

**GCE**

**History A**

Unit **F964/01**: European and World History Enquiries.  
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1073-1555

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2016**

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

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
BP	Blank Page – this annotation <b>must</b> be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
C	In <b>Q(a)</b> a comparison of source similarity or difference is made, either of content or of provenance. In <b>Q(b)</b> it denotes an effective grouping (for two or more interpretations), linkage or cross reference between sources.
J	In <b>Q(a)</b> a judgement is reached on the sources <i>as evidence</i> using content and provenance. In <b>Q(b)</b> a judgement is made on how far the <i>sources</i> support an interpretation.
P	In <b>Q(a)</b> the provenance is discussed and used as part of the judgement. In <b>Q(b)</b> a source's provenance is discussed discretely and not used to evaluate for the question. Linkage to the question is implicit.
S	In <b>Q(a)</b> a source or both sources are discussed separately and sequentially thus preventing comparison. In <b>Q(b)</b> the sources are approached sequentially thus preventing linkage and cross reference for the argument.
XP	Points of content and argument are juxtaposed – they are not comparable in <b>Q(a)</b> or the linkage made is inappropriate in <b>Q(b)</b> .
F	In either question the approach to a source, the sources as a whole, or the response in general, is overly formulaic or generic, failing to engage with either source content or precise provenance and context.
KU	Knowledge is used appropriately to support, extend, explain (context) or question a source or sources.
K	Knowledge is 'bolt-on', there for its own sake and not used or linked to the sources.
EVAL	There is evaluation of the sources for the key issue and question. This can be used for <b>Q(a)</b> but is more likely to be used for <b>Q(b)</b> .
ILL	The sources are simply used for reference or to illustrate an argument in <b>Q(b)</b> .
NAQ	The points made are not linked to the question and do not answer it.
?	This is to be used in <b>both</b> questions where is a factual error, irrelevant material and, in <b>Q(b)</b> , an inaccurate, questionable or unconvincing grouping of the sources for the question. It is also to be used in <b>both</b> questions where a judgement is on the topic rather than the sources.
NAR	There is description, either of the sources or of knowledge, or simply a narrative.
SEEN	The page has been read. This <b>must be used on each page seen</b> to ensure that the whole response has been considered.

**NB.** A brief summative comment is required following both questions. Use the language of the generic mark scheme to justify the level you have awarded. For specific guidance please refer to the topic specific mark scheme. Marks awarded must match the comments given.

Here are the subject specific instructions for this question paper

Candidates should answer on only one Option. They should answer questions (a) and (b) on that Option. If they answer on more than one Option then the higher mark should be awarded. Do not allow marks across more than one option. If they answer on Q(a) comparing the wrong source or sources then no more than a high L6 mark can be awarded. If fewer than the 5 sources on Q(b) are used then the next level down from the one awarded otherwise awarded is given, although please use professional judgement here.

**Question (a) Maximum mark 30**

**Notes related to Part A:**

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

## Marking Grid for Question (a)

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context;</li> <li>- the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
<b>Level 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness.</li> <li>• Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately.</li> <li>• Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>15-16</b></p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts.</li> <li>• Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-14</b></p>

<b>A0s</b>	<b>A01a and b</b>	<b>A02a</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue.</li> <li>• The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-10</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both.</li> <li>• Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>10-12</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted.</li> <li>• A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence.</li> <li>• Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it.</li> <li>• Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>8-9</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion.</li> <li>• Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-6</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit</li> <li>• Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-7</b></p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement.</li> <li>• Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context.</li> <li>• Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic.</li> <li>• Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-5</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance.</li> <li>• Weak or non-existent context with no conceptual understanding.</li> <li>• No structure with extremely weak communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment.</li> <li>• Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>

**Question (b) Maximum mark 70****Notes related to Part B:**

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

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



AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive.</li> <li>• Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-16</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance.</li> <li>• Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing.</li> <li>• There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>28-34</b></p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing.</li> <li>• Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential.</li> <li>• Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-12</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described.</li> <li>• May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely.</li> <li>• An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-27</b></p>
<b>Level 5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement.</li> <li>• Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>5-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped.</li> <li>• There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general.</li> <li>• There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-20</b></p>

AOs	AO1a and b	AO2a and b
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question.</li> <li>• Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Little organisation or structure with poor communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>3-4</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation.</li> <li>• A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content.</li> <li>• No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-13</b></p>
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question.</li> <li>• No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context.</li> <li>• Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive.</li> <li>• No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately.</li> <li>• No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-6</b></p>

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	a	<p><b>Study Sources C and E.</b>  <b>Compare these Sources as evidence for the importance of religious inspiration for the Crusaders.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sources are <b>similar</b> in content in that they both accounts indicate that the Crusaders believed divine intervention would help the. In <b>E</b> they prepared for battle with <i>fasting, prayer and almsgiving</i> and in <b>C</b> with a <i>procession and reconciliation</i> and again with <i>offerings</i>. The key moment in the siege is sparked by religious inspiration, the approach of a sacred hour in <b>E</b> and the hope of the help of God in <b>C</b>. In both Sources the lead is taken by churchmen, showing the importance of religious inspiration, <i>bishops and priests</i> in <b>E</b> and the <i>clergy</i> in <b>C</b>. Both show that the Crusaders did not just rely on religious inspiration. They <i>fought bravely</i> in <b>E</b> and <i>pressed on</i> in <b>C</b></li> <li>The Sources also <b>differ</b> in that <b>Source E</b> suggests that the failed assault gave the Crusaders some pause for thought, while <b>Source C</b> is more positive about divine aid. In <b>E</b> the knight who climbed on the walls could have been religiously inspired, or the connection could have been made by the writer. <b>C</b> refers to the mockery of the Saracens, with the implication that they would shortly receive their just deserts, but in <b>Source E</b> they flee at once with less implication that their flight results from religious intervention.</li> <li><b>Regarding the provenance and context</b> of the Sources, both authors were present. The writer of <b>Source E</b> was not a monk and his approach is generally more that of a layman, but here he accepts the role of prayer and is rather horrified when it does not seem to be effective. Raymond of Aguilers in <b>Source C</b> was part of the bare-footed procession and his beliefs urged him on and, as they were a key factor in his approach to the Crusade, his work might be seen as better evidence for the views of the Crusaders about the role of religious inspiration in these events.</li> </ul>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The focus must be comparative.</b> Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below.</li> <li><b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is good reason for not doing.</li> <li>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02)</li> <li>The comparison must be for the <b>key Issue</b> –</li> <li>If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded.</li> <li>The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer.</li> <li>Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation.</li> <li><b>Provenance</b> may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'.</li> <li><b>Stand-alone knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use <b>context</b> to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse.</li> <li>Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
b	<p><b>Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the main obstacle to the capture of Jerusalem was the vigour with which it was defended.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <b>supporting view</b> that the vigour of the defence was crucial is found by implication in <b>Source E</b>, the unknown lay writer, briefly in <b>Source A</b>, Fulcher of Chartres, <b>Source C</b>, Raymond of Aguilers and in <b>Source D</b>, Guibert of Nogent.</li> <li>• <b>The alternative argument</b>, that there were other factors, is found in <b>Sources A,B</b>, Robert the Monk, <b>C and E</b>.</li> <li>• The <b>supporting argument</b> in <b>Source E</b> is that the initial assault was unsuccessful, indicating a vigorous defence and this is fully supported with far more detail in <b>Source D</b>. <b>Source C</b> adds that the defending Saracens poured scorn on the procession of the Crusaders, which indicates they had considerable confidence in their ability to last out. From <b>Source A</b> comes the comment that Jerusalem was difficult to take and the length of the fighting suggests that it was stoutly defended. <b>Source D</b> again adds detail to this view, explaining the improvisations undertaken by the defenders and their total commitment to the defence.</li> </ul>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Judgements</b>, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. <b>Judgement on the topic</b> rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone.</li> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</li> <li>• The question is to <b>assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge the given interpretation</b>. The <b>focus must be on the sources</b>, and use their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate's ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</li> <li>• A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but <b>no set conclusion is expected</b>. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is <b>good reason</b> for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</li> <li>• <b>Bolt-on knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <b>opposing argument</b> is found in <b>Source E</b> where a single knight seems able to cause the defenders to flee and the Crusaders enter the city and begin to slaughter their enemies. <b>Source A</b> refers to an astonishing attack, corroborating <b>Source E</b>, and the reason for the failure is not the strength of the defence but the lack of scaling ladders. <b>Source D</b> supports this by mentioning difficulties in getting supplies to build siege machinery. <b>Source A</b> also hints at possible dissension, leading to the need for consultation and this could be linked to <b>Source C</b> and the reference to reconciliation. <b>Source B</b> brings in another explanation, namely the problems with supplies and most essentially, the need for water.</li> <li><b>Contextual knowledge</b> could be used to argue that the strength of the defences of Jerusalem was notable as they had been recently renovated after an earthquake and the inhabitants had supplies of food, and even more vitally, water. The garrison was competent. Well-trained and led and had prepared for siege engines as <b>Source D</b> indicates by putting mats and other items on the walls to cushion them from the blows of stones being hurled at them. The defenders also outnumbered the attackers and they were in better health and spirits as <b>Source A</b> shows.</li> <li>However, the other factors which made the attack difficult are well-attested. The need to construct effective siege engines is highlighted in <b>Source A</b> and Raymond d'Aguilers elsewhere describes how hard it was to make these. Prisoners and serfs were pressed into service. The weather in the Holy Land in June and July was not conducive to warfare in full armour and the sufferings from thirst are vividly portrayed in <b>Source B</b>. The leadership was not always as united as might be expected with Robert of Normandy, Robert of Flanders, Duke Godfrey and his brother Tancred, and Raymond of St Gilles all vying to some extent. The fact that the final</li> </ul>		<p>is <b>unbalanced</b>. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It follows that <b>knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source</b> (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01.</li> <li><b>Evaluation</b> of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.</li> <li>Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below.</li> <li>To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the <b>sources need to be grouped</b> according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. <b>Check that a grouping makes sense</b> – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made.</li> <li><b>A judgement based on the sources</b> is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing <b>or on the topic rather than the sources</b>. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered.</li> <li>Be impressed by <b>cross reference</b> within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A,</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>assault with the siege engines focused on two key points took the defenders by surprise and was successful, indicates further that the defences were not the main obstacle. The Crusaders were also spurred into action by the news that a relief army was approaching from Egypt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For <b>provenance</b> candidates might suggest that the authors of <b>all the Sources</b> were well-informed on the events of which they give accounts, but were not necessarily of one mind. The authors of <b>Sources A, C and E</b> were present and saw some of the events, while the writers of <b>Sources B and D</b> had reliable information at their disposal. The graphic account in Robert the Monk made him a popular author. There is also a good deal of cross fertilisation as <i>The Deeds of the Franks</i> was a source for many other writers. The role of signs and portents is greater in the work of Guibert of Nogent and Raymond d'Aguilers.</li> </ul>		<p>C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but <b>do not apply inflexibly</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the <b>sources to illustrate</b> an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is <b>referencing</b>.</li> <li>It is <b>not</b> necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.</li> <li>Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <b>Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded</b> – do <b>not</b> mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.</li> <li><b>Judgement</b> might accept or refute the view in the question.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	a	<p>The Sources have a <b>similar context</b> as they date from an Imperial Diet at Speyer, but their dates are <b>different</b> – <b>Source D</b> from the 1526 Diet and <b>Source E</b> the 1529 Diet. Both are official statements and both refer to enforcement of the Edict of Worms of 1521. <b>Knowledge</b> should be used to explain what this Edict stated, that Luther and his supporters were banned from the Holy Roman Empire, and that it had not been effectively enforced during the 1520s.</p> <p>The <b>provenance</b> of the sources is partly similar – the Imperial Free Cities are the authors of <b>Source D</b> and play a part in the Resolution of the Minority in <b>Source E</b>, though here in conjunction with John Duke of Saxony and 6 Lutheran princes. The difference in provenance is that in <b>Source D</b> the cities generally are the sole authors whereas <b>Source E</b> part of the authorship, as the Catholic princes, who are in a Majority, express a very <b>different</b> view. Therefore <b>Source E</b> might be seen as more useful than <b>Source D</b> as it is representative of a wider range of attitudes towards the Edict of Worms and shows more balance.</p> <p>The <b>content</b> of the sources is <b>similar</b> in that both refer to the concession won by the Lutherans at the first Diet of Speyer in 1526 that they may choose whether to enforce the Edict of Worms 'so as to answer before God'. <b>Source D</b> makes a case for this concession, pleading loyalty to the Emperor but asserting the damaging consequences of their attempts to enforce the Edict in light of increasing disagreement on ceremonies and abuses. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm and explain the diversity of sects which had arisen during the 1520s, such as the Zwickau prophets, Zwinglians, Anabaptists. Disagreements had arisen with Catholics, but also among reformers themselves. <b>Source E</b> reaffirms support for the concession won in 1526 and repeats briefly the reasoning that the Edict of Worms should be left to rulers' consciences, here signed by just 7 princes as well as 14 of the cities in <b>D</b>. The princely support for the cities is essential in <b>Source E</b> to give</p>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The focus must be comparative.</b> Candidates who deal discretely and sequentially with the sources must be placed in Levels 4 or below.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is good reason for not doing.</li> <li>• No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the content (A01), evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' (A02)</li> <li>• The comparison must be for the <b>key Issue</b> –</li> <li>• If the focus is general a L4 for A01 or below is to be awarded.</li> <li>• The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected for A02 in a Level 1-3 answer.</li> <li>• Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid comparative point for A01 from the sources. Beware of juxtaposed points. They may appear comparative but are not. For Levels 1-2 at A01 there needs to be some succinct development and explanation.</li> <li>• <b>Provenance</b> may be integrated or separate but it needs to be used comparatively for levels 1-2 at A02 and must not be generic or 'stock'.</li> <li>• <b>Stand-alone knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> rewarded. Candidates in Levels 1-3 A01 will use <b>context</b> to evaluate for the comparison. By Level 3 or below this will become uneven or increasingly sparse.</li> <li>• Formulaic responses where generic source qualities predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at Level 4 and below for A02.</li> <li>• <b>Judgements</b>, based on the quality of content and compared provenance, are required for Levels 1-3 at</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>them confidence as Lutherans are in a minority at the 1529 Diet in comparison to the Catholic princes.</p> <p>The Sources therefore have <b>differences</b>. The <b>introduction to Source E</b> reveals that the 1529 Diet had met at the Pope's request, suggesting that Catholic princes had been rallied by Rome to crush Lutheranism. <b>Contextual</b> knowledge might be used to explain the increasing hostility between the two religious groups in the light of the Peasants War 1524-6 and the Catholic League of Torgau 1526. In <b>Source E</b> the Resolution of the Majority, therefore, wishes to enforce the Edict, unlike <b>Source D</b>, by refusing to tolerate sects which deny transubstantiation and the Mass, and ending further innovation in religion. Thus the Majority view in <b>Source E</b> is uncompromising on the Edict, whereas the view in <b>Source D</b> is conditional, as the cities consider that the Edict was accepted on condition that the Pope announced a General Council which was impossible because of the Italian Wars (in hiatus in <b>E</b>). This condition is repeated by the Minority in <b>Source E</b>. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to evaluate this claim of conditionality, as the Edict was passed after the Elector of Saxony and other reforming princes had left Worms, so they might not consider it binding.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on the relative value of the sources as evidence, taking into consideration provenance and content in context. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		<p>A01. Unconvincing or no judgement is rewarded at L4 or below. <b>Judgement on the topic</b> rather than on the sources is a reason for placing in Level 4 or below but do not place in this level on these grounds alone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance.</li> </ul>



Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2 b	<p>The Sources contain references to both sides of the argument, so they may be grouped according to their view. <b>Sources A, B, D</b> and the introduction to and content of <b>E</b> are useful for the <b>supporting</b> view it was weak papal policy that allowed Lutheranism to strengthen. <b>Sources C, D</b> and part of <b>E</b> are useful for the <b>opposing</b> view, that it was the Lutheran princes, especially the Electors of Saxony, and the imperial free cities that played a more significant part in strengthening Lutheranism at this time. It might be argued that whatever policy Popes followed, internal German factors were more important.</p> <p><b>Sources A, B</b> and <b>D</b> are useful for the <b>supporting</b> view. <b>Sources A</b> and <b>B</b> suggest that Rome followed a weak policy towards Luther up to 1524. In <b>Source A</b>, Adrian VI regrets with ‘very great sorrow’ the progress of the Lutheran sects, and asserts that they ‘must be outlawed as disturbers of the public peace’, i.e. the Edict of Worms must be enforced. However, he undermines his message to the first Diet of Nuremberg 1522 by admitting frankly the corruption and abuses of the Roman Catholic Church. The introduction to <b>Source B</b> confirms Adrian’s failure to gain an agreement at the Diet to outlaw Lutheranism. The content of <b>Source B</b> states Clement VII’s view that papal policy had been weak, and condemns lack of action to call a General Council of the Church together with ‘our mild approach’ up to 1524. He urges the postponement of the first Diet of Speyer until papal policy can become more effective.</p> <p>In <b>Source B</b> Clement VII also suggests application of ‘the harsher penalties of the Church’. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to evaluate these statements. Papal fears of losing power to General Councils made Rome reluctant to fulfil this promise, as <b>Source D</b> confirms, where it is also stated that Clement had undermined attempts to call a General Council by sending his army against Charles V in the Italian wars. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to extend this point. As for ‘harsher penalties of the Church’ excommunication of Luther and his supporters in 1521</p>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The question is to <b>assess how the 5 sources contribute to or challenge the given interpretation</b>. The <b>focus must be on the sources</b>, and use their content and relative utility for the question. Award A01 Levels 1-3 according to a candidate’s ability to do this. If there is some grouping for a two sided argument than a low Level 3 may be appropriate. An attempt at argument with much description and some lack of focus is a Level 4. Little argument or appropriate explanation is Level 5 or below.</li> <li>• A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but <b>no set conclusion is expected</b>. Examples taken from source content given in the first column are neither required nor exclusive: reward any valid point from the sources for the argument and question.</li> <li>• <b>Always award at the top of the Level</b> unless there is <b>good reason</b> for not doing. Remember that there are usually 6-7 marks for A02. Automatically going in at the lower levels will unduly penalise.</li> <li>• <b>Bolt-on knowledge</b> is <b>not</b> to be rewarded in the top three levels for A01. It will not be used to support analysis or evaluation. This is a source paper. Use Levels 5-7 for a limited (5) weak (6) or very weak (7) attempt to use the sources. If there is excess of knowledge at the expense of the sources the response is <b>unbalanced</b>. Award a low L3 or below at A02 (according to severity of imbalance).</li> <li>• It follows that <b>knowledge is only to be rewarded where it is used to evaluate a source</b> (support, extend or question it), Levels 1-3 for A01.</li> <li>• <b>Evaluation</b> of the sources for the question (the assignment of value in relation to the question) is to be rewarded at Levels 1-2 for A02. A little evaluation in relation to the question or where provenance and</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>had been ineffective. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to confirm that harsh penalties had not been imposed as Charles V had been unable to enforce his outlawry from the Empire and he remained under the protection of Frederick of Saxony. In <b>Source B</b> Clement VII confirms the importance of Frederick's support for Luther by suggesting a firmer papal policy to secure his dismissal as an Imperial Elector. <b>Knowledge</b> might be added to develop this support up to the Elector's death in May 1525 and lead into the counter-argument that the princes and free cities were more significant than weak papal policy.</p> <p><b>Sources C, D</b> and part of <b>E</b> are useful for extending the content of <b>Source B</b> into an <b>opposing</b> view, that the princes and free cities were responsible for allowing Lutheranism to strengthen between 1522 and 1529. <b>Source C</b> gives evidence of the influence of Frederick of Saxony at the second Diet of Nuremberg 1524 in 'defending and favouring' the Lutherans. It also estimates the strength of Lutheranism at 25 000 adherents and Frederick's encouragement of disobedience by the subjects of Catholic princes. However, the <b>author</b> of <b>Source C</b> is a Venetian ambassador working for Ferdinand, who might not have felt his brother's loyalty to Frederick. As a Catholic reporting hearsay to the Venetian government, his purpose is to give accurate, reliable information about the feelings of Catholic princes and free cities, but he will share the Duke of Bavaria's shock at the heresy of eating meat on a Friday. The Duke might have emphasised his reaction to exonerate himself from culpability in the eyes of a foreign Catholic state. <b>Source D</b>, like the Resolution of the Minority in <b>Source E</b> and <b>Source C's</b> reference to the banner, is useful for confirming that the Imperial Free Cities strengthened Lutheranism at this time. The cities are treading a careful line between loyalty to the Emperor and refusal to enforce the Edict of Worms, exposing the weak policy of excommunication and outlawry. <b>Knowledge</b> might be used to develop the <b>provenance</b> and <b>context</b>: fears of civil war in Germany, of religious unrest in towns such as Nuremberg,</p>		<p>limitations are discussed discretely will confine an answer to level 3 or below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formulaic responses where generic source comments predominate or are ticked off at the expense of what is in the sources are to be awarded at A02 Level 4 and below.</li> <li>• To award Levels 3 and above for A02 the <b>sources need to be grouped</b> according to view appropriately. More effective responses, Levels 1-2, will realise that some or all of the sources may bear a variety of interpretations and can be used as much for the view as against it. <b>Check that a grouping makes sense</b> – candidates will often claim a source takes a view or says something it clearly does not. According to the extent of this place in a Level 3 or below (unconvincing) for A02. Check the extent of assertions made.</li> <li>• <b>A judgement based on the sources</b> is required for Levels 1-2 at A01. At Level 3 it may be partial in some way. Award a Level 4 or below if unconvincing <b>or on the topic rather than the sources</b>. However this must be balanced against the quality of the rest of the answer. If this satisfies other criteria then a Level 3 can be considered.</li> <li>• Be impressed by <b>cross reference</b> within and between groupings (Levels 1 and 2 for A02). A discrete and largely non cross-referenced approach to the sources is to be awarded at Level 3. A sequenced approach (A, C, E, B, and D) is usually awarded at Level 4 but <b>do not apply inflexibly</b>.</li> <li>• If the grouping and argument proceeds simply by using the <b>sources to illustrate</b> an argument (or narrative) then the response cannot be placed in Levels 1 or 2. Levels 3-5, according to extent, are appropriate. This is <b>referencing</b>.</li> <li>• It is <b>not</b> necessary to comment on the sources as a set. Candidates can be placed in the highest levels</li> </ul>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Augsburg and Speyer and of the distraction of the Italian Wars.</p> <p>The introduction to <b>Source E</b> suggests that Clement VII requested a second Diet of Speyer for a stronger policy of alliance with the Catholic German princes who were in the majority. However, this stronger policy backfired, strengthening Lutheranism. The content of <b>Source E</b> contains the Resolution of the Minority, known as the ‘Protest’, which hardened Protestant attitudes against enforcing the Edict of Worms and consolidated the existence of two opposing religions in Germany thereafter, which might be cross-referenced with <b>Source C</b>.</p> <p>Overall, in evaluation of the interpretation, it might be concluded that weak papal policy played a lesser part in the strength of Lutheranism than the strong policy of the Free Cities and princes. Supported overall <b>judgement</b> should be reached on how far the Sources accept the interpretation. No specific judgement is expected.</p>		<p>without it. Do not reward formulaic comments, especially those that automatically bemoan the lack of more sources. Do be impressed by comment that is perceptive (a particular slant) and use your professional judgement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates do <b>not</b> have to be exhaustive in approach to content and especially provenance. <b>Please mark what is front of you and be open-minded</b> – do <b>not</b> mark on what you would expect if you had taught the topic. There are many approaches to teaching topics and the sources that inform them. Be prepared to reward often unremarkable material and allow a candidate to develop an argument or refer later to a point.</li> <li>• <b>Judgement</b> might accept or refute the view in the question.</li> </ul>

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2016

