



GCSE (9–1)

History B (Schools History Project)

J411/16: Crime and Punishment, c.1250 to present with Britain
in Peace and War, 1900-1918

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for June 2019

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 2019

**J411/16
Annotations**

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Stamp	Annotation Name	Description
	Tick 1	Level 1
	Tick 2	Level 2
	Tick 3	Level 3
	Tick 4	Level 4
	Tick 5	Level 5
	Tick 6	Level 6
	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
	NAQ	Not answered question
	Wavy Line	Development / Evidence / Support of valid point
	BP	Blank page

Section A: Crime and Punishment, c.1250 to present

Question 1–3 marks	
(a) Name one type of capital punishment used in the period 1250–1500.	[1]
(b) Give one example of an organized crime in the period 1500 -1750.	[1]
(c) Identify one example of a new crime since 1950.	[1]
Guidance	Indicative content
1(a) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(a), likely valid responses include: burning, hanging, beheading.</i>
1(b) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(b), likely valid responses include: smuggling, highway robbery, poaching, heresy and treason.</i>
1(c) – 1 mark for any answer that offers an historically valid response drawing on knowledge of characteristic features (AO1)	<i>For 1(c), likely valid responses include: racial crime, car crime (compulsory seatbelts, drink driving, joy-riding), cybercrime, illegal drugs.</i> Any other historically valid response is acceptable and should be credited.

Question 2–9 marks	
Write a clear and organized summary that analyses the nature of crime during the Medieval period (1250– 1500). Support your summary with examples.	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks	
AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks	
Level 3 (7–9 marks)	<i>Answers should show connections in the situation defined in the question and use these to organise the answer logically.</i>
Demonstrates a well-selected range of valid knowledge of characteristic features that are fully relevant to the question, in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows sustained logical coherence, demonstrating clear use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>Answers could consider aspects of one or more of: serious and petty crimes such as homicide or stealing goods worth less than 12d; the crimes of the poor or the crimes of the rich and the nobility such as burglary or treason. New crimes emerging because of the Black Death e.g. vagrancy. The emerging problem of private armies towards the end of the fifteenth century.</i>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	<i>Use of conceptual understanding to organise the response might in this case involve the concept of change and continuity within the period. Or it may involve using significance of different types of crime from serious to petty crimes.</i>
Demonstrates a range of knowledge of characteristic features that are relevant to the question, in ways that show understanding of them (AO1). The way the summary is organised shows some logical coherence, demonstrating use of at least one second order concept in finding connections and providing a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>Answers may show use of second order concepts such as causation (e.g. why the types of crime changed or why there were different types of crime), diversity (rich and poor, local and national, petty and serious) and significance in how the type of crime led to different punishments.</i>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	<i>Please note that answers do not need to name the second order concepts being used to organise their answer, but the concepts do need to be apparent from the connections and chains of reasoning in the summary in order to meet the AO2 descriptors (see levels descriptors).</i>
Demonstrates some knowledge of characteristic features with some relevance to the question, in ways that show some limited understanding of them (AO1). The summary shows a very basic logical coherence, demonstrating limited use of at least one second order concept in attempting to find connections and to provide a logical chain of reasoning to summarise the historical situation in the question (AO2).	<i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i>
0 marks	
No response or no response worthy of credit.	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Question 2–9 marks	
Write a clear and organised summary that analyses the nature of crime during the Medieval period (1250– 1500). Support your summary with examples.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (7–9 marks)	<p>Answers at L3 will typically be organised around a second order concept such as causes/ consequences, change/continuity, diversity. Answers will be supported with two or more valid examples e.g.</p> <p>[Diversity] <i>In the medieval period the nature of crime varied greatly. There were serious crimes (felonies), which led to severe punishments. People might be hanged for things like homicide and stealing more than 12d worth of goods. Less serious crime, or 'petty' crime, involved theft of goods worth less than this, getting into debt, or doing limited harm to people or property. 7 marks</i></p> <p>[Causation] <i>People committed crime in the medieval period for a variety of reasons. Anger was one reason – over half of homicides stemmed from simple arguments, and this may have been because the system of strip farming meant that peasants had to work very close to each other, often when sharp tools were nearby. Hunger was another reason people committed crime. Crime such as theft rose when harvests failed and people found themselves in debt and in need.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Summary based on second order concept(s) with two or more valid supporting examples</p> <p><i>Other valid areas might include: Change – new crimes which had appeared by 1400 such as vagrancy, scolding, gangs of robbers, religious crimes, treason and the building up of private armies/retainers; causation – reasons why new crimes had appeared; causation – why homicide rates were so high in this period; diversity – different crimes associated with different groups of people, e.g. rich and poor.</i></p>
Level 2 (4–6 marks)	<p>Answers at L2 will typically be organised around a second order concept, supported with a valid example e.g.</p> <p>[Change] <i>At the start of the medieval period, crime tended to revolve around theft and harm to people. However, by 1400, several new types of crime had emerged. For example, 'vagrancy' became a problem after the Black Death. Workers wandered the country looking for better pay because they were in demand, but Parliament passed a law saying all able-bodied men had to stay and work in their home village.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Summary based on a second order concept with one valid supporting example</p>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	<p>Answers at L1 will typically list or describe relevant events or developments erg <i>There were lots of different crimes in this period. Larceny, homicide, vagrancy. Homicide didn't just include murder but also things like accidental killing.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: List of events / developments with no organising concept.</p>
0 marks	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Question 3–10 marks To what extent did the enforcement of law and order change in the Early Modern period (1500–1750)? Explain your answer.	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 5 (9–10 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sophisticated understanding of one or more second order concepts in a fully sustained and very well-supported explanation (AO2).	<p><i>Explanations could consider similarities - still no effective police force (personal freedom, cost), army put down any protests, riots or capture of gangs and was unpopular as unfairly brutal. Tithings and hue and cry continued to be the principal way of catching criminals.</i></p> <p><i>differences – use of watchmen, more criminals dealt with by JPs and the influence of manorial courts and church courts declined.</i></p> <p><i>Explanations are most likely to show understanding of the second order concept of continuity and change but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept such as diversity or significance.</i></p>
Level 4 (7–8 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show strong understanding of one or more second order concepts in a sustained and well-supported explanation (AO2).	
Level 3 (5–6 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show sound understanding of one or more second order concepts in a generally coherent and organised explanation (AO2).	
Level 2 (3–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Uses these to show some understanding of one or more second order concepts in a loosely organised explanation (AO2).	
Level 1 (1–2 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Uses these to show some basic understanding of one or more second order concepts, although the overall response may lack structure and coherence (AO2).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Question 3–10 marks To what extent did the enforcement of law and order change in the Early Modern period (1500–1750)? Explain your answer.	
NOTE: ALLOW CHANGE(S) / CONTINUITIES IN PUNISHMENT ONLY WHERE IT IS CLEARLY LINKED TO ENFORCEMENT / DETERRENT	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (9-10 marks)	<p>Level 5 answers will typically identify at least two changes/continuities in the enforcement of law and order 1500–1750 and explain them fully e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways, law enforcement changed little in the Early Modern period. Most of the methods were the same as the ones used in the medieval period. For example, local communities continued to police themselves because there was still no professional police force. So, for example, if the constable raised the hue and cry, people were expected to turn out and search for a criminal, and unpaid officials like JPs and churchwardens continued to play an important role.</i></p> <p><i>However, there were some changes to law enforcement in this period. For example, the nature of the court system changed. In the medieval period, it had been the local manor and church courts that dealt with petty crime. However, in the Early Modern period this was different because the government had extended the role of the JPs. By the 1600s their volume of work had increased and so small groups of JPs met more regularly in their local areas in 'petty sessions'. They dealt with some types of petty crime such as drunkenness or minor forms of violence.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Two or more methods of law enforcement 1500–1750 identified, with full explanation of how these were changes/continuities. NOTE: Some responses may take the approach of comparing the medieval and Early Modern periods. If they make a valid argument about change / continuity these can be credited.</p>
Level 4 (7-8 marks)	<p>Level 4 answers will typically identify one change/continuity in the enforcement of law and order 1500–1750 and explain it fully e.g.</p> <p><i>Some aspects of medieval law enforcement continued in this period. For example, local communities continued to police themselves because there was still no professional police force. So, for example, if the constable raised the hue and cry, people were expected to turn out and search for a criminal, and unpaid officials like JPs and churchwardens continued to play an important role.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One method of law enforcement 1500–1750 identified, with full explanation of how it was a change/continuity. NOTE Answers at L4 will often identify and describe several methods but only fully explain one of them.</p>
Level 3 (5-6 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically identify at least one valid change/continuity e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In the medieval period, there was the use of the hue and cry and this continued after 1500.</i> <p>Nutshell: Identifies one or more valid change/continuity but no supporting evidence. NOTE: 5 marks for one change/continuity identified; 6 marks for two or more</p>
Level 2 (3-4 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically contain correct descriptions of Early Modern law enforcement or related events without relating this to change or continuity, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In this period local communities policed themselves because there was no police force. So, for example, if the constable raised the hue and cry, people were expected to turn out and search for a criminal.</i> • <i>The assizes dealt with serious offences.</i> <p>Nutshell: Describes methods of law enforcement or other relevant events without addressing the question of change/continuity.</p>
Level 1 (1–2 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically contain general points or unsupported assertions e.g. <i>A variety of people were involved in the law enforcement system.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Assertion(s)</p>
0 marks	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Question 4*–18 marks ‘There was little change in the punishments used in the period 1250 – 1750’. How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer	
Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks AO2 Explain and analyses historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate knowledge of types of punishment in the period.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT to achieve the two highest levels, answers must identify and consider the alternative point of view.</i>
Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of change, continuity and significance but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i> <i>Grounds for agreeing include: the continuation of punishments from Medieval times such as fines, pillory, whipping and branding, ducking stools, the fact prisons were little used as a punishment, the use of hanging as a punishment.</i>
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing include: arguing that the introduction of the bridewell was important, the increase in use of both the Bloody Code and capital punishment in the period, the use of transportation to the Americas from the early 1600s onwards.</i>
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

<p>Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Question 4* – 18 marks	
'There was little change in the punishments used in the period 1250 – 1750'. How far do you agree with this statement? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a great deal of evidence which can support the statement. For example, there were many Early Modern punishments which were intended to cause humiliation and physical pain. These punishments had survived since the Medieval period. One example is the use of the stocks where heavy pieces of wood were placed around the offender's ankles and their feet were locked in place. Secondly, capital offences were punished by hanging, just as they had been in the Middle Ages. Hangings were often watched by large crowds. The condemned person was taken to the gallows where a noose was placed around their neck. It often took a long time for them to die as their neck wasn't broken by a drop.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there was some change in punishment by 1750. For example, even though the number of crimes for which you could be hanged increased, the actual levels of execution had dropped by 1750. Judges and juries often reduced the value of goods stolen to below that of a capital crime.or acquitted defendants due to lack of evidence. Transportation to North America or the West Indies started to replace hanging. In addition to this, the bridewell or 'house of correction' was a new type of punishment where vagrants were forced to work. Those who refused faced physical punishment. This was different to medieval gaols which were mainly used to hold temporarily hold prisoners who were awaiting other punishments.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think that there was actually more change than continuity. Even though some traditional punishments like the stocks continued, the beginning of a change in attitude is more significant in this period – both the use of a 'correction house' and the less frequent use of capital punishment marks the beginning of a belief that the purpose of a punishment was to change people's behaviour rather than to deter via harsh punishment.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side OR three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks</p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 3 valid examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a great deal of evidence which can support the statement. For example, there were many Early Modern punishments which were intended to cause humiliation and physical pain. These punishments had survived since the Medieval period. One example is the use of the stocks where heavy pieces of wood were placed around the offender's ankles and their feet were locked in place. Secondly, capital offences were punished by hanging, just as they had been in the Middle Ages. Hangings were often watched by large crowds. The condemned person was taken to the gallows where a noose was placed around their neck. It often took a long time for them to die as their neck wasn't broken by a drop.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there was some change in punishment by 1750. For example, even though the number of crimes for which you could be hanged increased, the actual levels of execution had dropped by 1750. Judges and juries often reduced the value of goods stolen to below that of a capital crime.or acquitted defendants due to lack of evidence. Transportation to North America or the West Indies started to replace hanging.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; three explained points of support (i.e. two on one side and one on the other)</p>
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a great deal of evidence which can support the statement. For example, there were many Early Modern punishments which were intended to cause humiliation and physical pain. These punishments had survived since the Medieval period. One example is the use of the stocks where heavy pieces of wood were placed around the offender's ankles and their feet were locked in place. Secondly, capital offences were punished by hanging, just as they had been in the Middle Ages. Hangings were often watched by large crowds. The condemned person was taken to the gallows where a noose was placed around their neck. It often took a long time for them to die as their neck wasn't broken by a drop.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</p>

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

	<p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a great deal of evidence which can support the statement. For example, there were many Early Modern punishments which were intended to cause humiliation and physical pain. These punishments had survived since the Medieval period. One example is the use of the stocks where heavy pieces of wood were placed around the offender's ankles and their feet were locked in place. On the other hand there was some change in punishment by 1750. For example, even though the number of crimes for which you could be hanged increased, the actual levels of execution had dropped by 1750. Judges and juries often reduced the value of goods stolen to below that of a capital crime or acquitted defendants due to lack of evidence. Transportation to North America or the West Indies started to replace hanging.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side NOTE Answers at L4 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a great deal of evidence which can support the statement. For example, there were many Early Modern punishments which were intended to cause humiliation and physical pain. These punishments had survived since the Medieval period. One example is the use of the stocks where heavy pieces of wood were placed around the offender's ankles and their feet were locked in place.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support NOTE Answers at L3 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the statement but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>No, I agree because bridewells were new.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe punishments in one or both periods, without addressing the question of change/continuity e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In the medieval period people fines were a usual form of punishment. For example, fines were used by church courts to punish gambling.</i> <i>By 1750 some people were being transported to British colonies as a form of punishment.</i> <p>Nutshell: Description of punishments in one/both periods without linking to change/continuity</p>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>No, there were many areas where punishments changed. Some of the old punishments died out.</i></p> <p>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</p>
0 marks	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Question 5*–18 marks	
How far do you agree that governments have been the most important factor influencing crime rates since 1750? Give reasons for your answer.	
Levels	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<p>AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 6 marks</p> <p>AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 12 marks</p>	
<p>Level 6 (16–18 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate knowledge of crime rates in the period.</i></p> <p><i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the level description. BUT, to achieve the two highest levels, answers must identify and consider the alternative point of view. OR answers may reach a judgment on how far the government has influenced the crime rate by comparison with other factors in the period 1750 – present</i></p>
<p>Level 5 (13–15 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of significance, continuity and change but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p>
<p>Level 4 (10–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: introduction of the Police Force; the increased government focus on winning votes; fear of popular revolts (eg French Revolution) made governments react; attempts by governments to reform the prison system over time</i></p>
<p>Level 3 (7–9 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: urbanisation; the reduction in chance; changing nature of beliefs in the period; the role of science and technology; the work of reformers</i></p>

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

<p>Level 2 (4–6 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2). <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

Question 5* – 18 marks	
How far do you agree that governments have been the most important factor influencing crime rates since 1750? Give reasons for your answer.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p>Level 6 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 18 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is some evidence which can support the statement. Firstly, it could be argued that the introduction of a professional police force under Robert Peel made a big contribution to the fall in crime in the second half of the nineteenth century. There were uniformed officers on the beat who tried to prevent theft and violence. They removed drunks, prostitutes and vagrants from the streets. Also, in the 20th Century, governments have become more involved in people's lives and introduced a range of new crimes including 'hate crime' after the murder of Stephen Lawrence. This meant that the crime rate has risen because there are now more laws to be broken.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there is a great deal of evidence against the statement. Industrialisation was a major reason that the crime rate rose until 1850. Theft from the workplace became much more common. Factories, warehouses and shops were full of goods which could be stolen. So industrialisation provided new opportunities for thieves. Poverty was another reason. The crime rate rose particularly sharply after 1815 when war with France ended and soldiers returned to Britain looking for work. There was low employment, high prices and falling wages. So many people turned to theft in desperation.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think that other factors had a much more significant impact than the government. There is no doubt there is a correlation between the introduction of the police and the fall in crime rates after 1850. However, the establishment of the police happened partly in response to the increasing crime anyway, which was still far higher in 1900 than it had been in 1750.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side OR three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 18 marks</p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 3 valid examples, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is some evidence which can support the statement. Firstly, it could be argued that the introduction of a professional police force under Robert Peel made a big contribution to the fall in crime in the second half of the nineteenth century. There were uniformed officers on the beat who tried to prevent theft and violence. They removed drunks, prostitutes and vagrants from the streets.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there is a great deal of evidence against the statement. Industrialisation was a major reason that the crime rate rose until 1850. Theft from the workplace became much more common. Factories, warehouses and shops were full of goods which could be stolen. So industrialisation provided new opportunities for thieves. Poverty was another reason. The crime rate rose particularly sharply after 1815 when war with France ended and soldiers returned to Britain looking for work. There was low employment, high prices and falling wages. So many people turned to theft in desperation.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; three explained points of support (i.e. two on one side and one on the other)</p>
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a great deal of evidence against the statement. Industrialisation was a major reason that the crime rate rose until 1850. Theft from the workplace became much more common. Factories, warehouses and shops were full of goods which could be stolen. So industrialisation provided new opportunities for thieves. Poverty was another reason. The crime rate rose particularly sharply after 1815 when war with France ended and soldiers returned to Britain looking for work. There was low employment, high prices and falling wages. So many people turned to theft in desperation.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 4 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is some evidence which can support the statement. Firstly, it could be argued that the introduction of a professional police force under Robert Peel made a big contribution to the fall in crime in the second half of the nineteenth century. There were uniformed officers on the beat who tried to prevent theft and violence. They</i></p>

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

	<p><i>removed drunks, prostitutes and vagrants from the streets. On the other hand there is a great deal of evidence against the statement. Industrialisation was a major reason that the crime rate rose until 1850. Theft from the workplace became much more common. Factories, warehouses and shops were full of goods which could be stolen. So industrialisation provided new opportunities for thieves.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</p> <p>NOTE Answers at L4 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is some evidence which can support the statement. Firstly, it could be argued that the introduction of a professional police force under Robert Peel made a big contribution to the fall in crime in the second half of the nineteenth century. There were uniformed officers on the beat who tried to prevent theft and violence. They removed drunks, prostitutes and vagrants from the streets.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</p> <p>NOTE Answers at L3 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Level 2 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the statement but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>Yes, I agree because of Peel's introduction of the police force.</i> <i>No, it was more to do with industrialisation.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 2 answers will typically describe crime/related events, e.g.</p> <p><i>Crime gradually increased between 1750 and 1810, then there was a sharp increase until 1820.</i> <i>Theft was still the most frequent crime. Murders were rare.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Description of crime or related events without linking this to the question</p>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p>Level 1 answers will typically make general and unsupported assertions eg</p> <p><i>No, there were many other reasons that the crime rate went up and down. the government impact was limited.</i></p> <p>Nutshell General/ unsupported assertion(s)</p>
0 marks	

Section B: Britain in Peace and War, 1900–1918

Question 6a – 3 marks

In Interpretation A, the author tries to give the impression that young men were pressured into joining the army during the First World War. Identify and explain one way in which he does this.

Notes and guidance specific to the question set

Points marking (AO4): 1+1+1. 1 mark for identification of a relevant and appropriate way in which the illustrator portrays wealth and comfort + 1 mark for a basic explanation of this + 1 mark for development of this explanation.

Reminder – This question does not seek evaluation of the given interpretation, just selection of relevant material and analysis of this in relation to the issue in the question.

The explanation of how the author tries to give the impression that young men were pressured into joining the army during the First World War may analyse the interpretation or aspects of the interpretation by using the candidate's knowledge of the historical situation portrayed and / or to the method or approach used by the author. Knowledge and understanding of historical context must be intrinsically linked to the analysis of the interpretation in order to be credited. Marks must not be awarded for the demonstration of knowledge or understanding in isolation.

NOTE:

- **One mark is for correct identification of a feature in the interpretation that relates to the question.**
- **For the second 2 marks, the candidate must either: pick out a specific feature in the image and develop the explanation by making two points about it;**
- **OR give 2 examples relating to a more general feature.**

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

For example:

- *The author describes the impression given by the soldiers and the band (1). The main character comments on their shiny uniforms and the patriotic symbols of the Union Jack. (1) This makes it seem like he is being swept up in the nationalistic enthusiasm of the moment. (1)*
- *The author depicts the sergeant major as intimidating (1). His voice is described as 'commanding' and he points his stick into the crowd (1). This gives the reader the impression that Tommo is scared of not doing what he says (1).*
- *The author gives the impression that everyone is in favour of getting the young men to sign up (1). The crowd all shout 'No' to the sergeant major's question and then an old woman accuses Tommo of being a 'coward' (1). This makes it seem like Tommo is being bullied into joining up (1).*

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

<p>Question 6b – 5 marks If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand responses to recruitment during the First World War.</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 2 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 3 marks Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO2 are equal in levels 1 and 2, AO2 carries greater weight in level 3.</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 3 (5 marks) The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a strong understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain clearly how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	<p><i>Answers may choose to put forward lines of investigation by framing specific enquiry questions but it is possible to achieve full marks without doing this.</i> <i>Suggested lines of enquiry / areas for research may be into matters of specific detail or into broader themes but must involve use of second order concepts rather than mere discovery of new information if AO2 marks are to be awarded.</i> <i>Examples of areas for further research include: reasons that men volunteered to join the army (causation); reasons for the introduction of conscription in 1916 (causation); reasons that men did not join up or refused conscription later on (causation); what happened to men who did not join up or who refused conscription later on (consequence); how typical this kind of approach was from the army (similarity/difference/diversity); how many men joined up or accepted conscription compared to those who did not (similarity/difference/diversity).</i></p>
<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). It uses a general understanding of second order historical concept(s) to explain how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	
<p>Level 1 (1–2 mark) The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). It shows a basic understanding of second order historical concept(s) and attempts to link these to explanation of how further research on the chosen aspect would improve our understanding of the event or situation (AO2).</p>	
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 6b – 5 marks	
If you were asked to do further research on one aspect of Interpretation A, what would you choose to investigate? Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand responses to recruitment during the First World War.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 3 (5 marks)	<p>Answers at L3 will typically identify an impression given in Interpretation A and suggest a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept into this area. They will explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War e.g.</p> <p><i>[Causation]</i> <i>Interpretation A suggests that men only joined up to the army because they were bullied into it and influenced by propaganda. I would investigate whether this was the main reason that men joined up or whether there were other reasons too, such as wanting to help. This would help us to understand whether men actively supporting Britain's involvement in the war.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept to compare to an impression given by Interpretation. Indication of how this would improve understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War.</p>
Level 2 (3-4 marks)	<p>Answers at L2 will typically identify one or more valid lines of enquiry based on a second order concept and explain how this enquiry would increase understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War e.g.</p> <p><i>[Consequence]</i> <i>I would investigate what happened to men as a result of not joining up. This would allow us to see how they were treated by other members of society and therefore how much support for the war there was overall.</i></p> <p><i>[Causation]</i> <i>I would look at the reasons that some men refused to join up. This would allow us to understand whether they were morally against the war or whether it was more for personal reasons such as not wanting to leave businesses or family behind.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry based on second order concept with indication of how this would improve understanding of responses to recruitment during the First World War.</p>
Level 1 (1-2 marks)	<p>Answers at L1 will identify a valid line of enquiry based on a second order concept (2 marks) eg</p> <p><i>[Diversity]</i> <i>I would investigate how typical it was for men to actively volunteer compared to those who didn't want to join up.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid line of enquiry about responses to recruitment during the First World War based on second-order concept</p> <p>Alternatively, L1 answers may identify details from Interpretation A and suggest further investigation into them (1-2 marks) eg <i>I would look for more information about the role of the sergeant major. It would be interesting to know what his role was in recruitment. [2 marks]</i> OR <i>I would find out how many men joined up in 1914. [1 mark]</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Find out more about people / events / objects in Interpretation A – not based on second-order concept</p>
0 marks	

Question 7–12 marks Interpretations B and C both focus on the People’s Budget of 1909. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Levels AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 12 marks	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
Level 4 (10–12 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a very detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a convincing and valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a convincing and well-substantiated judgment of how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	<p><i>Answers could consider:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Comparison of provenance and source type alone, eg B is from a website for general public, C is by a political party.</i> • <i>Individual points of similarity/difference in content eg B says the Budget was a trap for the Lords while C says historians do not think this; B says the revenue raised was not important while C says it gave the Liberals the means to pass their social reforms. Both sources discuss how the Parliament Act took away power from the House of Lords.</i> • <i>Differences in the overall portrayal of motives of Budget eg B suggests it was entirely political to tame Lords whereas C suggests the primary aim was social reform.</i> • <i>Developed reasons for differences – purpose / audience, eg B is a popular website, trying to generate interest by making the story seem controversial and dramatic; C is positive, less cynical and reverential because writers are talking about their heroes.</i> <p><i>Marks for relevant knowledge and understanding should be awarded for the clarity and confidence with which candidates discuss features, events or issues mentioned or implied in the interpretations. Candidates who introduce extra relevant knowledge or show understanding of related historical issues can be rewarded for this, but it is not a target of the question.</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>
Level 3 (7–9 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers a detailed analysis of similarities and/or differences between the interpretations and gives a valid explanation of reasons why they may differ. There is a generally valid and clear judgment about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 2 (4–6 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Offers some valid analysis of differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and gives a reasonable explanation of at least one reason why they may differ, and a basic judgement about how far they differ, in terms of detail or in overall message, style or purpose (AO4).	
Level 1 (1–3 marks) Analyses the interpretations and identifies some features appropriate to the task. Identifies some differences and/or similarities between the interpretations and makes a limited attempt to explain why they may differ. There is either no attempt to assess how far they differ, or there is an assertion about this but it is completely unsupported (AO4).	
0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 7–12 marks	
Interpretations B and C both focus on the People’s Budget of 1909. How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Answers at L4 will typically compare the overall message about or portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget. They will support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. They will use the purpose of one or both of the interpretations to explain reasons for different portrayals, e.g.</p> <p><i>As L3, plus:</i> <i>I think the reason that B focuses on the power struggle surrounding the Budget is that it is trying to generate public interest in Edwardian history by making the story seem controversial and dramatic. [10 marks] But C is more positive about the Liberals and less cynical about their motives because the writers are talking about their heroes and want them to appear in a good light. [12 marks]</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C, with support. Difference explained with specific purpose of B or C</p> <p>NOTE: Award 10-11 marks for candidates who use the purpose of <u>one</u> interpretation to explain difference in portrayals. Award 12 marks for candidates which use the purpose of <u>both</u> interpretations to explain difference in portrayals. Do NOT allow undeveloped comments about provenance at this level, e.g. B is negative because it’s a popular website for the general public OR C is positive because it’s on the Liberal Democrats’ website.</p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p>Answers at L3 will typically compare the overall message about or portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget. They will support this with relevant reference to the content of the interpretations. Answers at this level may attempt to explain differences using undeveloped comments about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation B suggests the Liberals passed the 1911 Budget entirely for political reasons. It says that Lloyd George set a ‘trap’ for the Lords and basically gave them an excuse to tame the Lords’ power when they refused to pass it. It says this was Lloyd George’s ‘key aim’ and suggests the Liberals’ social reforms were a bi-product of this power struggle. However, Interpretation C suggests the Liberals were being driven by their battle to achieve social reform which ‘formed the foundation of Britain’s welfare state’.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals in B and C with support from one or both interpretations. NOTE: Answers with support from only one interpretation award 7 marks</p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p>Answers at L2 will typically use the content of the interpretations to compare individual points of similarity and/or difference e.g.</p> <p><i>B says the Budget was a trap for the Lords while C says historians do not think this.</i> <i>Both interpretations discuss how the Parliament Act took away power from the House of Lords.</i> <i>B says the Budget was ‘controversial’ and C agrees it was ‘important’.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Selects individual points of similarity or difference</p> <p>Answers at L2 will typically make a valid comparison of the motives for the 1909 Budget but fail to develop this with relevant support, e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation B suggests that the Liberals passed the Budget simply to reduce the Lords’ power but C says that their main motivation was to get their reforms passed.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Valid comparison of portrayals with no support</p>
Level 1 (1–3 marks)	<p>Answers at L1 will typically make simplistic comments about provenance e.g.</p> <p><i>They are different because B is from a website for the general public and C is by a political party.</i> <i>They are similar because they are both modern interpretations.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Comparison of simplistic provenance</p> <p>Alternatively, answers will explain or paraphrase the portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget one interpretation only, with no valid comparison e.g.</p>

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

	<i>Interpretation C suggests the Liberals were being driven by their battle to achieve social reform which 'formed the foundation of Britain's welfare state'.</i> Nutshell: Portrayal of the motives for the 1909 Budget in one interpretation explained with no valid comparison
0 marks	

<p>Question 8*–20 marks In his 2000 school textbook, <i>The Struggle for Peace in Northern Ireland</i>, author Ben Walsh argued that the main cause of the Home Rule crisis 1912–1914 was the fact that the Liberal government ‘needed the votes of the Nationalist MPs in order to pass their laws.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 5 (17–20 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of British attitudes towards the Empire.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 4 and 5, this must involve considering both the issue of the 1910 election and another reason for the Home Rule crisis.</i></p> <p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (why the Home Rule crisis arose); consequence (the results of these causes); and significance (relative importance of events/individuals in causing the crisis); but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: In the elections of 1910 the Liberals lost their majority and there was a hung Parliament. The Liberals were now dependent on Irish Nationalist support. This greatly increased the influence of the Nationalists. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. However, this led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and they rallied around Carson and Craig in protest, making it clear they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p>
<p>Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	
<p>Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	
<p>Level 2 (5–8 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).</p>	

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

<i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
<p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<p>0 marks No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: The importance of other prior or subsequent events in leading to the crisis, eg the growth of Irish nationalism by 1900 and the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond meant that more pressure was applied to the Liberals. Alternatively, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Larne gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat; the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation. Another possible argument is that Asquith could have dealt with two private armies had senior British Army officers near Dublin not said they would resign if they were ordered to enforce Home Rule in Ulster (the Curragh Mutiny) – this meant that Asquith could not rely on the British Army.</i></p>

<p>Question 8*–20 marks In his 2000 school textbook, <i>The Struggle for Peace in Northern Ireland</i>, author Ben Walsh argued that the main cause of the Home Rule crisis 1912–1914 was the fact that the Liberal government ‘needed the votes of the Nationalist MPs in order to pass their laws.’ How far do you agree with this view?</p>	
<p>Guidance and indicative content</p>	
<p>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</p>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid clinging argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also some evidence to go against this interpretation. For example, Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists. Also, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Lame gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat because the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation. Finally, it could be argued that it was really only the actions of the British Army that caused an actual crisis. Asquith could have dealt with two private armies had senior British Army officers near not said they would resign if they were ordered to enforce Home Rule in Ulster (the Curragh Mutiny) – this meant that Asquith could not rely on the British Army.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I think it depends what we mean by ‘crisis’. The dependence of the Liberals on the Nationalist MPs certainly led to the Liberals agreeing to pass a Home Rule Bill. However, it was not inevitable that this meant danger of civil war until later events like the Curragh Mutiny followed.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinging argument = 20 marks</p>
<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</p>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by at least three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also some evidence to go against this interpretation. For example, Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists. Also, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Lame gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat because the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support NOTE 1: Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three. NOTE 2: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinging argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</p>
<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>I don’t agree because Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists. Also, it could be argued that it was only the formation of the UVF in 1913 and the Lame gun running which turned opposition to Home Rule into a serious threat because the Irish Volunteers were then formed by the nationalists in retaliation.</i></p>

	<p>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also some evidence to go against this interpretation. For example, Irish nationalism had grown tremendously by 1900, shown by the success of the moderate Irish Parliamentary Party under John Redmond. So more pressure was being applied to the Liberals to pass Home Rule anyway, even without the deal with the Nationalists.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</p> <p>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</p>
<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence to agree with the interpretation. After 1910 the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support. They helped the Liberals get through their welfare reforms and the Parliament Act. In return for their support, the Liberals agreed to grant Home Rule to Ireland and this became law in 1912. This led to the crisis because the Unionists would not accept this and said they would use armed force to resist Home Rule and form their own government in Ulster.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</p> <p>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</p>
<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because after 1910 there was a hung parliament and so the Liberals were dependent on Irish Nationalist support.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe the crisis/ other relevant events OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>The Unionists would not accept Home Rule and said they would use armed force to resist it.</i></p> <p><i>No, a crisis was inevitable anyway because Nationalists and Unionists disagreed with each other.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Description of the crisis or other related events without linking this to the question OR general, unsupported assertions.</p>
<p>0 marks</p>	

<p>Question 9*–20 marks In her podcast on the Historical Association website, historian June Hannam said that in the period 1910 to 1914 ‘the government was reluctant to take the step of giving women the vote because of women’s militancy.’ How far do you agree with this view of government responses to the campaign for women’s suffrage?</p>	
<p>Levels AO1 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. Maximum 5 marks AO2 Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. Maximum 5 marks AO4 Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. Maximum 10 marks</p>	<p>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</p>
<p>Level 5 (17–20 marks) Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers may be awarded some marks at Level 1 if they demonstrate any knowledge of the nature and extent of support for women’s suffrage.</i> <i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 4 and 5, this must involve considering both the issue of women’s militancy as a reason for the government not granting women the vote, plus another reason.</i></p>
<p>Level 4 (13–16 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<p><i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of causation (reasons that the government did not grant women the vote); change and continuity (in the methods women were using to campaign for the vote); consequence (impact of militancy and political beliefs); but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: Responses which describe/explain the impact of militancy upon public opinion only (as opposed to the government between 1910 and 1914) should be credited at Level 1.</i></p>
<p>Level 3 (9–12 marks) Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<p><i>Grounds for agreeing include: . From 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. There is evidence of a hardening government attitude as the campaign turned more militant, eg force feeding and the Cat and Mouse Act.</i></p>
<p>Level 2 (5–8 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. Attempts a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the interpretation (AO4).</p>	<p><i>Grounds for disagreeing include: Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, so this cannot have been the only</i></p>

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

<i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>	
<p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) involved in the issue (AO2). Understands and addresses the issue in the question and understands how this is shown in the interpretation e.g. identifying key words, etc. (AO4) There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about the interpretation, or there is an assertion about the interpretation but this lacks any support or historical validity. <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	<p><i>reason for refusing women the vote; the Liberals were more concerned with pushing through their social reforms than with granting the vote to women; there were political concerns from the Liberal government that enfranchising women on the same basis as men would disadvantage the Liberals in elections as middle class women were more likely to vote Conservative; there remained ideological beliefs about giving women the vote, eg a women's sphere being the home, etc.</i></p>
<p>0 marks</p>	
<p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p>Question 9*–20 marks In her podcast on the Historical Association website, historian June Hannam said that in the period 1910 to 1914 ‘the government was reluctant to take the step of giving women the vote because of women’s militancy.’ How far do you agree with this view of government responses to the campaign for women’s suffrage?</p>	
<p>Guidance and indicative content</p>	
<p>NOTE: Responses which describe/explain the impact of militancy <u>upon public opinion only</u> (as opposed to the government between 1910 and 1914) should be credited at Level 1.</p>	
<p>Level 5 (17-20 marks)</p>	<p>Level 5 answers will typically set out a balanced argument explicitly supported by at least 4 valid examples. For 20 marks, candidates must present a valid clinching argument e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. This can be seen in the government’s hardening of attitude after the escalation of militancy, for example by passing the Cat and Mouse Act.</i></p> <p><i>However, there is also lots of evidence to go against the interpretation. For example, Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, and they were rejected, so this cannot have been the only reason for refusing women the vote. One possibility is that the Liberal government were worried that giving women the vote on the same basis as men would disadvantage them in elections, as middle class women were more likely to vote Conservative.</i></p> <p><i>Overall I only partly agree with the statement. Whilst militancy was certainly not the only reason that the government did not enfranchise women by 1914, it is definitely the case that as long as the WSPU were carrying out a high-profile militant campaign, the government were never going to give in.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; two valid supporting examples each side <u>OR</u> three on one side and one on the other. Clinching argument = 20 marks</p>
<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</p>	<p>Level 4 answers will typically construct a balanced or one-sided answer explicitly supported by at least three valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. This can be seen in the government’s hardening of attitude after the escalation of militancy, for example by passing the Cat and Mouse Act. However, there is also evidence to go against the interpretation. For example, Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, and they were rejected, so this cannot have been the only reason for refusing women the vote.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced or one-sided argument; three explained points of support NOTE 1: Answers at L4 may attempt more than three points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for three. NOTE 2: It is likely that candidates at this level will attempt a clinching argument but this will be more of a summary or assertion/repetition of earlier arguments.</p>
<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</p>	<p>Level 3 answers will typically construct a one-sided answer explicitly supported by two valid examples e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot of evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. The government did not want to be seen as giving in to militant tactics, especially as after 1913 public</i></p>

J411/16

Mark Scheme

June 2019

	<p><i>opinion was turning against the WSPU – many influential members were leaving, whilst the NUWSS was growing. This can be seen in the government’s hardening of attitude after the escalation of militancy, for example by passing the Cat and Mouse Act.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument, two explained points of support</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 3 answers will construct a balanced argument with each side explicitly supported by one example, e.g.</p> <p><i>There is a lot evidence that to support the interpretation. For example, from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage. However, there is also evidence to go against the interpretation. For example, Private Members Bills for giving the vote to women were regularly put to the government before the campaign turned militant, and they were rejected, so this cannot have been the only reason for refusing women the vote.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Balanced argument; one explained point on each side</p> <p>NOTE: Answers at L3 may attempt more than two points but only provide explicit supporting evidence for two</p>
<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</p>	<p>Level 2 answers will typically construct a one-sided argument explicitly supported by one valid example, e.g.</p> <p><i>I agree because from 1911 onwards, as militancy escalated, each time the issue was raised in parliament, there was an increasing majority opposed to women’s suffrage.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: One sided argument; one explained point of support</p> <p>NOTE: Answers at L2 may attempt more than one point but only provide explicit supporting evidence for one</p>
<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</p>	<p>Level 1 answers will typically identify valid reason(s) to support and/or challenge the interpretation but without full explanation or supporting evidence, e.g.</p> <p><i>No, I don’t agree because actually it was more to do with the Liberals thinking they would do badly out of giving women the vote.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation</p> <p>Alternatively, Level 1 answers will typically describe the campaigns/relevant events OR make general, unsupported assertions e.g.</p> <p><i>The WSPU used direct action to get their point across. For example, they smashed windows and slashed paintings in art galleries.</i></p> <p><i>No, women weren’t equal so the government were against it anyway.</i></p> <p>Nutshell: Description of campaigns or related events without linking this to the question OR general, unsupported assertions.</p> <p>NOTE: Responses which describe/explain the impact of militancy <u>upon public opinion only</u> (as opposed to the government between 1910 and 1914) should be credited at Level 1.</p>
<p>0 marks</p>	

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2019

