



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE (9-1)

History B Schools History Project

J411/11: The People's Health, c.1250 to present with The Norman Conquest, 1065-1087

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2023

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 2023

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS**PREPARATION FOR MARKING****RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor assessor Online Training; OCR Essential Guide to Marking.*
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **number of required** standardisation responses.

MARKING

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.
5. **Crossed Out Responses**
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (*The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.*)

Contradictory Responses

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Longer Answer Questions (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there, then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.
7. Award No Response (NR) if:
 - there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.













9. *Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.*

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

- a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- b. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

11. Annotations

<i>Stamp</i>	<i>Ref No.</i>	<i>Annotation Name</i>	<i>Description</i>
	1191	Tick 1	Level 1
	1201	Tick 2	Level 2
	1211	Tick 3	Level 3
	1221	Tick 4	Level 4
	1231	Tick 5	Level 5
	1241	Tick 6	Level 6
	811	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
	501	NAQ	Not answered question
	1371	H Wavy Line	Incorrect/ muddled/ unclear
	1681	BP	Blank page
	151	Highlight	Part of response which is rewardable (at one of the levels on the MS)
	11	Tick	Tick

1. 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/PE.

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: The People’s Health, c.1250 to present

<p>Question 1–3 marks</p> <p>(a) Name one way in which the authorities in medieval Britain (1250-1500) tried to prevent the spread of disease in towns.</p> <p>(b) Give one example of a problem with living conditions caused by the rapid growth of towns in the period 1750-1900.</p> <p>(c) Give one example of a government action since 1900 that was introduced to improve air quality.</p>	
<p>Guidance</p> <p>1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)</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>	<p>Indicative content</p> <p><i>For 1(a), likely valid responses include: moving dung heaps to the outskirts of towns; fines for those selling unfit meat; lepers to be moved to the outskirts; orders to keep streets clean; closure of public ‘stews’; bans against throwing animal skins in the river; any specific measure regarding Black Death; gongfermers; orders to clean streets</i></p> <p><i>For 1(b) likely valid responses include: overcrowding; increased waste; pollution; lack of privies; lack of open space; lack of clean water supply; lack of sewers; back-to-back housing was poorly ventilated/ spread disease easily/ was cramped</i></p> <p>NOTE: Do not reward answers which simply name diseases, e.g. ‘Cholera’ or identify living conditions rather than problems, e.g. ‘Back-to-back housing’ (on its own)</p> <p><i>For 1(c) likely valid responses include: Clean Air Act; introducing smokeless fuel; lead free petrol; banning smoking in public places; various measure to encouraging less/cleaner car use (e.g. congestion charges, higher taxes for larger cars, etc.)</i></p> <p>Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.</p>

Question 2–9 marks	
Write a clear and organised summary that analyses public health in medieval monasteries. Support your summary with examples.	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks	
AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks	
Level 3 (7–9 marks)	
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).	<i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i>
	<i>Answers could consider aspects of one or more of: aspects of PH in monasteries (e.g. sanitation, provision of clean water, the disposal of waste, access to knowledge from the various books they had).</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	
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).	<i>Answers may show use of second order concepts such as causation / consequence (eg why PH in monasteries was generally good OR causation alone (eg why they put so much importance in fresh water/ sanitation).</i>
	<i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise the 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>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	
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).	<i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>
0 marks	
No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 2–9 marks Write a clear and organised summary that analyses public health in medieval monasteries. Support your summary with examples.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (7–9 marks)	<p>Summary based on second order concept(s) with two or more valid supporting examples, e.g.,</p> <p>[Causation / consequence – why health was good] <i>Public health in medieval monasteries was generally of a high standard. This was because monasteries were often built away from the unhealthy conditions in the towns. They had latrines which were built away from the living quarters and they flushed their waste away.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was that piped fresh water in from the hills into the monastery kitchens and washing areas. These measures meant that monks did not tend to suffer from the types of diseases which were common in towns and villages, such as dysentery. [8]</i></p> <p>[other valid examples include existence of infirmaries/ quality of food]</p> <p>[Causation – underlying reason(s) for good public health] <i>Monasteries had a better standard of public health because they pure water was very important for their work, including for baptisms, Mass and washing rituals. This meant they were built near rivers to supply clean water.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason was the wealth of the Catholic church. Often, man-made waterways were built to supply clean water. Their wealth and land meant they could afford to dig trenches and lay pipes. Individuals and town councils often couldn't afford to do this. [Threshold – 7 marks]</i></p> <p>[Diversity – differences between public health in monasteries and towns] <i>In monasteries, public health was a of higher standard than in the towns. For example, their latrines were built away from the living quarters and flushed waste away. However, in medieval towns, Gongfarmers emptied latrines but sometimes only tipped the cess into nearby streams which fed into the water supply. [Threshold – 7 marks]</i></p>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	<p>Summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example, e.g.</p> <p>[Causation / consequence] <i>Public health in medieval monasteries was generally of a high standard. This was because monasteries could deal with waste effectively. They were often smaller communities than towns, built in remote locations, away from the crowded conditions . They had latrines which were built away from the living quarters and they flushed their waste away. These measures meant that monks did not tend to suffer from the types of diseases which were common in towns and villages, such as dysentery. [6]</i></p> <p>[Causation] <i>Another reason was the wealth of the Catholic church. Often, man-made waterways were built to supply clean water. Their wealth and land meant they could afford to dig trenches and lay pipes, which town councils often couldn't afford. [Threshold – 4 marks]</i></p>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	<p>Descriptions of monasteries with no clear organising concept, e.g. <i>Monasteries were run by the Catholic church. They piped fresh water from the hills and had latrines. Monks used water for lots of religious rituals like baptism. They also had infirmaries for the sick.</i></p> <p>OR Statements based on second order concept with no valid specific examples or development, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Diversity) <i>Public health in monasteries was generally better than in towns. [1]</i> • (Causation) <i>Public health in monasteries was good because they libraries with medical books. [1]</i>
0 marks	

Question 3–10 marks Why did national and local governments find it difficult to deal with public health issues in the early modern period (1500-1750)? Explain your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 5 (9–10 marks) 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: lack of knowledge/ understanding of the causes of disease; the lack of popularity/ support for measures (e.g. Gin Acts etc.); growth of towns (e.g. difficulty in accessing clean water and disposing of waste safely); lack of central government control.</i></p> <p><i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Answers which simply describe some of the features of the period cannot reach beyond Level 1.</i></p>
Level 4 (7–8 marks) 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).	
Level 3 (5–6 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the 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).	
Level 2 (3–4 marks) 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).	
Level 1 (1–2 marks) 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).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 3–10 marks Why did national and local governments find it difficult to deal with public health issues in the early modern period (1500-1750)? Explain your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
NOTE: Do not reward answers which argue why authorities took little/no action – only reward answers which explain why they found it difficult.	
Level 5 (9-10 marks)	<p>Two or more reasons that governments found it difficult to deal with public health issues identified and fully explained, e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason why governments found it hard to deal with public health issues in the early modern period was the lack of understanding of what caused illnesses. For example, there were at least 8 major outbreaks of plague in the early modern period but people did not understand what caused it so they could not properly deal with it. Most people still thought that God had sent the plague or that it was caused by 'miasma'. They did not know about germs or the role of rats and fleas, so some of the measures the government took did not help, such as burning barrels of tar in the streets to clear the 'bad air' and banning cats and dogs from the street. These actions were based on wrong beliefs so governments were unable to prevent the spread of plague.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason why governments found it difficult to deal with public health issues was that some of the measures that governments took were not popular. For instance, there was a rise in drunkenness and social problems during the 'gin craze' of the 1660s. Gin coming from Holland was really cheap so the government introduced a tax and licences to control the sales. However, this did not solve the problem because people just ignored the law and opened up illegal dram shops. The government didn't get the gin craze under control until it made punishments really severe in the 1740s. [10]</i></p>
Level 4 (7-8 marks)	<p>One reason that governments found it difficult to deal with public health issues identified and fully explained, e.g.</p> <p><i>One reason why governments found it hard to deal with public health issues in the early modern period was the lack of understanding of what caused illnesses. For example, most people thought plague was caused by 'miasma'. So the measures taken by governments, such as burning barrels of tar in the streets to clear the 'bad air', did not help. Their actions were based on wrong beliefs so governments were unable to prevent the spread of plague. [Threshold – 7 marks]</i></p>
Level 3 (5-6 marks)	<p>Identifies a reason(s) and uses this to address question (but does not provide precise evidence), e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There was a lack of understanding about the true causes of disease, so this made it very difficult to deal with public health issues like plague because their actions did not tackle the root cause of the problem.</i> <p>OR</p> <p>Identifies a reason(s) and gives precise evidence (but does not go on to say how that answers the question), e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There was a lack of understanding about the true causes of disease. For example, there were outbreaks of plague every twenty years. One of the main theories at the time was that it was spread by miasma, so the 1578 plague orders contained instructions to do things like burn barrels of tar in the streets.</i>
Level 2 (3-4 marks)	<p>Describes public health issues or government action, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>During the Gin Craze, thousands of small gin shops opened in cellars, attics and back rooms in London. By the 1720s, it had become a serious problem.</i> <i>At this time the government had to deal with plague. There were 8 outbreaks in the early modern period. People with the plague were isolated in their homes and plague doctors went around trying to cure people</i> <i>At this time living conditions were bad. Towns were overcrowded and it was hard to get clean water. Air was polluted because of the increasing use of coal.</i> <i>The government tried to deal with the gin problem by passing Gin Acts.</i> <p>OR Identifies one or more reason but with <u>neither</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> support from precise evidence explaining why the reason made it difficult to deal with a particular problem, e.g. <i>They found plague difficult to deal with because they didn't know what caused it.</i> <i>Local governments found it difficult to deal with sanitation in the towns because towns were growing in this period.</i> <i>They found plague difficult to deal with because they didn't know what caused it. Plague came every 20 years on average and could kill 30% of a community. [No detail about lack of causes]</i>

Level 1 (1–2 marks)	<p>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>They didn't understand or know what to do.</i>• <i>People ignored rules.</i> <p>OR Describes actions by <u>general population</u>, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>During the plague, people tried to avoid miasma by sniffing flowers and herbs.</i> <p>OR Simply identifies health issues (without description), e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>The Gin Craze happened in this period.</i>
0 marks	

Question 4*–18 marks	
How far were improvements in public health in the 1800s brought about by improved scientific understanding about disease? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 6 (16–18 marks) 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>	<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 an alternative point of view.</i> <i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of change and continuity and causation or impact, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
Level 5 (13–15 marks) 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>	<i>Grounds for agreeing include: Pasteur's Germ Theory leading to the 1875 Public Health Act or a range of other measures, e.g. Artisans' Dwellings Act, Sale of Food and Drugs Act; local initiatives, e.g. Rochdale (pail privies), Manchester (slum clearance, Lake Thirlmere dam and aqueduct) or Birmingham (slum clearance),</i>
Level 4 (10–12 marks) 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>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include other factors that were also more important, e.g. 1867 Reform Act; action of individuals such as Chadwick or Disraeli; changing laissez-faire attitudes; technological advancement (e.g. engineering advancement leading to Bazalgette's sewers); public health crisis or poverty identified in Chadwick's report.</i>
Level 3 (7–9 marks) 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>	<i>NOTE: Some of these (e.g. engineering leading to sewers) may fit in either agree or disagree, as long as the candidate argues the point in a valid way.</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks) 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>	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) 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>	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

<p>Question 4* – 18 marks How far were improvements in public health in the 1800s brought about by improved scientific understanding about disease? Give reasons for your answer.</p>	
<p>Guidance and indicative content</p> <p>NOTE: For L3+ the resulting change/ improvement does need to be identified (but details about it are not required as the question's emphasis is causation)</p>	
<p>Level 6 (16-18 marks)</p>	<p>Balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to support the statement because big improvements were brought about after the publication of Pasteur's Germ Theory in 1861. This claimed that it was germs which made liquids turn bad and in 1864 he proved germs caused decay. This convinced most other scientists that disease was caused by germs. People were now more willing to pay money to improve public health, and this was important for the passing of the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p><i>However, change wasn't only brought about because of improved understanding. Some working class men had been given the vote in 1867, placing the power to elect MPs and town councillors in the hands of the working class, who were now a big group of voters. The Prime Minister, Disraeli, was determined to win the support of the new voters. He promised that public health would be top of the agenda and this was another reason he supported the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, there is further evidence to go against the statement because there were public health improvements before 1861, which happened for other reasons. For example, change also happened because of individuals like Edwin Chadwick. In 1842, Chadwick wrote a report for the Poor law Commission. It contained shocking details of the public health crisis. Even though Chadwick believed disease was spread by miasma, he recommended that towns should be forced to provide clean water and sewerage systems. His report was very influential and many politicians supported Chadwick. This led to the passing of the 1848 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason for public health improvements was 'The Great Stink' in 1858 when, during a hot summer, the River Thames dried up so much that the smell of sewage from the river became unbearable. It became impossible for MPs to continue with their debates and they decided to take action. The government ordered Joseph Bazalgette to build 1300 miles of new sewers across London which helped to stop the spread of cholera.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I do agree with the statement. The other reasons discussed had only a limited impact – for example, the 1848 Public Health Act was permissive, and Bazalgette's sewers were only in London. And although knowledge about germs wasn't the only reason that the 1875 Public Health Act was passed, it was less likely to have gained as much support without the scientific evidence to back it up.</i></p>
<p>Level 5 (13-15 marks)</p>	<p>Balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) (2–1) e.g.</p> <p><i>There is evidence to support the statement because big improvements were brought about after the publication of Pasteur's Germ Theory in 1861 This claimed that it was germs which made liquids turn bad and in 1864 he proved germs caused decay. This convinced most other scientists that disease was caused by germs. People were now more willing to pay money to improve public health, and this was important for the passing of the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p><i>However, change wasn't only brought about because of improved understanding. Some working class men had been given the vote in 1867, placing the power to elect MPs and town councillors in the hands of the working class, who were now a big group of voters. The Prime Minister, Disraeli, was determined to win the support of the new voters. He promised that public health would be top of the agenda and this was another reason he supported the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason for public health improvements was 'The Great Stink' in 1858 when, during a hot summer, the River Thames dried up so much that the smell of sewage from the river became unbearable. It became impossible for MPs to continue with their debates and they decided to take action. The government ordered Joseph Bazalgette to build 1300 miles of new sewers across London which helped to stop the spread of cholera.</i></p>

Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>One sided argument, two explained points of support (2-0), e.g. <i>I don't agree because there were other reasons too. For example, the 1875 Public Health Act happened because some working class men were given the vote in 1867, placing the power to elect MPs and town councillors in the hands of the working class. The Prime Minister, Disraeli, was determined to win their support and promised that public health would be top of the agenda. This was why he passed the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, change also happened because of individuals like Edwin Chadwick. In 1842, Chadwick wrote a report for the Poor law Commission. It contained shocking details of the public health crisis. Even though Chadwick believed disease was spread by miasma, he recommended that towns should be forced to provide clean water and sewerage systems. His report was very influential and many politicians supported Chadwick. This led to the passing of the 1848 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1-1), e.g. <i>There is evidence to support the statement because big improvements were brought about after the publication of Pasteur's Germ Theory in 1861 This claimed that it was germs which made liquids turn bad and in 1864 he proved germs caused decay. This convinced most other scientists that disease was caused by germs. People were now more willing to pay money to improve public health, and this was important for the passing of the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p> <p><i>However, change wasn't only brought about because of improved understanding. Some working class men had been given the vote in 1867, placing the power to elect MPs and town councillors in the hands of the working class, who were now a big group of voters. The Prime Minister, Disraeli, was determined to win the support of the new voters. He promised that public health would be top of the agenda and this was another reason he supported the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>One sided argument; one explained point of support (1-0), e.g. <i>I agree because big improvements were brought about after the publication of Pasteur's Germ Theory, which claimed it was germs which made liquids turn bad. In 1864 he proved that it was germs that cause decay. This convinced most other scientists that disease was caused by germs and also gave support for the earlier ideas of people like John Snow. People became more willing to pay more money to improve public health, and this was important for the passing of the 1875 Public Health Act.</i></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I agree because there were improvements because in 1861 Louis Pasteur had proven than germs were the cause of disease.</i> • <i>I don't fully agree. It was the action of individuals like Benjamin Disraeli who pushed through the 1875 Public Health Act.</i> • <i>I don't agree because it was also to do with how attitudes were starting to move away from laissez-faire at this time.</i> <p>Alternatively, description of public health improvements/ scientific developments/ without linking this to the question or without full explanation, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The 1875 Public Health Act said that all local authorities had to appoint a medical officer. They had to take responsibility for sewers and water supplies.</i> • <i>In 1861 Pasteur's published his Germ Theory and later proved that germs are the cause of decay and disease. This was important and led to big changes.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>They had to make improvements because the conditions in towns were really bad.</i> • <i>The causes of disease were discovered during this period.</i> • <i>Individuals played a big role.</i> • <i>Water got cleaner.</i>
0 marks	

<p>Question 5*–18 marks ‘Responses to epidemics between 1900 and 2000 were not effective.’ How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 6 (16–18 marks) 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>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 consider the alternative point of view.</i></p> <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation and consequence and change over time or significance, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: inadequate/ ineffective responses to Spanish Flu (e.g. lack of national co-ordination; inefficient copies of public information film; factories kept going; pubs mostly stayed open; Armistice Day celebrations went ahead; unhelpful press reaction, e.g. ‘eat plenty of porridge’ in News of the World; ‘quack’ remedies such as Dr Williams’ ‘Pink Pills for Pale People’) and HIV / AIDS (e.g. reluctance of government to fund research out of belief that it was only gay men and drug users who were affected, and there was prejudice against these groups; hospitals told to detain AIDS patients; doctors wearing gowns and masks around patients; media’s response caused fear and misunderstanding of the condition; lots of overreaction because people didn’t understand how the virus was actually transmitted, e.g. some Fire Service staff refused to give mouth-to-mouth resuscitation and some parents removed their children from a class where one pupil had acquired HIV from a transfusion.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: effective responses to Spanish Flu (e.g. work of James Niven in Manchester; other towns did shut schools, theatres, cinemas and dance halls, and disinfected trams daily) and HIV / AIDS (e.g. setting up of Terrence Higgins Trust which raised awareness; government funded free HIV tests and screened blood transfusions; public information campaign explained how the virus was really spread; charities provided clean needles to drug addicts; Princess Diana shook the hand of a man suffering with the illness in front of photographers and journalists to challenge the idea that HIV and AIDS was passed from person to person by touch; the government funded ART for people who were HIV positive).</i></p>
<p>Level 5 (13–15 marks) 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>Level 4 (10–12 marks) 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>Level 3 (7–9 marks) 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>Level 2 (4–6 marks) 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>Level 1 (1–3 marks) 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>	
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 5* – 18 marks	
'Responses to epidemics between 1900 and 2000 were not effective.' How far do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p>Balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because the response to the Spanish Flu epidemic was in some ways ineffective. For example, the national response was limited and local authorities were left to organise themselves. The government issued a public information film which advised people to do things like avoid public transport and crowds if they had symptoms, and wear face masks if it was necessary to be near flu patients. However, the film was not distributed until very late in the second wave, and there were not enough copies, meaning it was not very effective.</i></p> <p><i>However, some local responses to the Spanish Flu were effective. For example, the medical officer in Manchester, Dr. Niven, tried to limit the flu's spread by doing things like publishing advice about hygiene and organising the closure of businesses and schools. This was effective because the death rate was lower in Manchester than in other cities like London and Glasgow.</i></p> <p><i>Initially, many of the responses to HIV and AIDS were ineffective. For example, in the early 1980s, there was lots of ignorance about how the disease was spread and people over-reacted. For example, some Fire Service staff stopped giving mouth-to-mouth resuscitation out of fear of infection. The government said hospitals should detain AIDS patients. These kinds of responses were ineffective because they spread fear that the condition could be passed on by contact.</i></p> <p><i>However, by the late 1980s there was more understanding and more helpful responses. For example, charity groups provided clean needles to drug addicts to reduce transmission. The government funded free HIV tests there was a big public information campaign to educate people called 'Don't die of ignorance'. Leaflets and TV adverts explained how the virus was really spread. This was effective in raising awareness and helping to reduce the spread.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I agree with the statement. I think responses to Spanish Flu were fairly ineffective because although some towns like Manchester did shut schools and theatres, there was no coordinated effort which could deal with the overwhelming number of infections. Furthermore, although responses to HIV and AIDS became more effective over time, the damage from earlier ineffective measures had already been done and took a long time to tackle ignorance about the condition.</i></p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Balanced argument; three valid explained points (i.e. two on one side and one on the other) (2–1), e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because the response to the Spanish Flu epidemic was in some ways ineffective. For example, the national response was limited and local authorities were left to organise themselves. The government issued a public information film which advised people to do things like avoid public transport and crowds if they had symptoms, and wear face masks if it was necessary to be near flu patients. However, the film was not distributed until very late in the second wave, and there were not enough copies, meaning it was not very effective.</i></p> <p><i>However, some local responses to the Spanish Flu were effective. For example, the medical officer in Manchester, Dr. Niven, tried to limit the flu's spread by doing things like publishing advice about hygiene and organising the closure of businesses and schools. This was effective because the death rate was lower in Manchester than in other cities like London and Glasgow.</i></p> <p><i>Initially, many of the responses to HIV and AIDS were ineffective. For example, in the early 1980s, there was lots of ignorance about how the disease was spread and people over-reacted. For example, some Fire Service staff stopped giving mouth-to-mouth resuscitation out of fear of infection. The government said hospitals should detain AIDS patients. These kinds of responses were ineffective because they spread fear that the condition could be passed on by contact.</i></p>
Level 4	One sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g.

(10-12 marks)	<p><i>I agree because the response to the Spanish Flu epidemic was in some ways ineffective. For example, the national response was limited and local authorities were left to organise themselves. The government issued a public information film which advised people to do things like avoid public transport and crowds if they had symptoms, and wear face masks if it was necessary to be near flu patients. However, the film was not distributed until very late in the second wave, and there were not enough copies.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, many of the responses to HIV and AIDS were also ineffective. For example, in the early 1980s, there was lots of ignorance about how the disease was spread and people over-reacted. For example, some Fire Service staff stopped giving mouth-to-mouth resuscitation out of fear of infection. The government said hospitals should detain AIDS patients. These kinds of responses were ineffective because they spread fear that the condition could be passed on by contact.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1-1), e.g. <i>I agree because the response to the Spanish Flu epidemic was in some ways ineffective. For example, the national response was limited and local authorities were left to organise themselves. The government issued a public information film which advised people to do things like avoid public transport and crowds if they had symptoms, and wear face masks if it was necessary to be near flu patients. However, the film was not distributed until very late in the second wave, and there were not enough copies.</i></p> <p><i>However, some local responses to the Spanish Flu were effective. For example, the medical officer in Manchester, Dr. Niven, tried to limit the flu's spread by doing things like publishing advice about hygiene and organising the closure of businesses and schools. This was effective because the death rate was lower in Manchester than in other cities like London and Glasgow.</i></p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>One sided argument; one explained point of support (1-0), e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because the response to the Spanish Flu epidemic was in some ways ineffective. For example, the national response was limited and local authorities were left to organise themselves. The government issued a public information film which advised people to do things like avoid public transport and crowds if they had symptoms, and wear face masks if it was necessary to be near flu patients. However, the film was not distributed until very late in the second wave, and there were not enough copies.</i></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I disagree because during the Spanish Flu many towns did things such as shut schools which would have been effective.</i> • <i>I disagree because during the HIV and AIDS epidemic the government screened blood transfusions.</i> <p>Alternatively, description of response(s) to epidemic(s) without linking this to the question, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>During the HIV and AIDS epidemic, some parents removed their children from a class where one pupil had acquired HIV from a transfusion because they didn't know how the virus was transmitted.</i> • <i>The impact of the Spanish Flu led to the Ministry of Health being set up in 1919.</i> • <i>It was difficult for the government to respond effectively to Spanish Flu at a time when huge numbers of medical staff were still away at war.</i>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Valid but general assertion(s), or identification/descriptions of epidemics, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>I agree because there was lots of ignorance about AIDS.</i> • <i>The government response to Spanish Flu was inadequate.</i> • <i>The Spanish Flu came in waves. The second wave struck Britain between October and December 1918.</i> • <i>Hospitals looked after people during the Spanish Flu.</i>
0 marks	

Section B: The Norman Conquest, 1065–1087

Question 6a – 3 marks

In Interpretation A, the image gives the impression that early Norman castles were threatening and intimidating. Identify and explain one way in which it 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 website portrays intimidation + 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 interpretation gives the impression that early Norman castles were threatening and intimidating 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 website. 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.

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

NOTE: For three marks, candidates may either:

Start with a very specific feature (1) and then make two points of development (2) about their feature, e.g.

- *The motte is shown as very high in comparison to the rest of the area. (1) This shows us how it dominates the surrounding landscape and the people who live there. (1) This gives the impression of intimidation because it makes it seem like the Normans want the Saxons to know they are always being watched by their new Lords. (1)*

OR

Begin with a more general point (1), then go on to give an example of this (1), and then say how this gives the impression that early Norman castles were threatening and intimidating (1), e.g.

- *The interpretation uses colour to good effect to make the castle seem intimidating. (1) The chains are black and the clouds are dark and looming behind the castle. (1) This makes it seem quite menacing (1).*
- *The interpretation shows the castle dominating the area. (1) We're looking at it from below so it looks very high above the viewer. (1) This gives us the impression of power and control (1).*
- *The interpretation shows the castle as heavily defended. (1) For example, there are soldiers and metal and wooden spikes. (1) This makes it seem like they were built to terrorise the Saxons.*

NOTE: For three marks, candidates MUST identify how their chosen way gives the impression that early Norman castles were threatening and intimidating.

<p>Question 6b – 5 marks 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 Norman castles built in England between 1066 and 1087.</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 2 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks 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.</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 3 (5 marks) 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></p>
<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) 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><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>Level 1 (1–2 mark) 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><i>Examples of areas for further research include: Reasons for early motte and bailey castles being built/ their purpose (causation); whether all early Norman motte and bailey castles were built to the same design (diversity); the impact the building of the castles had on the areas where they were built (consequence/ change); the effectiveness of castles in controlling the Saxon populations/ rebellions (consequence).</i></p>
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p>Question 6b – 5 marks 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 Norman castles built in England between 1066 and 1087.</p>	
<p>Guidance and indicative content</p>	
<p>Level 3 (5 marks)</p>	<p>Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept to compare to an <u>impression</u> given by Interpretation A. Indication of how this would improve understanding of Norman castles built in England between 1066 and 1087.</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i> <i>Interpretation A suggests that early Norman castles had only a military function. I would investigate whether this was the case across the country, or whether that was just in areas where there were rebellions. This would help us to understand whether early Norman castles had other purposes as well, such as being status symbols for the Lords.</i></p> <p><i>[Causation]</i> <i>Interpretation A suggests that the early Norman castles were built to intimidate the Saxons. I would investigate whether there were also other reasons for building them. This would help us to understand whether early Norman castles had other purposes as well, such as being centres of administration.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, developed, valid line of enquiry: i.e. based on second order concept, with <u>clear explanation</u> of how the enquiry would improve understanding of Norman castles built in England between 1066 and 1087, e.g.</p> <p><i>[Change]</i> <i>I would investigate whether the design and location of castles changed between 1066 and 1087. This would enable us to understand if their purpose changed as the rebellions died down.</i></p> <p><i>[Consequence]</i> <i>I would look at the impact that the castles had on the local population. This would allow us to understand whether they were effective as a means of control.</i></p>
<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</p>	<p>Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept, with no clear indication of how the enquiry would improve understanding of Norman castles built in England between 1066 and 1087, e.g.</p> <p><i>[Change]</i> <i>I would investigate whether the design of castles changed between 1066 and 1087. (3) For example, how many stone castles were being built by 1087? (4)</i></p> <p><i>[Consequence]</i> <i>I would look at the impact that the castles had on the local population. (3)</i></p>
<p>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</p>	<p>Investigation based around finding out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A – not based on second-order concept (1–2 marks), e.g. <i>I would look for more information about how the castle was built, who built it and how quickly it was erected.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, investigation based on identifying details from Interpretation A and finding out if they are accurate (1 mark), e.g. <i>It shows the castle's tower as just an open platform and I would find out if this really was the case.</i></p>
<p>0 marks</p>	

<p>Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on the impact of the Norman Conquest on England. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?</p>	
<p>Levels AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 12 marks</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 4 (10–12 marks) 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>	<p><i>Answers could consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comparison of provenance and source type alone, e.g. B is from 1860s/70s, C from 2016; B is from a history book, C is from a website</i> • <i>Individual points of similarity/difference in content: both sources say the Conquest was an important event resulting in significant change; both sources mention the Conquest led to changes in land ownership; B talks about changes to do with the Church but C doesn't mention that and discusses architecture</i> • <i>Differences in the overall message about or portrayal of the impact of the Conquest, e.g. B argues that the Conquest had entirely negative consequences such as 'depriving' English families of their land and power. It portrays the Conquest more as a foreign takeover where 'foreign intruders' oppressed the Anglo-Saxons who are shown as 'heroes'. Whereas C gives a much more favourable impression of the lasting impact of the Conquest, focussing on the 'legacy' of the Normans in their 'spectacular' architecture.</i> • <i>Developed reasons for differences – purpose and context, e.g. B is a historian who believed in the superiority of Anglo-Saxon society and culture and is therefore more likely to view the Conquest as a negative thing which made 'slaves' of the Anglo-Saxons and brought foreign influence to Anglo-Saxon 'blood' (alternatively, B was written by a Victorian historian whose interpretation had been shaped by anti-French sentiments developed during the Napoleonic wars). Whereas C was written by a heritage group whose main focus is more likely to be on the architectural impact on the Conquest – they are trying to attract visitors to the 'spectacular castles and great abbeys' that they manage (alternatively, the article was written to celebrate the anniversary of the Battle of Hastings so is more likely to focus on the positive achievements of the Normans).</i> <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>
<p>Level 3 (7–9 marks) 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).</p>	
<p>Level 2 (4–6 marks) 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).</p>	
<p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) 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).</p>	
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 7–12 marks	
Interpretations B and C both focus on the impact of the Norman Conquest on England. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C, with support. Difference <u>explained</u> with specific purpose/ context of B and/or C, e.g.</p> <p><i>As L3, plus:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I think the reason that B is more negative is that B was written by a historian who believed in the superiority of Anglo-Saxon society and culture and is therefore more likely to view the Conquest as a negative thing because it made 'slaves' of the Anglo-Saxons and brought foreign influence to Anglo-Saxon 'blood'. (10)</i> <i>I think the reason that C is more positive is that it was written by a heritage group whose main focus is more likely to be on the architectural impact on the Conquest. They are trying to attract visitors to the 'spectacular castles and great abbeys' that they manage. (11)</i> <p><i>[Alternatively, B was written by a Victorian historian whose interpretation was shaped by anti-French sentiments developed during the Napoleonic wars. / The article in C was written to celebrate the anniversary of the Battle of Hastings so is more likely to focus on the positive achievements of the Normans.]</i></p> <p>NOTES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For these interpretations, award 10–11 marks for candidates who use the purpose/context of <u>one</u> interpretation to explain difference in portrayals. Award 11–12 marks for candidates which use the purpose/context of <u>both</u> interpretations to explain difference in portrayals. Do NOT allow <u>undeveloped</u> comments about provenance at this level, e.g. <i>B is negative because was written by a historian who believed in the superiority of Anglo-Saxon society</i> OR <i>C is positive because it is a tourist website.</i>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C with support from one or both interpretations, e.g.</p> <p><i>B argues that the Conquest had entirely negative consequences such as 'depriving' English families of their land and power. It portrays the Conquest more as a foreign takeover where 'foreign intruders' oppressed the Anglo-Saxons, who are shown as 'heroes'. Whereas C gives a much more favourable impression of the lasting impact of the Conquest, focussing on the 'legacy' of the Normans and their 'spectacular' architecture.</i></p> <p>NOTE: Answers with support from only one interpretation limit to 7 marks</p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Selects individual points of similarity or difference, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Both sources say the Conquest was an important event resulting in significant change.</i> <i>Both sources mention the Conquest led to changes in land ownership.</i> <i>B talks about changes to do with the Church but C doesn't mention that and discusses architecture.</i> <p>Alternatively, valid comparison of portrayals with no support, e.g. MARK AT 6 MARKS</p> <p><i>Interpretation B suggests that the Conquest was entirely bad thing but C gives the impression there were positive aspects as well.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, purpose of one interpretation used to explain its portrayal – no comparison, e.g.</p> <p><i>I think C is so positive because it's aiming to get people to visit the historic sites like Norman castles and abbeys, so it emphasises the spectacular architecture.</i></p>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	<p>Comparison of simplistic provenance, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I think they are different because B is a history book from 1860s/70s and C is a website from 2016.</i> <i>They are different because B is from a historian who has done lots of research but C is just from a tourist website doing advertising.</i> <p>Alternatively, summary / portrayal from one/both interpretations with no valid comparison, e.g.</p> <p><i>B argues that the Conquest had entirely negative consequences such as the loss of power to the Normans. It portrays the Normans as 'foreign' intruders.</i></p>
0 marks	

<p>Question 8*–20 marks In his 2012 article ‘The dark side of the Anglo-Saxons’, historian Ryan Lavelle argues that late Anglo-Saxon society was ‘certainly not free, equal or democratic’. How far do you agree with this view?</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 5 (17–20 marks) 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 character of late Anglo-Saxon England.</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. To reach Level 5, this must involve considering both reasons to agree and to disagree with the interpretation.</i></p>
<p>Level 4 (13–16 marks) 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 similarity and difference (diversity of Anglo-Saxon England); and change (changes in later years of Anglo-Saxons) but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p>
<p>Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the 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: society was hierarchical/ unequal – only a tiny minority were Earls or members of the Witan; kings had strong, central control; in practice, new Kings were members of previous King’s bloodline – Witan was just a rubber stamp; slavery – thralls were the property of a master; by 1065, ceorls were far less independent than they had once been and were becoming more tightly bound to serve the thegn; only five per cent of all the land in England was owned by women in 1066 and almost all these women were related to the earls; ‘Double-monasteries’ had more or less ended by 1000; cases of divorce were very rare; use of wergild reveals social inequalities.</i></p>
<p>Level 2 (5–8 marks) 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>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: Witan acted as advisors and helped the King to rule; Witan’s role on</i></p>
<p>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</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><i>'choosing' next King; Ceorls made up the bulk of the population and took part in local decision-making and trials in local courts; some people have seen ceorls as the backbone of a freedom-loving, early form of democracy; women had the legal right to own land and property; women's wergilds were the same as men's; there were laws that set out fines for any sexual harassment of women; in 'double-monasteries' the women were in charge; women had the legal right to leave a husband who committed adultery.</i></p>
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 8*–20 marks	
In his 2012 article ‘The dark side of the Anglo-Saxons’, historian Ryan Lavelle argues that late Anglo-Saxon society was ‘certainly not free, equal or democratic’. How far do you agree with this view?	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (17-20 marks)	<p>Balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 20 marks, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is actually some evidence to challenge this interpretation. For example, some people have argued that the position of women was quite advanced for the time. They had the legal right to own land and property, or divorce a husband in the case of adultery. There were even laws that set out fines for any sexual harassment of women. So this can be seen as equal in some respects.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, ceorls, who were ordinary farmers and craftsmen, made up the bulk of the population. They took part in local decision-making and trials at local courts, and some were free and owned land of their own. This could be considered quite democratic for the period.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is much evidence to support this interpretation. Anglo Saxon society was certainly unequal. By 1065, even ceorls were more tightly bound to their thegns and had less freedom, and although not as numerous, at least 10 percent of the population were slaves. These people were the property of their master and could be branded and beaten, which could not be classed as free or equal.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to this, only five per cent of all the land in England was actually owned by women in 1066 and almost all these women were related to the earls who were the richest people in society, showing that society was not as free or equal as is often argued.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think the interpretation is correct. To suggest that there was freedom and democracy would be going too far given the inequalities that existed in practice (as opposed to just theory), especially by 1065 on the eve of conquest.</i></p>
Level 4 (13-16 marks)	<p>Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support (2–1 or 3–0), e.g.</p> <p><i>There is actually some evidence to challenge this interpretation. For example, some people have argued that the position of women was quite advanced for the time. They had the legal right to own land and property, or divorce a husband in the case of adultery. There were even laws that set out fines for any sexual harassment of women. So this can be seen as equal.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, ceorls, who were ordinary farmers and craftsmen, made up the bulk of the population. They took part in local decision-making and trials at local courts, and some were free and owned land of their own. This could be considered quite democratic for the period.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is much evidence to support this interpretation. Anglo Saxon society was certainly unequal. By 1065, even ceorls were more tightly bound to their thegns and had less freedom, and although not as numerous, at least 10 percent of the population were slaves. These people were the property of their master and could be branded and beaten, which could not be classed as equal.</i></p>

<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</p>	<p>One sided argument, two explained points of support (2-0), e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't agree. The position of women was quite advanced for the time. They had the legal right to own land and property, or divorce a husband in the case of adultery. There were even laws that set out fines for any sexual harassment of women. So this can be seen as equal.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, ceorls, who were ordinary farmers and craftsmen, made up the bulk of the population. They took part in local decision-making and trials at local courts, and some were free and owned land of their own. This could be considered quite democratic for the period.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1-1), e.g.</p> <p><i>There is actually some evidence to challenge this interpretation. For example, some people have argued that the position of women was quite advanced for the time. They had the legal right to own land and property, or divorce a husband in the case of adultery. There were even laws that set out fines for any sexual harassment of women. So this can be seen as equal.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is much evidence to support this interpretation. Anglo Saxon society was certainly unequal. At least 10 percent of the population were slaves. These people were the property of their master and could be branded and beaten, which could not be classed as equal.</i></p>
<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</p>	<p>One sided argument; one explained point of support (1-0), e.g.</p> <p><i>I don't agree. For example, some people have argued that the position of women was quite advanced for the time. They had the legal right to own land and property, or divorce a husband in the case of adultery. There were even laws that set out fines for any sexual harassment of women. So this can be seen as equal.</i></p>
<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</p>	<p>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation (2-4 marks), e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Yes, I agree because there were many thralls or slaves in Anglo Saxon society. (2)</i> • <i>No, I disagree because women could divorce. But I agree because women didn't own much land. (3)</i> <p>Alternatively, description of late Anglo Saxon society without linking this to the question (2-4 marks) , e.g.</p> <p><i>Anglo Saxon society consisted of earls, thegns, ceorls and thralls. The Witan advised the King. The Wergild meant different people had different values. (4)</i></p> <p>Alternatively, valid but general assertions (1 mark), e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because there were different layers to society which is not equal. (1)</i></p>
<p>0 marks</p>	

<p>Question 9*–20 marks The history website BBC Bitesize argues that ‘William’s victory at Hastings in 1066 owed much to his planning and experience.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 5 (17–20 marks) 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 Norman society, culture and warfare pre-1066.</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. To reach Level 5, this must involve considering both reasons to agree and to disagree with the interpretation.</i></p>
<p>Level 4 (13–16 marks) 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 causation (ie which factors led to William’s victory, but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: William’s actions in Normandy pre-1066, e.g. crushing rebellions in Normandy/ making Normandy stable freed him up to invade England; William proved to be a good tactician and a fearless soldier; he fought off Anjou and Brittany to dominate Northern France – his successes raised his reputation as a successful leader so he could raise support for the invasion of England; it may have been William’s tactics of pillaging and raiding the south of England which forced Harold to hurry to Hastings before his army was ready; William’s careful military planning of his invasion (e.g. built ships; moved supplies to the coast; negotiated support of the Pope); tactics on battlefield at Hastings (e.g. use of the feigned flight, use of archers, bravery in removing his helmet to rally his troops).</i></p>
<p>Level 3 (9–12 marks) 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: Other reasons for William’s success, e.g. impact of Battle of Stamford Bridge on Harold’s troops; good luck (e.g. had weather been better to begin with he may have met Harold’s full and rested army; Harold’s mistakes (e.g. he chose not to wait longer in London to collect more troops to fight William. Instead, he hurried to Hastings with a smaller army); impact of Harold’s death on the Saxon army; advantages of Norman fighting more generally, e.g. use of cavalry.</i></p>
<p>Level 2 (5–8 marks) 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>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).</p>	

<p>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>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p>Question 9*–20 marks The history website BBC Bitesize argues that ‘William’s victory at Hastings in 1066 owed much to his planning and experience’. How far do you agree with this view?</p>	
<p>Guidance and indicative content</p>	
<p>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</p>	<p>Balanced argument; two valid explained points on each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other (2–2 or 3–1). Clinching argument = 20 marks, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that to support the interpretation. Firstly, William was able to win the battle because of his military preparations. He built ships and moved supplies to the coast. He negotiated the support of the Pope. This gained him the support of other powerful men and he was able to assemble a large army.</i></p> <p><i>Also, William’s experience in battle helped at Hastings. For example, he used the Norman tactic of the ‘feigned flight’, exploiting the situation where some of Harold’s troops broke ranks to chase fleeing Norman knights. This repeated feigned retreat broke down Harold’s shield wall and eventually led to his army’s defeat.</i></p> <p><i>However, there are other reasons that William won the battle. For example, when William landed in England, Harold’s army was still in the North of England fighting Harald Hardrada. William had intended to set off in August but was delayed by bad weather – had he set off when he had intended to, Harold would have fought him with a full army. So actually it was just lucky for William that the weather delayed him.</i></p> <p><i>It’s also possible to argue that Harold himself made mistakes, such as not waiting longer in London to collect more troops to fight William. Instead, he hurried to Hastings with a smaller army, which contributed to William’s victory.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think that although luck and Harold’s errors played a part, it required William’s planning and experience to be able to exploit the situation at Hastings. If he had been less well prepared or not used clever tactics, Harold’s depleted forces would not really have mattered.</i></p>
<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</p>	<p>Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support (2–1 or 3–0), e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that supports the interpretation. Firstly, William was able to win the battle because of his military preparations. He built ships and moved supplies to the coast. He negotiated the support of the Pope. This gained him the support of other powerful men and he was able to assemble a large army.</i></p> <p><i>Also, William’s experience in battle helped at Hastings. For example, he used the Norman tactic of the ‘feigned flight’, exploiting the situation where some of Harold’s troops broke ranks to chase fleeing Norman knights. This repeated feigned retreat broke down Harold’s shield wall and eventually led to his army’s defeat.</i></p> <p><i>However, there are other reasons that William won the battle. For example, it’s possible to argue that Harold himself made mistakes, such as not waiting longer in London to collect more troops to fight William. Instead, he hurried to Hastings with a smaller army, which contributed to William’s victory.</i></p>

<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</p>	<p>One sided argument, two explained points of support (2–0), e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree. Firstly, William was able to win the battle because of his military preparations. He built ships and moved supplies to the coast. He negotiated the support of the Pope. This gained him the support of other powerful men and he was able to assemble a large army.</i></p> <p><i>Also, William’s experience in battle helped at Hastings. For example, he used the Norman tactic of the ‘feigned flight’, exploiting the situation where some of Harold’s troops broke ranks to chase fleeing Norman knights. This repeated feigned retreat broke down Harold’s shield wall and eventually led to his army’s defeat.</i></p> <p>Alternatively, balanced argument; one explained point on each side (1–1), e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that supports the interpretation. Firstly, William was able to win the battle because of his military preparations. He built ships and moved supplies to the coast. He negotiated the support of the Pope. This gained him the support of other powerful men and he was able to assemble a large army.</i></p> <p><i>However, there are other reasons that William won the battle. For example, it’s possible to argue that Harold himself made mistakes, such as not waiting longer in London to collect more troops to fight William. Instead, he hurried to Hastings with a smaller army, which contributed to William’s victory.</i></p>
<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</p>	<p>One sided argument; one explained point of support (1–0), e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree. William was able to win the battle because of his military preparations. He built ships and moved supplies to the coast. He negotiated the support of the Pope. This gained him the support of other powerful men and he was able to assemble a large army.</i></p>
<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</p>	<p>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation (2–4 marks), e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Yes, I agree because William used clever Norman tactics like the feigned flight. (2)</i> • <i>No, I disagree because it was more to do with luck. Also, Harold made lots of mistakes. (3)</i> <p>Alternatively, description of Norman warfare and/or events of 1066 without linking this to the question (2–4 marks), e.g.</p> <p><i>During the Battle of Hastings, the Anglo Saxons were fighting on foot at the top of Senlac Hill behind their shield wall. The Norman forces included cavalry and archers. We’re not sure if Harold was killed by an arrow to the eye or if he was hacked to pieces by Norman knights. (4)</i></p> <p>Alternatively, valid but general assertions (1 mark), e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, William was an experienced soldier who fought well. (1)</i></p>
<p>0 marks</p>	

Need to get in touch?

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

Call us on

01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on

support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder

 ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

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



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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 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 operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

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

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

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

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