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General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate’s response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

  i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

  ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

  iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response
The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

(i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question’s terms
(ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
(iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
(iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
(v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer’s worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level
The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate’s ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication
QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate’s answer falls. If, for example, a candidate’s history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.
### 6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

**Part (a)**

**Target: AO2a (8%)**  
(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |      | **Low Level 1: 1-2 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 1: 3-5 marks**  
The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 6-10 | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content. |
|       |      | **Low Level 2: 6-7 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 2: 8-10 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 11-15| Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.  
Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing ‘how far’ there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources. |
|       |      | **Low Level 3: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
**High Level 3: 13-15 marks**  
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
| 4 | 16-20  | Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing ‘how far’ the sources are used in combination.  

**Low Level 4: 16-17 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  

**High Level 4: 18-20 marks**  
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed. |

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)
Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)
Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;As per descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</strong>&lt;br&gt;The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question’s focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.

**Low Level 3: 13-14 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 3: 17-18 marks**
The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.

The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.

Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.

**Low Level 4: 19-20 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.

**Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks**
As per descriptor

**High Level 4: 23-24 marks**
The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.

The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
### AO2b (16 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 1-4  | Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.  
  **Low Level 1:** 1-2 marks  
  The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
  **High Level 1:** 3-4 marks  
  The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed. |
| 2     | 5-8  | Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.  
  **Low Level 2:** 5-6 marks  
  The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
  **High Level 2:** 7-8 marks  
  The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed. |
| 3     | 9-12 | The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of both sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.  
  **Low Level 3:** 9-10 marks  
  The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
  **High Level 3:** 11-12 marks  
  The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed. |
| 4     | 13-16| Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.  
  **Low Level 4:** 13-14 marks  
  The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.  
  **High Level 4:** 15-16 marks  
  The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed. |

*NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*
**Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

**Unit 2 Assessment Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>AO1a and b Marks</th>
<th>AO2a Marks</th>
<th>AO2b Marks</th>
<th>Total marks for question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q (a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (b)(i) or (ii)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% weighting</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidates may well start with the cartoon from *Punch* in Source 1 which presents the Charge in the romantic light typical of that age. Although Tennyson’s poem in Source 2 provides slightly less gloss, nonetheless the overall impression is one of glory even in failure. Both these sources, therefore, offer a considerable challenge to the far from glorious scene described by Gowing in Source 3. Candidates should be able to develop the extent of the challenge by closer cross-referencing. Thus, both Sources 1 and 2 imply that it was the Russians who were on the receiving end of the Light Brigade’s sabres; for Gowing, in source 3, the reverse was the case. In a similar vein, the sources present differing views on the human costs of the Charge. The only casualties in Source 1 are Russians and although Tennyson alludes to fatalities within the ranks of the Light Brigade (‘not the six hundred’), this hardly equates to Gowing’s assertion that ‘few escaped’. However, by way of balance, candidates may well note that implicit in the heroic imagery of war presented in Sources 1 and 2 is the brutality as described by Gowing in Source 3. Higher performing candidates will seek to reconcile further some of the disagreements by exploring the attributions. Thus, it may be noted that both Sources 1 and 2 were produced in the immediate aftermath of the Charge when the war was in its early stages and, hence, traditional heroic motifs may well have still been in the ascendancy. Equally, the more perceptive may suggest that the populist outlook of *Punch* and the quasi-official nature of Tennyson’s position may have encouraged them to adopt a conformist stance. By contrast, Gowing was writing as an eye-witness for a readership for whom the event was now history. Thus, for better candidates any judgement as to the extent of the challenge posed by the sources will be tempered by an appreciation of both context and audience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the impact of the Boer War on the public’s perception of, and attitudes to, Britain’s imperial role. Candidates may well start with Sources 4 and 5 which present a strong case in favour of the contention. The references to the cost of the war and ‘a large section of British public opinion’ in Source 4 should provide a platform for an examination of working-class attitudes to imperialism. For many the war was seen as a distraction, both economic and political, from social reform and more knowledgeable candidates may cite the Liberal landslide in 1906 as evidence of this. This line of reasoning is endorsed by Source 5 and higher performing candidates should be able to develop the reference to Hobson and support this jaundiced imperial picture by exploring the contentious nature of the war’s origins, although some may question how far such intellectualising percolated down through the ranks of society. A contrasting vision of imperialism is presented by French in Source 6, although the more astute may well argue that context makes the articulation of any other view well nigh impossible. Candidates should be able to use their own knowledge to exemplify continuing public faith in Empire, with volunteerism, Mafeking celebrations and the Khaki election all valid areas for discussion. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of the sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the war’s effect on the public’s opinion of imperialism, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the treatment of conscientious objectors during the First World War. Sources 7 and 8 allow candidates to access the arguments for and against the contention in the question, and it is likely that most will begin here. Gregory’s revisionist view (Source 7) can be contrasted with Marwick’s more traditional approach (Source 8), although higher performing candidates will, through a closer reading of the text, recognise that there are areas of agreement. The experience of Pethick-Lawrence in Source 9 would appear to support Gregory’s representation in Source 7 of the tribunals as sympathetic and just, and many responses will operate at this level. However, the more astute will go beyond surface comprehension and will note that Pethick-Lawrence’s age, high political profile and social connections could all help to explain the relatively humane treatment he received. Even so, the response of the military representative was hardly sympathetic. The contrast drawn out in the three sources between frivolous (Source 7) and principled (Sources 8 and 9) appeals should allow candidates to enter into a discussion on the nature and scope of the cases which came before the tribunals and the range of sanctions available to them. Candidates should be rewarded according to the depth and range of material they are able to deploy. The terms of the Military Services Acts, the work of pacifist groups such as the No Conscription Fellowship and the response of the authorities (Non-Combatant Corps, Pelham Committee etc) are all valid areas for inclusion. In arriving at a judgement, more able candidates will also appreciate the importance of siting responses in the mores of the time. Whatever line of argument is followed, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the diverse and complex nature of the state’s responses to conscientious objectors, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
Candidates will probably start with Source 11 which provides the most egregious support for the contention in the question. The continuing work of the NUWSS in the guise of the NUSEC is highlighted in the attribution. The content cites Rathbone’s dissatisfaction with the scope of the 1918 Act and her desire to see unenfranchised women represented as the prompt for ongoing campaigning by the suffrage organisations and this can be cross-referenced with the female lobbying depicted by Strachey in Source 12. The more astute could well suggest that Strachey, as one of the architects of the campaigning in the lead up to the 1918 Act, might be painting an overly positive picture of its impact, but the willingness of Baldwin to meet with the suffrage organisations (Source 11) does provide corroboration of the movement’s role in the decade leading up to the Equal Franchise Act. The counterview is presented by Source 10 with Lady Gwendolen Elveden pointing to the political pragmatism that underpinned the Conservative party’s decision to grant equal voting rights. The clear implication is that the need to fulfil a pledge and maintain the support of apolitical but ‘naturally conservative’ women far outweighed the role of a politically active minority in determining party policy. Higher performing candidates will be able to cross-refer this with Source 12, where Strachey, although emphasising the impact of the work of women’s societies at Westminster, nonetheless admits that such activity was ‘positively welcomed’ by politicians who were now aware that every bill had a ‘woman’s side’. Whatever judgement is reached must be backed by appropriate evidence, with the best responses appreciating that in the lead up to the 1928 Act the suffrage organisations were, to a large extent, pushing at the open door of political pragmatism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The question asks candidates to focus on the extent to which the women’s movement can be seen to have made progress in the first decade of the twentieth century. Candidates may well start with Source 14 which categorically states that this was the case, citing the growth of the NUWSS and the increased backing in Westminster as supporting evidence. The source can then be cross-referenced with Source 15 which points to the growing support for the suffrage movement in this period. These two sources can be used as a platform for the more knowledgeable to explore further the advances both in terms of grass-roots organisation and parliamentary support. Undoubtedly the NUWSS experienced substantial growth in this period, with total membership and the number of branches rising rapidly. However, the more astute may balance this empirical evidence of progress by highlighting the rifts that were beginning to appear within the women’s movement in this period and questioning the extent to which the interests of working-class women really did find a voice in these new organisations, particularly the WSPU. Similarly, Smith’s reference to the support for suffrage shown by MPs will enable candidates to explore the extent to which the political parties, and particularly the Liberal party, were prepared to push for women’s suffrage. The fate of the Plural Voting Bill, the Women’s Suffrage Bills and the first Conciliation Bill can all be cited as evidence of the reluctance of Asquith and the Liberal party to endorse female enfranchisement. Equally, the better performing candidates will take note of the qualification contained in the final sentence of Source 15 and appreciate that the numbers cited as evidence of the growing popularity of the suffrage movement represent only a small percentage of the 10.5 million women in Britain at the time. Source 13 presents the counter-view to Smith with Pankhurst asserting that ‘no progress has been made’, although the more able will be aware that, given the context of the speech, there may be a desire to underplay the movement’s successes in order to justify extreme action. The militancy referred to by Pankhurst can be used as evidence both to support and refute the contention in the question (public attention versus government intransigence), and higher performing candidates will be likely to show some appreciation of this. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature and extent of the progress made by the women’s movement in this period, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question is focused on the impact of the 1870 Education Act on the educational opportunities available to girls. Candidates may well start with Sources 17 and 18 which, together, provide evidence of the beneficial effect of the 1870 Act. Rees in Source 17 outlines the nature of provision prior to 1870 and how this disadvantaged girls from working-class families. Source 18 can then be used to highlight how the 1870 Act was meant to counter school absenteeism by establishing the means by which localities could guarantee free, compulsory education. The more knowledgeable may pick up on the reference to School Boards to point to the increasing involvement of women in the management and direction of schools and the positive effect this may have had for girls. Source 16 presents a clear case for the counter-argument with Turner emphasising both the limitations of the curriculum for girls and the continuing problem of working-class female absenteeism post 1870. The more astute will be able to cross-reference the assertion in the source that ‘authorities often turned a blind eye to the frequent absences of girls’ with the conditional nature of the wording of the 1870 Act in Source 18, with better responses showing an awareness that school attendance was not, despite Turner’s assertion to the contrary, in fact made compulsory until Mundella’s Act in 1880. Those performing at higher levels will recognise that both Sources 16 and 17 explicitly, and Source 18 implicitly, are directed on the experience of working-class girls and, thus, will question the extent to which the Act had any significance for the schooling of the more privileged. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the scope and limitations of the 1870 Act, with sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.