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>
</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. |
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 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As per descriptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>7-12</th>
<th>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.

**Low Level 2: 7-8 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth  
**Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks**  
As per descriptor.  
**High Level 2: 11-12 marks**  
The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>Low Level 2: The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>Mid Level 2: As per descriptor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>High Level 2: The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3     | 13-18 | Candidates’ answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, 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 mostly be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.  
**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. |
| 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. 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. |

3 13-18 Candidates’ answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, 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 mostly be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.

**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. 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.
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.

### 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.

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>
### 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>Candidates may well start with Source 3 which gives a spirited defence of the staff officers in the Crimea. This stance on the commanding officers in general could then be supported by the content of Source 2 which provides an exculpation of Cardigan's leadership in one of the most notorious incidents of the war. Both these sources, therefore, on the surface present a considerable challenge to Wolseley's highly critical assessment in Source 1. However, closer reading of Sources 1 and 2, along with careful contextualising, will result in candidates presenting a more nuanced evaluation of 'how far'. Thus, in Source 2 the extent to which Cardigan was open to criticism is revealed not only by the existence of a libel case but also the judge's admission that such negative publicity is to be expected. Similarly, in Source 3 the very fact that Simpson was required to report on the state of the army highlights the level of public concern at the time. Candidates may also note that Simpson had only been in post for two months at the time the report was written and that the focus is more on honour and duty than efficiency and professionalism. The more perceptive candidates will contrast this with Source 1 where the emphasis is firmly centred on military performance. Those operating at higher levels will be able to contextualise this and recognise the reference to the effects of the purchase system. Thus, for better candidates any judgement as to the extent of the challenge posed by the sources will be qualified by an understanding that the personal integrity alluded to in Sources 2 and 3 is not the same as the professional expertise in Source 1.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (b) (i)</td>
<td>This question asks candidates to focus on the impact of the Boer War on the public's attitude towards Empire. The evidence of Source 6 can be used in support of the view in the question by laying stress on the importance of the class divide with, for the majority of the working-class in Britain, the war being, at best, an irrelevance. The importance of class in assessing public attitudes towards Empire is also hinted at in Source 4 with decidedly non-working class venues of clubs and the Theatre Royal being used to illustrate popular approval. Source 4 can be used to argue against the contention in the question and this stance can be supported by the final sentence in Source 5. Candidates should be able to develop this line of argument by examining the influence of the popular press and the rhetoric of Conservative politicians such as Joseph Chamberlain. However, the more perceptive candidates will take note of the date in Source 4 and recognise that the focus is on immediate reactions rather long-term attitudes. Candidates' own knowledge of the contemporary debate surrounding the justness of the war, the significance of the outcome of the Khaki election of 1900 and the domestic concerns that were brought into relief as a result of the fighting can all be used in support of arguments for and against the view. At the higher levels, there should be a clear focus on agreement or disagreement, with evidence from the source</td>
<td>40</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) (ii)</td>
<td>Many candidates may well start with Source 7 which presents the counter-argument. Most will be aware of Sassoon’s poetry and will be able to elaborate on the suffering of the men and the concomitant fall in morale, especially after the Somme campaign. However, the more perceptive will pick up on the fact that Sassoon is not protesting against the High Command and the way the war is being fought but rather against the government’s justification for the continuation of the war. Higher performing candidates should also be able to contextualise the source and, thus, question the extent to which Sassoon really did act on behalf of soldiers. Sassoon’s position can also be cross-referenced with the opinion presented in Source 8, although here the focus is on the declining martial spirit of the new recruits rather than changing attitudes to the war itself. The contrasting view is clearly presented in Source 9 where it notes the willingness to serve and the lack of any real resistance to military authority. The importance of placing the mass army of 1914-18 in its social and cultural context is alluded to in the source; working men in Edwardian Britain were used to harsh conditions and strict authority and had strategies to cope with them. However, again the more perceptive may note the nuance of the source, and recognise that emphasising stoicism and ‘passive acceptance’ is not the same as saying that morale was high. The reference to the French and Russian armies in 1917 is to mass mutinies, which certainly did not affect the BEF but which, again, does not necessarily mean that morale did not dip in the later stages of the war. Achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the spirit of the British Army between 1914 and 1918, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C2 Britain, c1860-1930: The Changing Position of Women and the Suffrage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 (a)           | Candidates will probably start with Source 11, which specifically states that it was militancy which brought about a speedy change in the government’s attitude to women’s suffrage. The Home Secretary’s determination to spend parliamentary time debating methods to curb suffragette activity is taken as a sign of desperation in the face of mounting militancy and can be cross-referenced with the need to introduce the Cat and Mouse Bill, and the acknowledgement of its relative impotence, in Source 10. Although Ullswater, in Source 10, is claiming that militant action merely ‘hardened the opposition’, candidates should take into account the provenance of the source and be aware that the author would be reluctant to admit that the government would respond positively to intimidating tactics. However, candidates should be able to balance this perspective by examining the counter-arguments. Thus, it may be noted that Pankhurst’s opinion in Source 11 is as one would expect and, indeed, the attempt to sequester WPSU funds, far from being a token of
complete surrender and hence a step forward in the battle for votes, can be viewed as a continuation of the government’s desire to combat militancy without enflaming the situation. Equally her allusion to the short time-span of the WSPU’s violent campaign can be cross-referenced with Source 12, where Swanwick is emphasising the greater public support that has been built up over time for the non-militant NUWSS. Written over twenty years after the events, Swanwick was still an active participant in the suffrage movement, although she clearly feels she has to redress an imbalance in the public perception of the struggle, and the more perceptive candidates will be aware of this. Even so, the more knowledgeable candidates will be aware of the contrast in methods and impact of the NUWSS and the WSPU and be able to link this contextual understanding with the points raised by Swanwick in Source 12. Whatever judgement is reached must be backed by appropriate evidence and the better candidates will recognise the importance of addressing both the response and the resolve of the opposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (b) (i)</td>
<td>Candidates will probably start with Source 13 which presents the argument in support of the view given in the question. Thus, the provision of a degree of financial independence for married women was a significant step towards equality in married life. A close reading of the text should enable candidates to pick up on the implication in the source that the Act allowed women to extend their role outside the confines of the family home by developing ‘their own interests’. Source 15 refers to the amendment to the 1870 Act and presents candidates with the opportunity to highlight how many of the anomalies in the original Act were ironed out in 1882. Candidates should note that the trunk labelled ‘Married Women’s Property’ is now firmly padlocked. However, the more perceptive will also recognise the mocking tenor of the cartoon, with the limitations in emancipation thrown into relief by the overtly submissive attitude adopted by the women. Source 14 presents a clear case for the counter-argument. Many candidates will pick up on the description of the Act as ‘half-hearted’ to highlight the difficulties that any legislation aimed at improving the position of women had in passing through parliament, and to underline the limitations of the reform. They may also note the suggestion that, for many men, the Act was as much about their own financial security as it was their wives’ economic independence. The reference to ‘continued pressure’ at the beginning of the source will allow the more knowledgeable candidates to contextualise the passing of the Acts and their significance in the emancipation of women. Thus, candidates may highlight the psychological impact that this new found freedom had or they may point to the work of the Married Women’s Property Committee and the practical experience in organising a reform campaign that was gained. Alternatively, they may argue that the passing of the Acts was merely part of a general trend towards social reform and that changes in education, welfare, employment were equally, if not more, important. 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 change in women’s position in society as a result of the Acts, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</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>2 (b) (ii)</td>
<td>The question is focused on the extent of, and reasons behind, the Liberal Party's support for women's suffrage. Candidates may well start with Source 17 which unequivocally states that the Liberals' promises of help for the women's movement are worthless. The more knowledgeable candidates should be able to contextualise this and will be aware that Becker is speaking in the immediate aftermath of the Liberals' failure to support the suffrage amendment to the 1884 Reform Act. Source 16 outlines the dilemma facing the Liberal Party that resulted in the apparent volte-face of 1884. Although enfranchisement of women appeared to be a natural extension of Liberal belief in social reform, this had to be balanced against the impact on party politics and the widely held belief that newly enfranchised women would vote Conservative. Superficially, Source 18 appears to present the counter argument, and weaker candidates may well operate at this level. However, better candidates will be able to contextualise Asquith's promise by deploying their knowledge of the growing Conservative threat and the tensions surrounding electoral reform. The more perceptive will also note that, unlike 1884, Asquith is proposing full suffrage on the assumption that the majority of working-class women will vote Liberal. Candidates should be able to use their own knowledge to provide supporting detail on the changing relationship between the Liberals and the advocates of women's suffrage across the period. Thus, they may refer to the Liberal Party's fear that newly enfranchised women would vote Conservative and to Asquith's entrenched opposition in the years 1908-14. Alternatively reference could be made to the work of the Women's Liberal Federation and the importance of grass-roots support within the Liberal Party. 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 Liberal support for the women's suffrage campaign, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>