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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%)**

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>
</table>
| 1     | 1-5  | 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.  
**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.
(40 marks)

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></td>
<td></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>2</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</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>
| 3 | 13-18 | 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. |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | 19-24 | 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 the 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.*
### 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>
</tbody>
</table>

| % weighting     | 10%              | 8%         | 7%         | 25%                      |

### 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.
C1 The Experience of Warfare in Britain: Crimea, Boer and the First World War, 1854-1929

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>Taken at face value there is an obvious conflict between the sentiments expressed in Sources 2 and 3 and the vitriolic attack in Source 1, with both Panmure in Source 3 and the letter writer in Source 2 keen to praise Raglan’s amenable disposition. However, a closer examination of both the content and provenance of the sources should result in a more nuanced evaluation of ‘how far’. Thus, in source 2 the extent to which Raglan’s ‘bad name’ has become common currency is revealed, not only by the fact that the author felt it necessary to make such a spirited defence of his commander-in-chief, but also by the allusion to ‘The Times and other abusive papers’. The more perceptive may also note that the author describes himself as ‘long-serving’ and so may well have a residual loyalty that is not felt by others. Similarly in Source 3 candidates may qualify Panmure’s positive assessment of Raglan by noting that this is no more than one would expect under the circumstances; indeed, those with more detailed contextual knowledge may support this stance by pointing to the fact that on assuming office in February 1855 Panmure, in fact, became one of the fiercest critics of Raglan’s performance. Candidates may also note that Panmure is writing when the worst of the winter hardships have long gone, with the focus more on Raglan’s achievements as a diplomat than his popularity as a military leader. Those performing at higher levels will be able to contrast this with the emotional tone adopted in Source 1, where the emphasis is firmly centred on the day to day running of the army when logistical shortcomings were most apparent. They should also be aware however, that The Times was running a prominent campaign against the High Command at this time and thus it was largely those with a grievance to air who were given a public platform. Thus, for better candidates any judgement as to the extent of the challenge posed will be qualified by a consideration of the differences in both the timing and focus of the sources.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number</td>
<td>Indicative content</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (b) (i)</td>
<td>The focus of the question is on the impact of the Boer War on social reform. Candidates will probably start with Source 6 which can be used in support of the view in the question. Here a clear causal link is being drawn between concerns over the vulnerability of the Empire, which the Boer War had brought into high relief, and Government action ‘to help the poor’. This line of argument can be supported by both the provenance and content of Source 5. The very fact that it was felt necessary to establish such a Committee may be seen by some as evidence of intent to act on the part of the Government, and certainly the report does point towards a connection between recruitment and reform. However, those performing at higher levels may point out that the Conservatives failed to respond to the report, and that the subsequent Liberal government only acted after agitation by Labour. Indeed, some (the more cynical) may suggest that the establishment of a Committee, far from revealing urgency, is simply a governmental method for deferring action. Source 4 presents a platform for the counter-argument by questioning the link between the war and improved social welfare in both the short and long terms. Not only does Pope suggest that the inevitable increase in the National Debt that the war entailed had a deleterious effect on the immediate provision of welfare programmes, but he also argues that the war, in the long-term, far from convincing the government to help the poor, merely added weight to a pre-existing move towards reform. Indeed, more astute candidates may note the not unimportant semantic difference between ‘reinforce concern’ (Source 4) and ‘drew attention’ (Source 6). Candidates can also argue from their own knowledge that, instead of instilling in the government a genuine desire to help the poor, the Boer War simply raised concerns regarding geo-political security which resulted in preventive social welfare legislation. Thus, candidates’ own knowledge on the timing and nature of health care reform and school improvement, as well as the national efficiency debate, can all be used in support of arguments for and against the view. At higher levels, there should be a clear focus on agreement or disagreement, with the evidence from the source material and the candidates’ own knowledge balanced and integrated.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidates may well start with Source 8 and certainly it presents compelling evidence of not just technological advances but also a High Command eager to embrace tactical innovation. This view can be supported by cross-referencing with Captain Kelly’s recollections in Source 7 which point towards a new approach in frontal assaults. However, candidates may note that Kelly is contrasting his experience in 1918 with one of the most costly attritional campaigns of the war and so it is hardly surprising that he arrives at a favourable judgement. In addition, the action he is recalling takes place in the aftermath of the Germans’ failed Spring Offensive when a weakened defence rather than improved offence may account for any breakthrough. The counter-argument is clearly presented in Source 9 with Laffin, unsurprisingly considering the title of his book, firmly placing the blame for tactical inertia at the door of the High Command. However, the more knowledgeable will be aware that the differences between the stances adopted by Corrigan and Laffin can, to an extent, be reconciled. Many of the innovations cited by Corrigan were defensive and, hence, would help to explain the High Command’s failure to pursue a mobile war; the core of Laffin’s criticism. Candidates should, therefore, be aware that, in arriving at an assessment of the ‘revolutionary’ nature of the British Army’s learning curve, the unique conditions under which the war was fought and the difficulties facing senior commanders need to be forefronted. 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 tactical and technological innovation, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
Candidates may well start with the points of agreement. All three sources point to the drive and vivacity of Mrs. Pankhurst as well as to her commitment to, and control over, the cause of women’s suffrage. Here, reward can vary according to the range and depth of cross-referencing. However, an awareness should also be shown of the points at which the sources diverge, and the more perceptive here will take notice of tone as well as content. Thus, both Sources 10 and 12 refer to the ‘emotion’ that was at the heart of Mrs. Pankhurst’s approach yet, in contrast to the positive reading in Source 10, Billington-Greig in Source 12 regards this as an exploitative tool. Similarly, Source 11 views Mrs. Pankhurst’s tendency to autocratic leadership as evidence of her selfless commitment to the cause, whereas for Source 12 there is a strong suggestion of self-aggrandisement. In coming to any assessment of ‘how far’, those performing at higher levels should also take into account the provenance of all three sources. Thus, all three are written after Mrs. Pankhurst’s death, with Sources 10 and 12 coming from people who had been personally affected by her campaigns and, therefore, had some interest in the recasting of her memory. Billington-Greig in Source 12 is looking to explain her initial devotion to, and eventual split from, Mrs. Pankhurst, while Brailsford in Source 10 has both an ideological and personal attachment to her cause. It could be argued that The Times in Source 11 is more removed, although more able candidates may note the tendency for obituaries to accentuate the positive attributes of the subject. Indeed, those with wider contextual knowledge could support this point by observing that the news media in general, and The Times in particular, had, at the time, been harsh critics of Mrs. Pankhurst and the WSPU’s militant tactics. The best answers will concentrate on the extent of support on the basis of precisely selected evidence.
This question is focused on the relationship between women workers and the trade unions. Candidates will most likely start with Source 15 as this lays out in unequivocal terms the arguments in support of the contention in the question. Thus, the source sets out the apparent paradox of women being perceived, on the one hand, as men’s economic inferiors, with female employment regarded as no more than a stopgap between childhood and motherhood, yet, on the other hand, they are also seen as rivals who threaten to undermine men’s dominance in the workplace. Candidates should be able to cross-reference this latter point with Frank Delves’ speech to the TUC in Source 13. Although superficially espousing equality between male and female workers, the more perceptive will recognise that the speech is driven by a desire to preserve men’s control of the labour market. Those operating at higher levels should take into consideration the provenance of Source 13 and show some awareness of just how widespread the resistance to women within the Trade Union movement must have been for the president of the TUC to declare it openly at Congress. The more knowledgeable will be able to support this stance by references to the attitudes of, and positions adopted by, specific unions to female workers. Source 14 provides candidates with a platform to present the counter-argument. Candidates should be aware of the peculiar circumstances surrounding the development of unionism in the textile industry and how these lent themselves to the fostering of a greater sense of equality between male and female members. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able to place the sources in the context of women’s socio-economic position in the second half of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, with the very best showing an awareness of the considerable regional variations that existed. 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 of, and variations in, the relationships between women workers and the trade unions, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
2 (b) (ii) The question is focused on the changing status of women within marriage. Candidates will probably start with Source 18 which can serve as a platform to present the argument in favour of the view given in the question. More knowledgeable candidates should be able to develop the references to ‘rights’ to examine in greater depth the significance of some of the changes to matrimonial laws since the mid-nineteenth century, such as the Divorce Act, the Married Women’s Property Acts, the Matrimonial Causes Act and the Jackson Marriage Case. Although Pugh’s line of argument can, in part, be supported by Source 17, more astute candidates will appreciate that Perkin is falling short of portraying the period as one in which any advances could be described as a ‘formidable record of improvement’. Instead the piecemeal and limited nature of reform is emphasised and higher performing candidates may well expand on the reference to the ‘natural order of things’ to note the gulf that existed between legal reform and public attitudes. The points raised in Source 18 can be cross-referenced with the outlook presented by Elizabeth Robins in Source 16 where the inequalities in a husband’s and wife’s rights over their children are highlighted, although those performing at higher levels may take into account the provenance and note that Robins’ would be more likely to emphasise shortfall over progress. Candidates may, therefore, forefront the improvements in the rights that women enjoyed within marriage in arriving at a judgement. Alternatively, they may stress the inequalities that still existed in 1914, noting the limitations of legislative reform both in terms of scope and practice. 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 any improvement to the position of women within marriage, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.
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