

Advanced Extension

Mark Scheme

GCE

Advanced Extension Award History 9846 (Paper 01)

- General instructions for examiners pp 2-4
- Operational mark scheme for 2004 paper pp 5-12

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 shown by the candidate's written work alone should receive credit. Analytical links indicated in such a way in a final hurried answer should be given credit.

Where one word or single phrase answer is appropriate to answer a sub-question, candidates should not be penalised for using note form. If you encounter the use of note form in a sub-question which requires extended writing, 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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 answers 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.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE MARKING AND SUBMISSION OF SCRIPTS

General points

- (a) All batches of scripts selected by the examiner for sending to the Team Leader should be from a range of centres and, more importantly, should contain a wide range of responses. To get together suitably varied and appropriate batches, examiners will inevitably have to sort through different packages of scripts and should be prepared to do this. Team Leaders attach much importance to their reviewing of marked scripts in the early and early middle stages of the examining period, when they hope to be able to guide members of their team towards acceptable standards of marking in all parts of the paper(s). They will find it difficult to give adequate guidance if they are not provided with a wide range of scripts.
- (b) Any changes to the mark scheme which are agreed at the Standardisation Meeting are mandatory and must be uniformly applied. The examiner will be provided with a copy of the revised mark scheme and should leave the old mark scheme at the Standardisation Meeting.
- (c) Alterations to scripts in the light of the requirements of the Team Leader must be made by the examiner in red. Such alterations are mandatory.
- (d) It is essential that alterations to marking which are required by the Team Leader should be made in the script in which such alterations are specially requested and also in other scripts, already marked, where such alterations are appropriate. The required alterations should then be applied in the marking of all subsequent scripts.
- (e) First class post (NOT recorded delivery) is to be used in all communication between an examiner and the Team Leader.

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)

To what extent, according to the author of Source 1, do political and social historians differ in their approaches to the analysis of change in history? (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

NB Two general points

- This is a question about **differing approaches** to the **analysis of change**, and *not* a question about the **differences between political and social historians in general** – that is, it's not a question about the **different topics** political and social historians study and the **different kinds of evidence** they use. 'General' responses here which don't focus tightly on differing approaches to the analysis of change can't get beyond L1
- The wording is 'To what extent ...' not 'In what ways ...'** but the material on 'extent' is subtle and not at all easy to spot. Reserve higher L3 for those who do spot it but allow very well developed work on ways to get to lower L3 (5 marks out of 6)

Level 1 (1-2) should be awarded **either** to answers which do not focus tightly on the analysis of change (see above) **or** to answers which consist essentially of **simple statements only**. In this context 'simple statements' means work showing understanding of a way in which political and social historians differ but which does not get beyond **citation or quotation of relevant passages** from Arnold, with **no evidence** or only **very limited evidence, of a capacity to get beyond the surface of the text** and to make inferences or to explain things in the candidate's own words. Candidates might, for example, quote to the effect that for political historians, change comes about 'through human competence or incompetence; its is affected by strength of ideologies; and it is subject to a degree of chance' whereas social historians people are 'moved to action' by their 'social and economic circumstances'

At **Level 2** (3-4) there will be an evident and to some degree **successful attempt to offer an explanation of ways in which political and social historians differ** as opposed to quoting passages and leaving the reader to work out their significance. The key point which needs to be understood and communicated **at this level** is that Arnold suggest that political historians view change as matter of human agency (a 'top-down' view of change) whereas social historians are to a degree economic determinists (a 'bottom-up' view of change). For higher L2 and lower L3 (4-5 marks) look as well for clear-minded explanation of

the point that social historians, under the influence of sociology and anthropology and as a result of increasing interest in 'culture' are not **merely** economic determinists.

At higher **Level 3** (6 marks) answers will **focus sharply and tightly on points of difference**; and points are likely to be made and explored in a **well controlled, orderly and coherent** sequence. **The issue of extent of differences between political and social historians will also be addressed.** The most likely way in which this might be done is that (very able) candidates will point out that in his second and third paragraphs Arnold is talking about narrative /'Great Man' political historians (political historians of the 'crudest', later 19th century, sort) and not about **all** political historians - and that at the start of his fifth paragraph he maintains that practically all historians nowadays (**by implication, not only social historians but political historians too**) are marxists with a small 'm'. Also to be rewarded is the point out that Arnold implies in para one political historians ideology can be a factor bringing about change and suggests in his final paragraph that contemporary cultural historians think the same way.

A final decision on whether to allow good 'ways' only work to lower L3 or to restrict L3 to those who address 'extent' can be left to the standardising meeting and can be discussed in the light of work see. In pre-standardisation marking, though, allow impressively controlled and developed 'ways' only work to get to 5 marks.

QUESTION 1 (b)

The author of Source 1 acknowledges that there were and are some men and women who might be called 'great'. Using your own knowledge, identify an historical figure from any period you have studied who in your judgement deserves to be called 'great', and explain why you believe this to be so. (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 and plausibility of **the choice of historical figure**
- **quality of explanation of 'greatness'** – the chosen figure's influence and impact are central here, but also relevant is consideration of the criteria of 'greatness' are made explicit
- the **quality of supporting evidence** offered

NB Two general points

- (i) The wording 'historical figure from any period you have studied' was intended to steer candidates away from contemporary, living individuals but if such individuals do feature look closely at the quality of explanation and, in particular, of supporting evidence. 'Historical' does not preclude those whose greatness arose from intellect or charisma rather than political impact or influence – but if the likes of Shakespeare or Beethoven appear their 'greatness' needs to be explored in historical rather than aesthetic terms.
- (ii) It may be that answers will be encountered in which candidates concentrate on contesting the validity of 'Great Man' theories of history rather than making a choice and justifying it. Answers of this kind would comprehensively evade the question and cannot really be allowed beyond L1.

Level 1 answers (1-5 marks) will consist largely or exclusively of **simple statements**. They may very well be answers of the 'potted biography' kind – there will be some accurate information but the figure's life and achievements will be **described** rather than **evaluated**. There may be **assertion with either no support or only limited support**. No attempt will be made to make criteria of 'greatness' explicit.

Level 2 (6-10 marks) At this level focus will be maintained pretty securely (which is not necessarily to say really tightly throughout) on the **chosen figure's impact and influence**. There will be **developed statements** relating to this impact and influence – that is, statements which are both historically well-founded and supported with a fair amount of accurate evidence. Answers will as well - particularly at the higher end of the level - have **clearly discernible shape and order**, with points clearly made and logically sequenced. The evaluative comment will, however, be **workmanlike rather than really penetrating or perceptive** by very good A Level standards and the criteria of 'greatness' being used are likely to be wholly or largely implicit as opposed to being made explicit in a developed way.

Level 3 (11-15 marks). Essentially analysis of impact and influence which is by very good A Level standards **sustained, wide-ranging, well-ordered and penetrating**. Command of historical context will be very secure and **supporting evidence will be detailed and intelligently deployed**. There is also likely to be **explicit, high-order consideration of criteria of 'greatness'** – for example, consideration not only of the scale and extent of the figure's influence but also (eg) of whether 'greatness' is a value-laden term which can't be used to describe the activities of the Hitlers and Stalins (Arnold's 'Really Awful Men') or whether the 'great' are servants of those whom they lead as opposed to imposing their personal aspirations, whims and agendas on their followers.

QUESTION 1 (c)

‘Change in history must come about because of changes in economic conditions.’ How far do you agree that this view has been highly influential, and how persuasive do you find it? You should in your answer make reference to both sources and to your own historical reading. (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 authors’ 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 **15-20 marks**

INDICATIVE CONTENT

NB Two general points

- This is **in part** a **source-based question**. The best work (L3) will be **an impressive synthesis of material from the sources and ‘own knowledge’**: the least impressive answers (L1) will work very closely from the sources with little or nothing added from ‘own knowledge’. Candidates whose ideas derive very largely or entirely from the sources but who exemplify and develop them very well from ‘own knowledge’ can certainly get to Level 3.
- The question set involves two distinct tasks – one concerning the **influence** of the idea that change is driven by changes in economic conditions, the other concerning the **persuasiveness** of this view. L1 answers may concentrate on one at the expense of the others; L2 answers will address both, but perhaps not in balanced fashion; L3 answers should offer a balanced and effective treatment of both aspects.

Influence

Both Sources 1 and 2 acknowledge the influence of the idea that economic conditions shape historical development - Source 1 by saying that practically all historians nowadays are Marxists with a small ‘m’, Source 2 by saying that Marx’s ideas are ‘seductive’ and that it is true within limits that they have influenced social and economic history. On the other hand, there is plenty in the sources to suggest that there are limits to the influence of economic determinism – some political historians take a different view of historical causation (Source 1), social historians have been heavily influenced by ideas from sociology

and anthropology (Source 1), economic history as a discipline has drifted away from mainstream history and is not greatly influenced by Marxism (Source 2), cultural historians don't owe their methodology heavily or exclusively to Marx (Sources 1 and 2), gender history challenges the idea of 'class analysis and economic determinism' The hope is that candidates will be able to support or develop some of these insights through their own knowledge / reading.

Persuasiveness

The ablest candidates may very well have ideas of their own on the persuasiveness of economic determinism but for others there is a good deal in the sources on alternative theories of historical change – the political historians' model (change comes about through human agency), the cultural historians' model (ideology can be influential as a factor in change) and the gender historians' model.

At **Level 1** (1-6 marks), answers may focus entirely or very largely on influence or persuasiveness and as a result be **very seriously unbalanced** – although they may treat both aspects in a lightweight, underdeveloped way, offering simple statements on the two. Answers are also likely to be **exclusively or very heavily source-based**, with little or nothing offered in the way of evidence of independent reading or own knowledge. Lightweight responses based on own knowledge but neglecting the sources are a possibility but an unlikely one. The treatment of influence and persuasiveness might well be run together.

At **Level 2** (7-14 marks), both influence and persuasiveness will be addressed but answers might lean, perhaps quite heavily, in the direction of one or the other, most likely the former. At L2 the likelihood is that influence and persuasiveness will be discussed separately but be prepared to comb for relevance and balance work which isn't divided into two distinct sections. Answers at this level may be **quite heavily source-based** but there should be **some** clear evidence of 'own knowledge': it is likely to appear in the form of historical examples or case studies which are used to back up or endorse ideas which appear in the text. Expect '**own knowledge**' to be **relevant and accurate if not wide-ranging**.

At **Level 3** (15-20 marks) there will be a **balanced, highly assured treatment** of both influence and persuasiveness. In all probability they will at this level be treated separately but don't assume that answers lacking a clear two-part structure are by definition sub-Level 3. 'Own knowledge' / evidence of independent reading will be extensive, wide-ranging and, by very good A Level standards, highly impressive. At this Level 'own knowledge' / independent reading is likely to be used not only to offer case studies which back up ideas derived from the sources but also as the basis of ideas and arguments deployed when 'persuasiveness' in particular is being discussed. Candidates are likely, that is, to have a well-developed prior acquaintance with 'Marxist' ideas on historical change but NB the question is answerable, and answerable to a high level, by those who do not have such prior acquaintance. NB also - don't be over-impressed by candidates who have encountered Marxist historiography in one particular A Level context (Marxist interpretations of the English Revolution, for instance) and who take the opportunity to offer an answer consists essentially of a description of the historiography of one event or episode.

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

INDICATIVE CONTENT

2. **'Imagination is chief among the qualities needed by the historian.' To what extent do you agree with this view? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own historical reading and study.**

The question has a clear **comparative** dimension. In mid-range work and above (Levels 2 and 3) there should be both a **clear identification of other important qualities** (among which perhaps stand out (i) wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of relevant primary / archival and of secondary source material, and (ii) the ability to communicate the results of research in a clear, cogent, compelling fashion) and some **weighing** of the claims of imagination against these other qualities. If these other desirable qualities are explored fully and **the role of imagination is passed or glossed over very hastily, the answer is likely to be L2**. One of the hallmarks of a L3 answer, even of those which argue that imagination is less important than other qualities, is likely to be a well-founded, well-exemplified and, at the very top of the range, wide-ranging grasp of the part which imagination plays in historical study and writing (eg not only the ability to empathise with historical figures or to speculate in an informed way when the evidence is thin or it runs out but also the ability to set about an historical inquiry, or to write the results of an historical inquiry, from a fresh, unusual and illuminating angle or, as a writer, to recreate a scene vividly). Be wary here of any candidate looking to off-load pre-packaged post-modernist material to the effect that historical writing doesn't embody objective truth and is a species of fiction etc etc: insist for anything beyond L1 on honest engagement with the question as set.

3. **'Heritage history is not real history: it presents a view of the past which is bland and unquestioning.'** How far do you agree with this observation? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own studies and to your experience of 'heritage history'.

The starting-point of good (higher L2 and L3) work here is a clear, demonstrated awareness of where 'heritage history' might be found (theme parks, on television, museums) and what its defining characteristics are (notably, perhaps, the 'packaging' of the past in ways designed to appeal to paying customers). The core of good (higher L2, L3) answers will be full, highly developed consideration of whether this kind of packaging inevitably means that the past is presented in a bland, essentially inoffensive way – with a customer-driven emphasis on the quaint, the grotesque or the reinforcement of myths and stereotypes about the past. Look for exploration and exemplification of ideas of this kind in relation to the candidate's own experience of 'heritage history', and if the exploration / exemplification is perceptive and wide-ranging, think in terms of higher L2, L3. If, however, answers are essentially descriptions of theme parks visited or television programmes watched, without anything very much in the way of developed or sustained analysis, they are likely to be L1. A distinguishing feature of L3 as opposed to good L2 work might be the explicit contrasting of the aims and nature of 'real' and 'heritage' history (with L2 work criticising 'heritage' history without making its assumptions about 'real' history explicit) but this is a question in which there is likely to be more than one route to the highest level.

4. **'History shows that empires benefit neither rulers nor ruled.'** How far do you agree with this view? Develop your answer by specific reference to any historical period or periods you have studied.

There needs for L3 be a **reasonably well balanced treatment of both 'rulers' and 'ruled'**. If answers focus exclusively on one or the other, or are very heavily weighted in the direction of one or the other, L2 would be appropriate even in circumstances where the quality of argument and supporting evidence is by good A Level standards impressive. Similarly, for L3 the treatment should normally extend or range beyond the experience of one single empire – answers which were in effect a case study of (say) the 19th / early 20th century British Empire would be likely to be L2 rather than L3. In other words, a **reasonably broad perspective** should be expected in L3 work. However, an answer which in all other respects was well focused, argued and supported could be considered for the lower part of L3 even if the exemplar material and supporting evidence were limited geographically and chronologically. A third criterion for distinguishing between L2 and L3 is the **range of pointing** on the impact of empires on rulers and ruled. If answers are one-dimensional, focusing for instance on the economic impact of empires at the expense of any other consideration, they would be L2 even if very well done. At L3 social, political and perhaps psychological as well as economic aspects are likely to feature – not necessarily all of them, of course, but look for a decent range. NB (i) The focus of the question is the consequences / effects of empire, not the causes of imperial growth / expansion: answers which press standard A Level fare on causes into service and do little else are going to be L1, and modest L1 at that (ii) Don't be over-stringent on what constitutes an empire – reference to informal as well as formal empires is on-side.

5. **'Information technology has in practice had little impact on the process of historical inquiry.'** To what extent do you agree with this statement? Develop your answer by specific reference to your own studies and to historical works you have read.

It might be argued that the word processor makes life easier or (much better, this) that the Internet has made, and is making, access to archival material easier. These points are however relatively pedestrian in the context of the question and by themselves, even if fully exemplified, are unlikely to be worth much more than L1 or lower L2. The focus in higher-level work really needs to be on the extent to which the **process of historical inquiry** has been changed by the availability of ICT. Has there, for instance, to take one of the most obvious ways in which the historian might make use of ICT, been a marked shift in the direction of quantitative studies making use of databases and spreadsheets, or is history still in general researched and written in pretty much the same way as it was before ICT became available? The very best (good L3) answers are likely to have two

dimensions -- on the one hand, knowledge and awareness of areas (economic history, demographic history, research into voting behaviour?) where ICT has been profitably used, and, on the other, knowledge and awareness of other kinds of history currently being written (where it would, for example, be relevant to point to the 'revival of narrative' by the likes of Figs and Schama, or to emphasise the fact that research in 'new' areas such as gender and leisure history has been largely conducted using traditional methods). In other words, there needs for good L3 to be **awareness of the elements of both change and continuity in historical inquiry and writing**. If the focus is very heavily or exclusively on one or the other - that is, change or continuity - the answer is likely to be L2.