell and his supporters.</p> <p><b>Source B</b> might be used to extend the idea of 'self-preservation' to an alternative policy design, thus providing another <b>counter-argument</b>: to improve the moral behaviour of the people according to puritan principles. The attempt by the Major-Generals to withdraw pub licences, close brothels, gaming houses, races, plays and the like aggravated divisions rather than healing them. This again might be seen as Cromwell and his government preserving their own authority and their puritan moral principles at the expense of healing divisions.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	The <b>provenance</b> of these linked sources as reported comments revealing the tensions and division within parliament and the army, expose the conflict between healing divisions and the preservation of existing authority and the creation of a Godly puritan society. The value of the sources supporting this argument should be evaluated comparatively with those supporting the interpretation.		

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2013

