

1. Principles of Assessment

Examiners are encouraged to exercise their professional discretion and judgement in the assessment of answers. The schemes that follow are a guide and may at times be inapplicable to answers that tackle questions in an unusual, though acceptable, manner. Where examiners find it necessary to adapt the mark scheme to the needs of such answers, written comments should make clear the basis on which such decisions were made.

Examiners should at all times mark positively rather than negatively, i.e. reward candidates for what they know and understand rather than penalising them for what they do not know or understand. Examiners should bear in mind that the examination is designed for a wide ability range and should therefore make full use of the whole range of marks available.

2. Date of marking

Do **NOT** date scripts. Each script should be numbered consecutively and marking should be completed in centre number order.

3. Addition of marks

Marks for each sub-question should be placed in the right hand margin. The final total for an answer must be ringed and placed in the right-hand margin and transferred to the front sheet. Do not write comments in the right hand margin. The level awarded should be noted in the left-hand margin as L1, L2 etc.

4. Annotation

The marking of questions is discussed in paragraph 5 below. Examiners must ensure that their marking is not only accurate and consistent, but that it is easy to follow. Marking conventions as described in the mark schemes and exemplified at standardisation must be followed. Every answer must show evidence in the body of the work that it has been marked.

Answers should be analysed as follows:

- Underline with a straight line the key points of reasoning and argument; indicate flawed reasoning, irrelevance or error with a wavy line (in the left hand margin if the passages are lengthy).
- A cross or encirclement may be used for errors of fact; a question mark may be used to indicate a dubious or ambiguous assertion; an omission mark to indicate the absence of material that might reasonably be expected.

5. Marking of questions

Levels of response

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

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

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

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

6. Maps and diagrams drawn by candidates

A map or diagram which relates directly to the set question, which is substantially accurate and which suggests (e.g. by location of places and boundaries) firmer historical understanding of the question than that shown by the candidate's written work alone should receive credit.

7. Note form

If you encounter the use of note form treat it on its merits. Unintelligible or flimsy notes will deserve little, if any, credit. If an answer consists of notes which are full and readily intelligible, award it the appropriate conceptual level but go to the bottom end of that level.

8. Comments by examiners on answers and on scripts

Examiners should feel free to comment on a part of an answer, a whole answer or a complete script to clarify the basis on which marks have been awarded. Such comments are of assistance to Team Leaders and to any others who may have reason to look further at a marked script at a later stage. These comments must represent professional judgements and must be related to the criteria for the award of marks. Negative comments should not, of course, be employed as an opportunity to vent the examiner's frustration. For example, 'irrelevant' may be an acceptable comment; 'hopeless' is not.

9. Consistency

Examiners should apply a uniform standard of assessment throughout their marking once that standard has been approved by their Team Leader. They should not try to find extra marks for candidates. It is the duty of an examiner to see that the standard of marking does not vary in any particular area of the mark range.

10. Spread of marks

Undue 'bunching' of marks is very undesirable. In particular, examiners should not hesitate to give high marks, and should go up to the maximum if it is deserved.

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

11. Rubric offences

- (a) A candidate who offends against the rubric of a paper should have all the answers marked and the best answers counted up to the required number within a particular paper or section of a paper.
- (b) A candidate who offends against the rubric of a question which allows an internal choice should have the entire question marked, and should be credited with the parts best attempted, counted up to the required number. An answer that offends against the rubric and that does not score should be indicated thus: QU.2. RUBRIC OFFENCE. DO NOT SCORE.

12. Illegibility

Scripts which are impossible to read or which contain offensive or disturbing comments should be marked 'E' on the front cover and forwarded (separately) to the Assessment Leader for History at Edexcel after the script has been marked and the mark recorded. Such scripts will be considered separately by the Principal Examiners at the conclusion of the awarding meeting.

13. Quality of written communication

The marking of the quality of written communication is embedded within the levels of response of some questions. It forms one of the considerations for deciding reward within a level.

General Instructions

(applicable to both Sections A and B)

In questions where each level contains a range of marks, bullet points one and two should be used to decide the level which the answer has reached. When awarding marks within a level, move up or down from the mid-point according to the extent to which the remaining criteria are met.

SECTION A

Question 1(a)

Study Source 1.

In what ways, according to the author of Source 1, do 'grassroots history' (line 1) and 'traditional academic history' (line 4) differ? (6 marks)

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

The answer shows the ability to:

- comprehend and begin to analyse the key points of argument.
- select appropriately from the source material in support of the analysis offered. (1-2 marks)

Level 2

- The answer shows the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the author. (3-4 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows the ability to explore the arguments offered with confidence and discrimination.
- Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence selected will show that the work has been fully assimilated. (5-6 marks)

INDICATIVE CONTENT

Effectively a 'comprehension' starter. Comment on the differences is dotted through the text rather than being concentrated in one place: a capacity for inference and for organising / structuring material will be needed to access the highest level. The main differences identified in the text are:

- traditional history focuses on high politics, 'grassroots' history on ordinary people
- traditional history is (relatively) old-established, 'grassroots' history is new-fangled
- in traditional history the historians' questions arise out of the source material while in 'grassroots' history the questions asked determine the source material sought

L1: **Simple statements** extracted from the source i.e. **quotation/citation** rather than explanation. (1-2)

L2: Developed statements, in which an individual point or points of difference are explained with secure reference from the source. Expect two of the differences identified above to feature at this level. (3-4)

L3: Developed explanation, with individual points of difference clearly explained and some overall structuring of the explanation. All three points identified above should feature if higher L3 is to be awarded, but an answer which is notably well-organised and well-referenced could go to lower L3 without being comprehensive in its coverage. (5-6)

Question 1(b)

Use your own knowledge.

Identify one major political decision you have studied which was influenced in some way by the 'common people' (see Source 1, line 1). In relation to the decision you identify, use your own knowledge to explain the nature and extent of the impact the 'common people' had on the thinking of those in political authority. (14 marks)

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

- The answer shows adequate understanding of the proposition and demonstrates some conceptual awareness.
- Historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question is adequate and appropriately selected.
- The answer offers some development of the analytical points made.
- The candidate will be able to analyse complex historical ideas which will be communicated in logical and generally well-structured ways. (1-5 marks)

Level 2

- The answer shows a clear understanding of the analytical demands of the question, demonstrating secure conceptual awareness.
- The historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question will be secure, and well selected, demonstrating an understanding of period, as appropriate.
- Points are adequately developed and some may be convincingly thought through.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed. (6-10 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows a clear and complete understanding of the analytical demands of the question.
- Historical knowledge will be related precisely and effectively to the question set, demonstrating confidence in moving between generalisation and detailed discussion.
- The author's argument is fully analysed and the candidates' argument in response is convincingly developed.
- The answer displays independence of thought in its ability to assess the validity of the author's view.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas and concepts will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed throughout. (11-14 marks)

INDICATIVE CONTENT

This question is designed to give candidates an opportunity to do some empirical history. The main criteria for deciding between levels here are:

- appropriateness of the choice of political decision
- quality of explanation of the nature of the common people's impact on the decision
- quality of explanation of the extent of the common people's impact. NB This criterion is the one which is likely to allow differentiation between solid / competent work on the one hand and very good work on the other
- quality of supporting evidence

- L1: Simple statements. At this level answers will lack sharp focus on a single decision - or, alternatively, a choice of decision is made which doesn't clearly lend itself to discussion of the influence of the 'common people'. There will be description or flawed analysis of nature of common people's impact rather than sustained analysis of it. The 'extent' dimension of the question will not be addressed and supporting evidence will be limited. (1-5)
- L2: Developed statements. At this level candidates will select a decision which facilitates discussion of the impact of 'common people', though at the lower end of the level there may not be focus on a single decision (e.g. candidates may discuss 'appeasement' in general rather than, say, the decision at Munich to cede the Sudetenland to Nazi Germany). There will, however, be clear focus on, and sustained analysis of, the nature of the common people's impact and supporting evidence will be solid. The comparative dimension of the question (i.e. consideration of 'extent' - assessment of the importance of the 'common people' in relation to other factors at work) will be either neglected (lower L2) or treatment of it limited in development (higher L2). (6-10)
- L3: Developed explanation. The decision will be notable well-selected given the thrust of the question and will facilitate a stimulating discussion of the relative importance of the impact of the common people and other factors. There will be a balanced and penetrating analysis of both nature and extent of the common people's impact and supporting evidence will be detailed and intelligently deployed. (11-14)

Question 1(c)

Study Sources 1 and 2, and use your own knowledge.

'History is an argument without end' (Source 2, line 43). How do you account for the frequency with which historians disagree in their interpretations of the past? Develop your answer by making use of both sources and by specific reference to any historical period or periods you have studied. (20 marks)

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

- The answer shows adequate understanding of at least one proposition and, in considering it, demonstrates some conceptual awareness.
- The historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question is adequate and appropriately selected.
- The answer offers some development of the analytical points made.
- The candidate will be able to analyse complex historical ideas which will be communicated in logical and generally well-structured ways. (1-6 marks)

Level 2

- The answer demonstrates secure conceptual awareness, showing a clear understanding of the arguments of at least one source and offering integrated responses calling on other reading and appropriately selected historical knowledge.
- The historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question will be secure and well selected, demonstrating an understanding of period, as appropriate.
- Points are adequately developed and some may be convincingly thought through.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed. (7-14 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows a clear and complete understanding of the analytical demands of the question and its full conceptual demands are met.
- Historical knowledge will be related precisely and effectively to the question set, demonstrating confidence in moving between generalisation and detailed discussion.
- The author's arguments are assimilated and the candidate's argument in response is convincingly developed.
- The answer displays independence of thought in its ability to assess the validity of the presented views (Sources 1 and 2) in the light of own knowledge and reading.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas and concepts will be communicated throughout in writing which is well-controlled, coherent and well directed. (15-20 marks)

INDICATIVE CONTENT

There is a lot in the sources to get candidates under way. The two main points to be derived from the sources, are:

- that the political outlook or bias of historians can influence what they write (see Source 1, lines 29-39)
- that evidence is fragmentary and incomplete, forcing historians towards conjecture - with the result that the same evidence may be read differently (see Source 2, lines 14-37)

There are, however, other points that could be made on the basis of the sources, such as (i) the idea that **history is written for consumption by different audiences** (and hence differs) and (ii) that **historians go to the evidence with different questions and get different answers**. 'Own knowledge' could provide development / exemplification of these points and /or new ideas and arguments, such as the idea that succeeding generations re-write history in the light of their own preoccupations (hinted at in final paragraph of Source 2). The higher part of the top level should be reserved for those who offer new ideas, not just development / exemplification of ideas in the sources.

- L1: **Simple statements** extracted from the sources with only limited explanation or development from own knowledge OR set-piece accounts of an historical debate based on 'own knowledge' offered with no, or only limited, adaptation. (1-6)
- L2: **Developed statements** in which ideas (almost certainly source-based) are not merely extracted/cited/recycled but explained/contextualised. Answers may however lack range and/or explanations may be partial/flawed/under-developed. (7-14)
- L3: Developed and sustained explanation. **Wide-ranging, clearly structured, authoritative writing which offers a coherent synthesis of material from the sources and 'own knowledge'**. (15-20)

SECTION B

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1

- The answer shows adequate understanding of the focus of the question, demonstrating some conceptual awareness.
- Historical knowledge related to the question is adequate and appropriately selected.
- The answer offers some development of the analytical points made.
- The candidate will be able to analyse complex historical ideas which will be communicated in logical and generally well-structured ways. (1-6 marks)

Level 2

- The candidate offers an answer which shows a clear understanding of the analytical demands of the question and demonstrates secure conceptual awareness.
- Historical knowledge deployed in relation to the question will be well selected, secure and accurate.
- Points are adequately developed, some may be convincingly thought through.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed. (7-14 marks)

Level 3

- The answer shows a complete and clear understanding of the analytical demands of the question and its full conceptual demands are met.
- Historical knowledge will be related precisely and effectively to the questions set, demonstrating confidence in moving between generalisation and detailed discussion.
- All arguments are convincingly developed and the answer displays genuine independence of thought.
- The candidate's ability to analyse complex historical ideas and concepts will be communicated in writing which is controlled, coherent and well-directed throughout. (15-20 marks)

2. *'History is shaped just as much by chance as it is by long-term social and economic trends.'* To what extent do you agree with this claim? Develop your answer by specific reference to any historical period or periods you have studied.

Discussions here need to be centred squarely on causation in history if the higher levels are to be accessed. There may be candidates who focus a single case study or who offer a series of case studies, without addressing, or without addressing sufficiently, the larger issues raised in the question. It's difficult to see how pieces of empirical historical writing of this kind which address the question in only a limited way can get beyond Level 1. Some candidates with a broader perspective may well see the question as an opportunity to offer a critique (or perhaps, alternatively, an endorsement) of Marxist historiography. Answers of this kind, if well-pointed, well-informed and supported by relevant examples could in principle go to the top of Level 3. On the other hand, explicit and sustained emphasis on Marxism isn't essential for the top level. One basis for distinguishing between the good (L2) and the very good (L3) might be what is made of the concept of 'chance': events might be said to be shaped by short-term 'political' causes but to equate these with 'chance' is something the ablest candidates may not do.

3. *'All political careers end in failure.'* How valid, in your judgement, is this claim? Develop your answer by specific reference to the political careers of historical figures you have studied.

Two things should be looked for in higher-level work here: a clear argument in relation to the quotation (yes, they do/ no, they don't) and good exemplification. Exemplification needs to have range (answers based on one political career only are unlikely to get beyond low Level 2 (7-9 marks), whatever their other merits) as well as depth. It would, of course, be legitimate to explore the issue of failure (failure on whose terms?) and this may be a characteristic of the highest-quality work. On the other hand, beware of word-spinning. This question is aimed at those whose intellectual tastes lie in the area of empirical history rather than theorising of a more abstract kind: the capacity to argue a case and to support it effectively is the main thing looked for. Contemporary careers can be accepted but answers constructed around contemporary careers *only* (e.g. Bush, Blair) are likely to be no more than lower Level 2 at best (maximum 10 marks)

4. *'Difficult to research and of its essence partisan.'* How acceptable do you find this comment on gender history? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own studies and to historical works you have read.

The question contains two distinct claims and both need to be addressed in a developed way if answers are to get to higher Level 2 or to Level 3. An answer confined to one or the other cannot really get beyond mid Level 2 at best. 'Difficult to research' invites consideration of whether women are 'hidden from history' by the paucity of source material. Blanket endorsements of this proposition are less likely to impress than nuanced judgements which suggest that source material is scarcer for those outside social and political elites than for those within, and that some aspects of women's lives are more difficult to research than others. 'Partisan' here suggests that gender history, or more specifically women's history, is by its nature sympathetic to the women written about. It's a proposition which may be either endorsed or challenged: what will matter is the quality and perceptiveness of the reasoning and the persuasiveness of the supporting evidence. Particularly welcome will be arguments supported by reference to specific, named works of gender history.

5. *'Television history is only worthwhile if it confines itself to topics where visual evidence is of paramount importance.'* To what extent do you agree with this assertion? Develop your answer by reference to your own historical reading and viewing.

An argument for or against the assertion, obviously a nuanced one at the higher levels, is what is looked for, along with secure exemplification. Much popular TV history has not been produced in accordance with the self-denying ordinance suggested in the question, and candidates therefore might be inclined to make out a case in favour of such programmes rather than condemning them. If this indeed proves to be the most common line taken, look for well-supported arguments as to why TV history of this kind might be deemed 'worthwhile'. Answers which are effectively confined to the suggestion that such TV is educative are perhaps likely to be in the lower part of the range (L1, low L2). The best work (good L2 and L3) ought to give consideration to TV history programmes which do focus on topics where visual evidence is important (art history and maybe military history being possible cases in point) rather than just ignoring this element in the question and thus turning it into a generic question about the merits / demerits of TV history in general. Such 'generic' answers ought not to get beyond Level 2 and would have to be impressive on their own terms to get that far.

