

## GCE HISTORY: 6HI02 - PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT

The purpose of assessment in AS History is to identify and reward the levels of knowledge, understanding and skill demonstrated by candidates across a range of ability and achievement.

Across all units and options it is important to have a clear sense of:

- the understanding and skills required, as defined by the **assessment objectives** related to different units
- the levels of **progression** within them, and
- the **range and quality of historical knowledge** that candidates will need to offer in demonstrating their skills within the limited time available to them.

The **Assessment Objectives** relating to Advanced Level History are set out on page 10 of the specification document:

		% in AS	% in A2	% in GCE
<b>AO1</b>	a Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.  b Demonstrate their understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context</li> <li>■ the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</li> </ul>	70%	70%	70%
<b>AO2</b>	a As part of a historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.  b Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.	30%	30%	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>		100%	100%	100%

The process of assessment takes place through two Units, both of equal weighting. Unit 1 focuses on AO1 only, while Unit 2 addresses both AO1 and AO2.

## Unit 2: Nature of the assessment

Candidates attempt one two-part question. There is a choice of question for part (b).

Part (a) Target: AO2a (20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Part (b) Target: AO1a & AO1b (24 marks) and AO2b (16 marks) (40 marks)

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

NB: Both parts of the question address historical interpretation - how the past has been represented, how such representations are constructed, and how far they can be sustained. However, wider knowledge of a period is directly rewarded only in part (b) questions. No marks are allocated for AO1 in part (a).

### The Assessment Objectives

#### AO1: Historical Knowledge and Understanding

Assessment in Unit 2 addresses AO1 as a single objective and therefore corresponds closely to assessment in Unit 1, but with one significant difference. Because candidates are using their knowledge and understanding to evaluate representations of the past, based on sources, they need to link and integrate their own knowledge with points drawn from the sources. In practice, therefore, marking of AO1 in Unit 2 reflects the range and depth of relevant knowledge offered, and its application to constructing arguments and evaluating a given judgement as in Unit 1. However, it also reflects the extent to which knowledge is integrated with arguments drawn from sources, which offer 'representations' of the past.

Table 1: AO1a and AO1b

Level	Description
1	Candidates will produce mostly <u>simple statements</u> . These will be supported by <u>limited factual material</u> , which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be <u>mostly generalised</u> . There will be <u>few, if any, links between</u> the simple statements. <i>Commentary - this also means that candidates are unlikely to make links between their own knowledge and the points drawn from source material.</i>
2	Candidates will produce a series of simple <u>statements supported by some, mostly accurate and relevant, factual material</u> . The <u>analytical focus will be mostly implicit</u> and there are likely to be <u>only limited links between simple statements</u> . Material is <u>unlikely to be developed very far</u> . <i>Commentary -L2 will therefore be characterised by separate, partially developed points, rather than the building of a coherent, integrated argument.</i>
3	Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. <u>Factual material will be mostly accurate</u> , but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. <i>Commentary - at this level candidates will begin to integrate points from knowledge and/or sources into a coherent argument based on their understanding of the issues raised by the 'representation' in the question and portrayed in the sources.</i>
4	Candidates offer an analytical response which <u>relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it</u> . <i>Commentary - this will be created by analysing the material in the sources in the context of wider knowledge to define the key issues raised by the question. The response therefore integrates the evidence into their wider understanding of the issues.</i> The analysis will be supported by <u>accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked</u> . The selection of material may lack balance in places.

Table 1 highlights the key criteria used to decide on levels of achievement, and to define progression. These can be summarised as:

- **Focus on the question.** This refers to the central task of evaluating a given judgement or 'representation' of the past. Focus is shown by the nature of the statements made, the extent to which they address issues related to the question (L2/3), and how far they are linked into coherent arguments (L3/4). Progression in each of these areas depends on the inclusion of **explicit, explanatory links** relating statements and selected material to the central issues and/or to each other.
- **Quality of factual information used to develop the statements.** This is demonstrated by the range and depth of factual reference selected to support statements, its precision, accuracy and relevance to the question. At the higher levels there should be explicit links that show how the material supports or relates to the claims being made - i.e. 'worked' examples.

- **Integration of factual knowledge with points taken from the sources to demonstrate historical understanding.** Both the given judgement and the sources offer representations of the past, which can be supported, developed and challenged by reference to the candidates' own knowledge. Progression is based on how far knowledge is used for this purpose as part of a coherent argument focused on the central task of evaluating the given judgement. It may also be demonstrated by the use of knowledge to develop and/or evaluate points based on evidence taken from a particular source.

In addition, assessment of A01 includes **quality of written communication**, as set out in generic descriptors. This is not a separate consideration - it is integral to the criteria set out above. Range and quality of vocabulary, spelling/punctuation and syntax all influence the clarity and quality of expression, while accurate use of paragraphs is essential in developing complex arguments.

The generic level descriptors, set out in the mark schemes provided, define the extent to which these qualities should be required at different levels. For the purposes of marking two points require emphasis.

- To make judgements about the levels achieved, markers need to balance consideration of all three criteria. However, they should not demand the same level of achievement in all three. The application of the different criteria is part of progression through the levels - for example, focus and integration of knowledge with sources tend to be high-level indicators. Therefore the range and balance of achievement across the criteria informs judgements both between and within levels.
- In practice there is likely to be significant overlap between the criteria, since focus on the question, selection of relevant support and explanatory links influence all three. However, this may not always be the case, and candidates may well achieve a particular level and mark within it through different combinations of strengths and weaknesses.

## **A02: The nature and application of evidence from historical sources**

A02 is divided into two parts: A02a is focused on the use of evidence taken from historical sources to establish a judgement or interpretation of the past, while A02b is focused on the analysis and evaluation of how the past has been interpreted or 'represented' in different ways.\* It therefore addresses both conceptual understanding of the **nature** of historical evidence, and the range of skills required in **using it as a basis for judgement**. A02 mark schemes do not allocate marks for historical knowledge, **but sources need to be interpreted and evaluated within their historical context.** This means that wider knowledge enables candidates to see the implications of source material and to reflect context and provenance in evaluating the quality of evidence.

\*N.B. The terms 'interpretation' and 'representation' of the past are often used to mean similar things. In the analysis that follows interpretation refers to the process of reasoning from evidence to build up ideas about the past, while representation refers to the claims and judgements that are made as the outcome of the process.

In Unit 2 examinations, candidates are required to interpret the evidence of the sources in order to evaluate the representation stated in the questions.

### Unit 2 Assessment structure: Parts (a) and (b)

Objective 2a requires candidates to 'analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination' and this is addressed in part (a) of the question, worth 20 marks. 2b requires candidates to 'analyse and evaluate how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented' and to do so 'in relation to the historical context'. This is addressed in part (b) of the question and in conjunction with AO1, for 40 marks. Therefore, while there is a consistent progression through the conceptual levels of AO2 across both parts of the question, **the mark schemes must also reflect the context of the task that is being set and the need for candidates to produce a response that is task-specific.** This has implications for the ways in which the levels are interpreted and the **kind of evidence that we look for within a response** to show that a candidate is exercising particular forms of skill and understanding.

#### Part (a)

Objective 2a relates primarily to the analysis of sources and the interpretation of evidence drawn from sources in order to develop a judgement. Part (a) questions set a task of this kind, based on specific sources and the question of 'how far' they support and/or challenge a given judgement about a particular historical enquiry. They are explicitly required to weigh conflicting evidence as the basis for an historical judgement. The task is therefore essentially practical, and requires candidates to demonstrate a range of skills commonly used by historians to develop judgements based on sources. These are comprehension, analysis, cross-referencing, interpretation and evaluation. However, the task also draws on understanding of the nature of historical evidence - that it is evidence rather than information, that it is often fragmented and shaped by its origins, and that it therefore requires interpretation that takes those origins into account. This also means that all statements about the past are based on interpretation, and are therefore open to being challenged.

#### Part (b)

The implications of this are developed in Objective 2b assessed in part (b) questions. These questions provide candidates with a 'representation' of the past based on specific sources, and ask them to evaluate it on the basis of both the sources and their own wider knowledge - effectively, sources interpreted in context. To do this, candidates need to

- **Analyse, cross-reference and interpret the sources as in part (a) in order to support and challenge (evaluate) the given representation, but they are also required to...**
- **Assess both the sources and the ways in which they can be interpreted in the context of wider knowledge, in order to reach a judgement.**

This is a more complex task, capable of producing different interpretations of the evidence that can be weighed and judged. To do this well candidates need to be aware that different interpretations and representations of the past can be made on the basis of the evidence, that each has validity, and that balanced judgements take account of this. At AS level most candidates are unlikely to have a fully developed appreciation of this, but at the higher levels their responses should demonstrate awareness that representations of the past are based upon interpretation and should be evaluated in those terms.

Table 2 below sets out the level descriptors for both 2a and 2b, to highlight the ways in which these concepts are applied to task-specific assessment in Unit 2 questions and the nature of progression across the levels. In both cases the **higher levels reflect conceptual understanding of the nature of historical evidence**, but the ways in which this is demonstrated may vary with the nature and complexity of the specific task.

Table 2

AO2:

Level	Part (a) Objective 2a - 20 marks	Part (b) Objective 2b - 16 marks
1	<u>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question.</u> Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.	<u>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question.</u> Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.
2	<u>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed.</u> There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. <u>Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</u> The source provenance may be noted, without applying its implications to the source content. <i>Commentary - within L2 candidates will begin to cross-reference the sources, and may well make inferences from what they say, but they will tend to be logical deductions or common sense inferences rather than historical inferences related to the period. This is often demonstrated by a lack of contextual awareness and a tendency to make anachronistic references.</i>	<u>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question.</u> When supporting the decision made in relation to the question <u>the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</u> <i>Commentary - in this context references to the provenance of the sources contemporary to the period are not as central as in part (a)- see note below. Where they offered they are likely to be part of a more developed application of wider knowledge, assessed as part of AO1.</i>

<p>3</p>	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by <u>evidence drawn from the sources.</u></p> <p>Sources are used as <u>evidence</u> with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence.</p> <p>In addressing 'how far' there is a clear <u>attempt to use the sources in combination</u>, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p>	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. <i>Commentary - there may be fewer direct comparisons than in an (a) response because the points are developed and integrated into wider knowledge. However, there will be some cross-referencing of points from different sources to develop, support or challenge statements and arguments across the response.</i></p> <p>In addressing the specific enquiry, <u>there is clear awareness that a representation* is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of [all or] both sources, although there may be some lack of balance.</u></p> <p>The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question, supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources.</u> The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. <i>Commentary - this means that the sources are treated as a set, to create a body of evidence.</i> The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. <u>The attributes of the sources are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content will bear in relation to the specific enquiry.</u> In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p>	<p><u>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</u> Discussion of the claim in the question <u>proceeds from</u> the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation* in the sources. <i>Commentary - this means that L4 responses will analyse the sources as a set and directly cross-reference between them to raise issues relating to the representation set out in the question. In this sense the response will be clearly 'source-driven' although wider knowledge will be integrated into the arguments that follow.</i> <u>There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence</u> in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p>

\*'Representation' here refers to the view, or judgement, presented in the question, which is derived (at least in part) from the evidence contained in the sources.

#### Note on source evaluation in Part (b)

Students should not strain to 'evaluate' the sources in the (b) question. There is no need to make a comment on the Secondary sources as works of historians. The focus in the (b) question is on evaluation of representations or claims (AO2b) rather than on evaluation of contemporary sources (AO2a). However, claims are based on evidence, and where the contemporary evidence in support of, or in challenge to, a claim is strong or doubtful it needs to be taken into consideration.

Table 2 demonstrates the common elements of progression in AO2, but also highlights the differences created by the specific tasks set and the context in which both skills and understanding have to be applied. Table 3 summarises the range of skills and relevant progression across both objectives as addressed by the assessment structure.

Table 3: Summary and Progression

AO2 a and b			AO1	AO1 and AO2	
	Interpretation of evidence	Cross-reference and integration	Evaluation of contemporary sources (AO2a) evidence	Historical Knowledge and Understanding	Structural Development and focus
L1	Surface comprehension	Surface matching		Simple statements with some relevance	Simple statements
L2	Comprehension of information	Comparison		Relevant knowledge deployed	↓ Developed Description with Predominantly Separate statements
L3	Interpretation ie Inference, deduction, extrapolation	Developed comparison	Notes provenance	Accurate reference deployed with conceptual focus and some links to sources	↓ Developed Argument(s) focused On the specific Enquiry
L4	Interpretation of evidence as a basis for judgement	Analysis of points and interaction	Applies provenance and context	Accurate contextual reference selected for development and integration	↓ Reaching a Judgement (part a)
		Using sources as a set	Evaluation in context		↓ Evaluation and Substantiated Judgement (part b)

## Part 2: Guidance for teachers on evaluating student responses

### Part (a) questions

Part (a) questions are focused on the application of source handling skills to a specific and limited task. Candidates are directed to make a judgement on the basis of the sources, and can therefore be expected to cross-reference them in order to make direct comparisons between them (L2/3). They are explicitly instructed to make a judgement as to 'how far' they support a given claim (L3/4). Since the sources always offer conflicting evidence, they can be expected to weigh up the evidence to make a judgement (L4). **Progression is therefore based on how effectively they execute these tasks by making and developing statements supported by reference to the sources, and by making and developing links between the sources to judge 'how far'.**

However, the way in which the skills are applied also reflects their understanding of the nature of historical evidence, and of the historical context to which it relates. A key step therefore comes when a candidate goes beyond what a source 'says' to consider what it implies or 'suggests', and therefore begins to use sources as evidence rather than information. This is reflected in the **use of inference** to develop points on the basis of evidence, and also in the **use of provenance** to evaluate the evidence against the attributes of the source. **At levels 3 and 4, therefore, the processes of cross-referencing and comparison are based on interpretation, and evaluation includes the quality and reliability of the evidence. However, interpretations need to respect the context of the period and be historical rather than simply logical or speculative. At the highest levels this enables candidates to recognise the possibility of different interpretations and may lead them to reconcile conflicting views in an overall judgement.**

Exemplar scripts for part (a): Analysis and interpretation of sources to establish a judgement.

Question: How far do these sources [Sample assessment materials, p148, sources 1, 2 and 3] suggest that the smaller monasteries were dissolved in 1536 because of their corruption?

**Script A**

In the sources it does suggest that the smaller monasteries were dissolved because of their corruption. Source 1 was written by Richard Layton, who was one of Cromwell's commissioners. Source 1 suggests that Layton is not satisfied with the way that Henry is running the churches, the way he blatantly states that Henry has six children, slept with virgins, and the pope allowed him a whore, when the monasteries are meant to be celibate. Layton comes across as if he is trying to warn people that Henry is ruining the monasteries and this may lead to worsening times for the monasteries. This report was given a year before the state of the monasteries took a wrong turn and also was given a year before source 2. I feel that the audience for this report is the public who want to get rid of Henry and Cromwell because they are not doing a very good job of running the churches; also it comes across like a petition that people could read and sign up for. "And he thanks God that he never meddled with married women, but only with maidens (the fairest that could be got). The Pope has given him licence to keep a whore". This statement clearly shows that Layton is not happy with the way Henry is living his life, taking the virginity of innocent women, and for the Pope to licence him a whore is totally going against the word of God. Source 2 follows on from source 1, it was written a year later by Cromwell who intends to get rid of all the monasteries worth less than £200 a year, because they are not making enough money. This source suggests that Cromwell is trying to persuade people that it's a bad idea to keep them open because they did not make enough money for what the king and Cromwell wanted to do. Source 3 was written by Robert Aske just before he was executed. The beginning of the statement sounds as if he is supporting the idea of shutting the smaller monasteries, but in the second half he talks about the bad things that are happening. The sources do back each other up, sources 1 and 2 back up Henry and Cromwell's parts, while source 3 backs up the ordinary people.

*The response is confused, and seems to lack any awareness of the period, allowing a misreading of source 1 and a serious misinterpretation of the meaning and implications of all three sources. Inference and provenance are mis-applied and unrewardable. Amongst the claims a few simple points are made with accurate reference from the sources, taken at face value. L1 - 3 marks.*

## Script B

Source 1 was written by a man who was working for Thomas Cromwell, who very much wanted the monasteries to be closed down. Layton was sent to collect evidence to close down the monasteries, and so he is likely to write only about the negatives that he could find. The corruptions he found were 'a holy father who has six children' when priests were meant to be celibate, so this outrageous finding could be an inkling into a world of corruption, especially as 'the Pope allowed him a whore'. To Thomas Cromwell this would be a brilliant start to banish the monasteries how he wanted to.

Source 2 was written a year later by Thomas Cromwell himself and it very much uses the evidence found in source 1 - it obviously shows that what Layton found was extremely important in finding reasons to dissolve the monasteries. With the information from Layton he is able to set up the act of 1536. He says the monasteries are going against what God wants.

From these first two sources I believe that the corruptions found really did lead to the act of 1536 and Cromwell wanting them shut down. Source 3 was written by Robert Aske before his execution in 1537, a year after the act was introduced. He was talking against Henry VIII to stop the monasteries being shut down. The fact that it was so close to his execution could mean that he was forced to say what he did at the threat of torture. Unlike the other two sources he speaks highly of the monasteries - 'gave great alms to poor men' - but then he goes on to speak of the bad things - 'Church of God is damaged and pulled down'.

This source links with source 2, because both say God's work isn't being done. This seems to be the main concern in all three sources and the main cause for the monasteries being shut down. The monasteries go against God's will and do things that shouldn't be approved and simply would not be allowed. These corruptions that were found did lead to the closing of monasteries and source 1 portrays their corruptions vividly and clearly.

*Use of provenance, developed in context, to question the quality of evidence. Assertive but valid.*

*Inference based on reasoning from evidence in context.*

*Cross-referencing the sources although the link is simplistic and reference to the source very limited.*

*Attempts to use provenance, but the argument is unclear. Why would the government torture him to say this? Use of provenance here is out of context and speculative. Confused interpretation.*

*Attempts a final judgement, but it is undermined by misunderstanding of source 3. Treatment of the first two sources has L3 elements, but reference to sources is brief and simplistic in places. Source 3 is not adequately comprehended, preventing the response from being securely developed - L2/3 borderline - 10/11 marks*

Question: How far do these sources [SAMs, p.234, sources 8, 9 and 10] suggest that in the early twentieth century the British Raj was an oppressive regime?

**Script C**

The view that the British Raj was an oppressive regime is not supported by Source 8, but Sources 9 and 10 do suggest that British rule was not a positive thing for Indians.

The view is supported by source 9 when it suggests that Indians are 'instruments of our own oppression'. This implies that the Indians felt used by the British and feel as if Britain is only there for their own gain. This opinion is also supported in source 10 when it mentions that the British are 'stealing' India's wealth from the Indian people. This suggests that many were unhappy at the way the British neglected India's economy in favour of their own. Source 9 also makes a bold statement that Britain is 'keeping us in ignorance and blindness', which certainly sounds oppressive. However, source 9 is from a speech made by the extremist INC member, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, therefore it is to be expected that he would support this view, especially as the speech was in 1907, just two years after the partition of Bengal was announced. Similarly, source 10's purpose would most likely be to gain support for those campaigning against partition, as the pamphlet was circulated in the Bengal area at the same time, when there would have been a lot of negative feelings about what happened.

An alternative view is put forward in source 8, which is a letter from Lord Curzon who was Britain's representative in India. Curzon believes that he is there 'for the good of India' and that is Britain's main aim. We can infer that he is trying to reassure people that the British Raj is really a positive thing for India. He mentions that he will 'keep courage and press forward' suggesting that he has had some problems. It is not surprising that he does not believe the British regime to be oppressive, because he was the one making the decisions. Lord Curzon believed that the British should rule through the Princes and keep a strict hierarchy, and he arranged the great Durbar of 1903 to represent this. He despised the 'Bengali babus' who were Indian civil servants and lawyers Educated in British ways, and wanted to keep India's traditional rulers as symbols of power.

In conclusion, two main arguments can be drawn from the sources. Sources 9 and 10 support support the notion that the British Raj was an oppressive regime, whereas source 8 opposes the notion. I think the strongest argument is the one for the British raj being oppressive, as they imposed the partition and caused many other problems.

*Inference*

*Cross-reference*

*Developed inference drawn from two sources.*

*Link to statement*

*Developed use of provenance to question the strength of the evidence in sources 9 and 10, with relevant but not overly extended contextualisation.*

*Considers source 8, but inferences are weak What 'people'? He is writing to the Cabinet. Relates the evidence to British assumptions, but points lack development and fails to see the implications of the British belief that they knew what was good for India.*

*The final section of this paragraph is of no value to the response. It is external knowledge, not linked to the sources and too extensive to be relevant as explaining Curzon's evidence. It leads the candidate away from the focus of the question. The inclusion of this knowledge causes a drift away from the task in hand.*

*The conclusion is*

	<p><i>disappointing, because it simply rehearses the conflicting arguments and makes an assertive claim, based more on own knowledge than the evidence from sources.</i></p> <p><i>Overall the response reaches the top of L3, and possibly a borderline L4. The sources are analysed, cross-referenced and interpreted as a set, with developed reference to content and reference to provenance used as a means of evaluating the quality of some of the evidence. Handling of sources 1 and 2 is excellent. However, treatment of source 8 is relatively superficial and there is some loss of focus and drift into reciting background knowledge, depriving the candidate of the time to establish the evidence-based judgement required for secure L4. L3/4 - 15 or 16 marks.</i></p>
--	--

## Script D

To an extent sources 8, 9 and 10 suggest that in the early twentieth century the British Raj was an oppressive regime. However, within the sources there is evidence that the regime might not have been as oppressive as one would think.

Sources 9 and 10 clearly suggest that the regime of the British Raj was harsh as they describe how an alien government has rule over India and the oppression that has resulted from their willingness to use India for their own interests. Source 10 calls the British 'thieves' because they import their own goods to sell and drain India's wealth. It also talks about how the British steal the harvest from the peasants' fields and therefore cause hunger, fever and plague. This could be seen as good evidence of the Raj as an oppressive regime because it is from a pamphlet circulated in 1907, which implies that these views could be widespread. While source 10 criticises the financial oppression of the Raj, source 9 is explaining how the British oppressed the free thinking minds of Indians, as Tilak emphasises how ignorance and blindness prevented the people from realising how they are strong enough to rule this country on its own. Source 8 supports this source as it is Lord Curzon, the British Viceroy of India and so the man who implements the regime of the Raj, writing about the White Man's burden in that it was up to the British to guide India forward so that it could develop as a country. This suggests that the British thought India could not function without the Raj, which means that the British would have repressed any views that the Indians could govern the country, which source 9 is inferring.

However, there is evidence in sources 9 and 10 to suggest that the Indians' feelings of being oppressed by the British are a particular reaction to a previous event. Both were written in Bengal after the partition of Bengal in 1905, which had enraged many Indians, particularly religious groups, and so the views would

Have been influenced and heightened by the anger caused by partition rather than a long term resentment of the oppressive nature of the Raj. Also, source 9 is a speech made by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, who was known to be radical, and so he would have wanted the British to come across as oppressive, and the origin of source 10 is described as anonymous and so the pamphlet may also have been written by a radical. Source 8 shows that the British did have good intentions that did not involve oppression, as Curzon speaks of wanting to keep ties with India for the good of the country and for a noble aim, suggesting that the British Raj was not intended to be an oppressive regime.

In conclusion, while all the sources do suggest a measure of repression, whether it maybe involved the wealth or the mentality of the Indian people, there is not enough strong evidence that shows the British Raj as an oppressive regime. The origins of all the sources are dubious, since sources 8 and

*Inference....*

*Developed with supporting reference and....*

*...briefly evaluated.*

*Cross-referencing, based on analysis of points and integration of sources....*

*...developed by links across the sources based on further inference....*

*...to build a developed argument in support of the statement, based on interpreting the sources as a set.*

*Interpretation challenged, by further consideration of the sources, using provenance with sufficient contextualisation to explain its significance.*

*Inference, used to weigh the quality of evidence.*

*Again the sources are treated as a set to build an argument, challenging the strength of the first interpretation on the basis of both conflicting evidence (source 8) and evaluation based on provenance. At this point the response has clearly addressed 'how far', even if not explicitly, and could be awarded borderline L4 marks.*

<p>9 come from people  Who will obviously have contrasting opinions: source 8 was written by the British Viceroy, while source 9 came from an Indian radical, and it is uncertain where source 10 came from. If there was another source that was not linked to opposing sides it would be easier to tell if the Raj was oppressive. However, <u>there is no evidence to show that the Raj was not oppressive, only that it was not intended to be. The arrogance of Curzon's belief that the British knew best suggests that it probably was high-handed at times, for example in the partition of Bengal.</u>  <u>Which could be seen as oppressive by those who disagreed.</u></p>	<p><i>The conclusion does offer a judgement, based on the limitations of the evidence, and this is sufficient in the context of the preceding argument to reach L4, at 18 or 19 marks. However, the judgement is, at this stage, slightly weak - not proven for lack of 'objective' evidence.</i></p> <p><i>The final sentence offers further development using the 'unwitting testimony' of Curzon's attitude in source 8, linked contextually to the origins of sources 9 and 10, to offer a more definite conclusion that begins to reconcile the conflicting evidence into an overall judgement. L4, full marks.</i></p>
---	--

NB: The application of wider knowledge in part (a) questions.

As the responses here demonstrate, candidates cannot be rewarded for wider knowledge included in responses to part (a), since the questions target AO2 only. However, candidates should not ignore the historical context, or 'pretend they know nothing' outside the sources. In Script A, for example, the candidate's misunderstanding of the sources and misinterpretation of evidence would be prevented by contextual awareness. At best, the placing of sources in a contextual vacuum may lead to a tendency to take them at face value and restrict responses to L1 or L2, or to speculation that is not focused on the defined enquiry. Lack of contextual awareness, for example, undermined the final sections of Script B.

Therefore contextual awareness, especially an understanding of issues and attitudes, should be applied in order to help candidates:

- See the implications of statements within a source and make inferences relating to the enquiry - for example the value of Layton's evidence for Cromwell's purpose in Script B, or the oppressive implications of Curzon's attitude in Script D.
- See the significance of the information given in the provenance of a source as a means of interpreting and evaluating the evidence offered by the source content. For example, the significance of the date and authorship of sources 9 and 10 can be related to the partition of Bengal, and in both Script C and Script D candidates made valid reference to the event in developing their points. However, it should be emphasised that **the reference was brief, and directly applied to developing arguments from the sources**, whereas the material relating to Curzon in Script C was too extensive and insufficiently linked to source handling to be credited.

Contextual knowledge therefore plays a role in enabling candidates to interpret and evaluate evidence in order to reach higher levels, but it cannot be rewarded by separate marks. A brief reference may be useful in explaining the implications of a particular piece of evidence or the significance of its provenance and therefore support higher level arguments within AO2. Longer passages of contextual knowledge such as in the final part of Script C are a waste of time and may actually lead the candidate away from the task - which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources, in order to reach a judgement. However, candidates should not be discouraged from applying contextual awareness in handling the sources.

Therefore, in marking part (a) responses no specific penalty needs to be imposed for the inclusion of passages of knowledge, other than that imposed by the candidate in wasting time and failing to focus on the sources. Markers should simply ignore the unrelated material and reward arguments based on the source content or provenance - as demonstrated in scripts B, C and D.

### Marking Part (b) Questions

The conceptual progression outlined in AO2 is also assessed in part (b) questions, through the application of AO2b and the central task of evaluating a judgement or representation of the past. For this reason **Table 2 demonstrates a common progression from using sources as information, and building arguments on that basis, to using sources as evidence and building arguments on the basis of inference and interpretation.** Since the provided sources always indicate conflicting interpretations, these can be used to develop conflicting arguments and evaluate them to reach a judgement. In part (b), however, candidates are directed to apply their wider knowledge of the historical context to the evidence derived from the sources, and they are not explicitly directed to assess 'how far' but to 'explain' their answer. This may well lead them to develop conflicting interpretations, but it also offers alternative methods of developing and evaluating both the evidence in the sources and the representation given in the question, for example, by reference to contextual knowledge rather than direct comparison between sources. The key step comes in the recognition that what is being evaluated is a 'representation', in itself an interpretation based on evidence placed in context, to be evaluated on that basis. Candidates may not, therefore, directly cross-reference between sources, since it is possible to cross-reference from sources to wider knowledge, to evaluate and come to a judgement by setting the evidence in context - as in L3. At the highest level, however, candidates have the opportunity to **analyse the conflicting evidence offered by the sources and set out alternative 'representations', to explain and evaluate them by weighing the evidence in the context of wider knowledge, and to establish an overall judgement on that basis** - as in L4. In practice this is likely to require direct cross-referencing between sources to define key issues and set up different, probably conflicting, arguments. The final judgement will address conflicts of interpretation, and may reconcile the conflicting evidence into an overall conclusion.

Table 4

## Marking Part (b) questions

Level	AO2b - 16 marks	AO1 - 24 marks
	Description	Description
1	<u>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question.</u> Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.	Candidates will produce mostly <u>simple statements</u> . These will be supported by <u>limited factual material</u> , which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question). The material will be <u>mostly generalised</u> . There will be <u>few, if any, links between</u> the simple statements.
2	<u>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question.</u> When supporting the decision made in relation to the question <u>the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</u> <i>Commentary - in this context references to provenance may well be part of a more developed application of wider knowledge, assessed as part of AO1.</i>	Candidates will produce a series of simple <u>statements supported by some, mostly accurate and relevant, factual material.</u> The <u>analytical focus will be mostly implicit</u> and there are likely to be <u>only limited links between simple statements.</u> Material is <u>unlikely to be developed very far.</u> <i>Commentary - any conclusion is likely to rely heavily on assertion rather than explanatory support.</i>
3	The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. <i>Commentary - however, there may be few direct comparisons because the points are developed and integrated into wider knowledge.</i> <u>In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there are examples of reasoning from the evidence of [all or] both sources, although there may be some lack of balance.</u>  The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, which is supported by the evidence of the sources.	Candidates will attempt analysis and will show <u>some understanding of the focus of the question</u> and which demonstrates at least <u>implicit understanding of the key issues required to sustain a relevant judgement.</u> They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. <u>Factual material will be accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</u>  <i>Commentary - responses at this level will begin to link contextual knowledge to points drawn from the sources as evidence of analytical argument and understanding of the issues. The response begins to offer coherence and integration in building different arguments.</i>

4	<p><u>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources.</u></p> <p><i>Commentary: whether this is set out as a single argument or dispersed through the response, this analysis does require direct cross-reference or comparison between sources, so that arguments address the body of evidence provided by the sources as a set.</i></p> <p><u>There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</u></p>	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p><i>Responses at L4 will demonstrate understanding of the issues raised by the representation in the question by integrating evidence from sources into its historical context in order to develop, support and challenge conflicting interpretations and evaluate the representation in the question.</i></p>
---	---	---

Table 4 sets out the objectives and levels of progression required in marking part (b) responses. It is essential that the objectives are treated separately, and it is entirely possible for a response to reach different levels in relation to objectives 1 and 2b. The overall mark awarded is the sum total of two distinct judgements based on separate criteria.

However, the fact that the candidate needs to plan a response that meets the requirements of both objectives may result in some areas of overlap. This is especially the case at higher levels where recalled knowledge is integrated with points drawn from sources to develop an interpretation or evaluate the quality of evidence upon which an argument is based. Free-standing knowledge, which is relevant to the claim and the development of a judgement, but not clearly linked to evidence drawn from sources, can be credited only under AO1. However, recalled knowledge which is used to contextualise evidence, develop an interpretation, or evaluate what weight the evidence will bear, should be credited at higher levels in AO1 and may also contribute to the conceptual level achieved under AO2. The application of such knowledge is part of 'reasoning from the evidence' (L3) or 'developed reasoning' and 'weighing of the evidence' (L4). Under AO2, contextualisation and direct cross-referencing of sources can both contribute to 'a conclusion based on the discriminating use of evidence' at L4.

Candidates cannot be credited for the 'same' knowledge twice, but they may be credited within AO1 for its deployment and within AO2 for its application to the interpretation and evaluation of evidence taken from the sources.

Exemplar Scripts for Part (b): Developing a judgement from sources and own knowledge.

<p><b>Question: Do you agree with the suggestion in Source 6 that Henry VIII and Wolsey conducted an effective foreign policy in the years 1515-25?</b></p>	
<p><b>Script E</b></p> <p>Henry's and Wolsey's foreign policy between 1515 and 1525 included many faults. However, many positives also came from the policies they used, leading to different opinions on the matter.</p> <p>Source 4 is a painting showing the Field of the Cloth of Gold. This was a particularly successful part of foreign policy and so <u>portrays it, as well as England, in a good light. A lot of the painting also captures the wealth of the country and the king, as indeed no expense was spent [spared?] on the meeting of the two countries. However, this is not in itself a primary source, it could be based on one but as it was painted in 1991 it is only classed as secondary meaning it may not have been like the artists impression. The pavilions in the back ground of the painting add to the effects of showing the wealth.</u></p> <p>Source 5 is a letter written to Wolsey from the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk about the amicable grant. The dukes would like to be honest with Wolsey and as it was written at the time it is a very valuable source. The amicable grant <i>never</i> went down too well so close to other means of financing wars they wished to participate in, as the rich men believed they were giving over too much money. The period this letter was written in was 1525, the time the foreign policy began failing. The quote 'the kings highness to call his council' explains <u>that not everything is going well and as planned. This letter disagrees with source 4 but they are about five years apart, leaving time for change.</u></p> <p>Source 6 suggests more of a positive image, but again the source is secondary, not being written at the time. The first line <u>sums up foreign policy well - 'failed to bring great gains to the country' - but the rest is positive, referring to 'active role' and 'win glory, honour and prestige'.</u> This disagrees with <u>source 5, but it does also say that not much money was gained.</u></p> <p>In my opinion the foreign policy presents many disadvantages and advantages. I can see the views that source 6 has, although I don't completely agree with them. It is hard to say the whole period was effective, although it began well. Ten years is</p>	<p><i>There is an implicit sense of debate here, but it is based on understanding of different events rather than the nature of the evidence and differing interpretations.</i></p> <p><i>How? The response lacks detailed reference to the source, offering instead a brief statement based on wider knowledge. Provenance is incorrectly noted and applied simplistically. The final sentence does offer some reference to the painting, but it is very limited.</i></p> <p><i>Paraphrasing the source at face value</i></p> <p><i>Valid, if rather generalised wider knowledge.</i></p> <p><i>Limited inference on the failure of foreign policy, but links are not explained.</i></p> <p><i>Brief cross-referencing</i></p> <p><i>Summary from source at face value</i></p> <p><i>Limited cross-referencing</i></p> <p><i>Conclusion is sound in argument but makes only generalised reference to sources and is based effectively on wider knowledge of a very generalised kind. AO1 L2 at best.</i></p> <p><i>The response is focused on the sources and does select relevant material to develop points that support and differ from the representation in the question. However, the sources are taken at face value and provenance is used in a simplistic, not always accurate way. There are some</i></p>

<p>enough time for things to go considerably wrong.</p>	<p><i>attempts to cross-reference, but in general the sources are treated as separate examples from within the period.</i>  <i>There is little sign of reasoning from evidence -</i>  <i>borderline L3 at best (9 marks) Wider knowledge is used but range/depth is very limited. There is little sign of integration, but the focus on the question does create some coherence. Nevertheless the limited range of reference and lack of developed statements keeps the response at borderline L2 in AO1 - 7 marks.</i>  <i>Total=16/40</i></p>
---	---

<p><b>Script F</b></p> <p>In the years 1515-25 Wolsey was at his peak, and he and Henry ran a very effective campaign for a time, constantly searching for ways to improve England's influence and status abroad. <u>Although it was a mix of success and failure over this period, foreign policy under Wolsey and Henry remained predominantly robust during these ten years.</u> By 1515 Henry had captured two French towns (Therouanne and Tournai), brought glory to himself and his country, and silenced the threat from Scotland. 1515 saw Francis I ascend to the French throne; around Henry's age, he would prove one of Henry's more formidable rivals along with Charles V, crowned King of Spain in 1516 and Holy Roman Emperor in 1519. These two men were the most powerful in Europe, ruling over the super-powers of the time, while England was clearly a weaker country, in danger of being overshadowed by the two great powers.</p> <p>Henry wanted nothing more than to change this and have England become powerful. Inspired by tales of knighthood and chivalry, Henry VIII wanted to leave his own legacy as an imperial king. Wolsey was appointed as Chief Minister <u>to achieve this goal for Henry, to, to 'win glory, honour and prestige, which meant so much to Henry'</u> (source 6). Wolsey's job was to put England on the map.</p> <p>France and Spain became rivals as they battled it out for power and control of Europe. Leo X was concerned that this feud between the two powers would distract them from his main concern, a possible onslaught from the Ottoman Turks. His call for peace and a</p>	<p><i>Judgement.</i></p> <p><i>Accurate contextual knowledge used to set the scene and define terms.</i></p> <p><i>Definition of aims, based on contextual knowledge and illustrated from source 6.</i></p> <p><i>Accurate account of foreign policy in the years 1518-20, with consideration of aims and achievements.</i></p> <p><i>Reference to source 4 used to support and illustrate the claims of success, but reference from the source is not developed. Provenance is noted but not used to consider the evidence and</i></p>
---	---

crusade was answered by Wolsey, who proposed instead the Treaty of London in 1518, which arranged for England, France, Spain and the Holy Roman Empire to focus on the threat posed by the Turks rather than fighting amongst themselves. Arguably Wolsey's single greatest achievement, England was portrayed as the peacemaker and given status and glory as Henry desired.

When Charles was appointed Holy Roman Emperor both he and France looked to attract England as an ally. Francis met Henry in 1520 in the prestigious event known as the Field of the Cloth of Gold. As shown in source 4 it was massive, an opportunity for each king to show off to the other his wealth and importance. Although source 4 may not have been painted at the actual event, as it happened, it was commissioned by Henry VIII who clearly wanted to commemorate the event as grand and immense. Golden tents (hence the title) were strewn across the field and although there was competition between the two kings it was all in the hope from Francis' perspective that the two sides would join forces, while Henry looked good as the host. However, despite all this magnificence, in 1521 Henry decided to side with Spain, after Charles visited England, because of traditional ties (Catherine of Aragon) and England's links with the Netherlands, a Hapsburg possession

Things turned sour for England and foreign policy when Henry was reluctantly roped into the war that was emerging between France and Spain, known as the Hapsburg-Valois struggle. Now at war with France (1522-23) English troops acted alongside Imperial troops to capitalise on a French rebellion, though it amounted to nothing and 'failed to bring gain to the country, but it did thrust the country into a major war that its wealth and population scarcely justified'. (Source 6) And this was true; England was simply not big or rich enough to keep pace with such powers as France and Spain. Henry turned to Wolsey to 'maintain Henry's honour and influence' (source 6) through funding. 1523 saw Wolsey call the second of only two parliaments he called in eight years and ask the nobles to grant him £800,000. This failed, however, and in 1525 Wolsey proposed the Amicable Grant, a travesty and easily his most notorious failure. Constant demands for money via taxation throughout the country had rendered him unpopular, and Wolsey decided to bypass parliament, opting for forced loans from the nobility. However, near rebellion in London and East Anglia forced him to back down. Source 5 is a letter addressed to Wolsey to inform him of the rebellions taking place in

*conclusions are based on knowledge of the events rather than analysis of the source. Hints of reasoning from evidence are not sustained.*

*Brief reference to source 5 to illustrate financial problems, hints of inference related to Wolsey's position, but not focused on the question.*

*Despite some valid selections from the sources, the response is essentially an account of foreign policy based on wider knowledge. The material is accurate, and despite a narrative approach, focus on the question is maintained for most of the time. The argument is not entirely balanced, tending to support the claim in the representation more strongly than to challenge it, but there is sufficient challenge to secure L3. Key issues are understood, and the attempts to illustrate points from the sources provide partial integration. AO1 L3 - 17 marks  
However, use of the sources is very*

'many...counties'. Emphasis is put on the need for the 'the King's Highness to call his council', in other words to take power from Wolsey, at least in that situation. He was humiliated and publicly blamed, despite having only followed Henry's orders. Charles finally defeated France in 1525 at Pavia, N.Italy, where the French army was annihilated and the French king captured, to be released within a year.

Although this would appear a happy ending to 1525 for England, when the relationship between Henry and Charles deteriorated, Henry moved to ally with France, which proved the wrong decision. However, Charles would not allow Henry to capitalise on his victory, so Henry had little choice.

1525 was the year England seemed to spiral out of control, dominated by the greater powers of France and Spain. However, 1515-25 had seen England hold their own in foreign affairs, with Wolsey and Henry mostly able to avoid too much conflict. Foreign policy had been effective in those ten years, and there were no major rebellions at home, despite the focus on foreign affairs. For as long as Henry allowed it he and Wolsey were a good team, and many of the events that led to their downfall in 1525 were unavoidable, no matter which side they supported. They did well to improve England's status, as supported by source 6, 'which meant so much to Henry'.

*limited. Points*

*selected are relevant but very undeveloped, taken at face value, with no attempt to reason from the evidence. They are simply used to illustrate arguments derived from knowledge. AO2b L2 - 8 marks.*

*Total=25 marks*

## Script G

The question asks whether I agree with the suggestion that Henry and Wolsey conducted an effective foreign policy, and personally, I don't. I feel that foreign policy was a failure. However, from looking at the sources and some of my own knowledge, I also know that some things were achieved.

Sources 4 and 6 support the suggestion that foreign policy was effective. Both sources show that England was made to appear important and impressive, and like a dominant country. Source four shows a scene from the 'Field of the Cloth of Gold' which showed off English power and prestige. The Field of the Cloth of gold took place between 7<sup>th</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> June 1520, and was a meeting between Henry VIII and Francis I near Calais. It was meant to increase the bond between them after the Treaty of London in 1518. Both kings took the chance to show off to each other and show just how magnificent their courts were. The meeting included tournaments, jousting, archery, wrestling, among other activities. The Field of the cloth of Gold was a *monumentous* occasion, and source 4 gives us an idea of just how grand it looked. And this grandness would make England seem impressive, which is what both Henry and Wolsey wanted. Source six backs this up, stating 'Henry and Wolsey did well to preserve an independent and active role, and bring glory, honour and prestige, which meant so much to Henry'.

Foreign policy also had other achievements, such as the capture of two French towns in 1512-14. They could then be used as leverage in dealing with France. Foreign policy was also famous for the Treaty of London which was arguably Wolsey's greatest achievement. England also managed to ally with various different countries, so it remained safe and was made to look grander than it actually was. So in these respects foreign policy was effective.

Foreign policy was also a failure in many ways and sources 5 and 6 give evidence of this. Source 5 explains the resistance to the Amicable Grant. Foreign policy was also very expensive, and Wolsey tried to use taxation and the Amicable Grant to pay for it, but this caused riots as source 5 demonstrates. Source six offers further evidence about the policy being expensive, saying that 'English diplomacy between 1515-25 failed to bring any great gains to the country', so it lost England money and failed to achieve much. Henry's ambitions were unrealistic in the first place, considering how limited England's resources were, so therefore it is unlikely that foreign

*Style lacks some sophistication, but valid statements are made, and there is an awareness that conflicting arguments can be made.*

*Sources used together suggests analysis and reasoning from evidence to build up arguments. Both sources are referenced, although reasoning is not fully developed. Contextual knowledge is integrated to bring out the implications of source 4 and develop an inference. Treatment of source six is less secure in both interpretation and contextual support.*

*Out of period, but rescued by following development. However, reference is limited and generalised - in what way was the Treaty of London an achievement?  
What allies, when?*

*Alternative argument based on sources used in conjunction and supported by contextual knowledge, but again the range and precision of supporting reference is limited.*

*Overall, the response is well-focused and does weigh up conflicting evidence in the context of wider knowledge, to come to a judgement - the requirements of L4.*

<p>policy would be effective or bring lasting gains. Henry was often tricked by other monarchs and out of the three powers, France, Spain and England, it was Spain that came first in power. And because England changed allies from Spain to France, Henry could not get his divorce from Catherine, which was one of his aims by 1525. The alliance with France was very unpopular in England, but Spain had not brought England any gains either.</p> <p>Based on the evidence in the sources that England made no real gains and that foreign policy was expensive and led to high taxation and near-rebellion, I disagree with the suggestion in source six that Henry and Wolsey conducted an effective foreign policy in the years 1515-25.</p>	<p><i>However, neither use of sources nor contextual knowledge is sufficient for that level. Sources are analysed and cross-referenced, but inferences are not fully developed and links are often implicit. No attempt is made to consider reliability or the significance of their origins/purpose for the quality of the evidence. AO2b L3 - 12 marks. Similarly, contextual knowledge is accurate but lacks depth, integration is often implicit and links are not fully developed. AO1 L3 - 16 marks. Total=28 marks</i></p>
---	---

<p><b>Script H</b></p> <p>Source six offers a historian's view of English foreign policy in the years 1515-25, and represents it as 'effective' despite some problems. While acknowledging that it 'failed to bring any great gains to the country' and that Henry's ambitions could be considered 'vainglorious', David Grossell claims that England's 'independent and active role' won 'glory, honour and prestige' which 'meant so much to Henry'. Source 4 seems to support this claim, but the evidence of source 5 highlights some of the problems that arose as a result. To make a balanced judgement these claims need to be set in the context of the period, and the range and extent of Henry and Wolsey's achievements must be considered.</p> <p>Source six refers to 'the conflict between Francis and Charles' which was the key feature of European diplomacy in this period. When Francis I succeeded to the throne of France in 1515 he became a rival to Henry for 'glory, honour and prestige' as well as an obstacle to Henry's ambitions in France. However, with the accession of Charles V in Spain and his election as Holy Roman Emperor in 1519, France was effectively surrounded by Hapsburg territories, and some kind of conflict between them was probably inevitable. For Henry this was an opportunity - both powers would benefit from an English alliance, and it was this situation that gave him the chance to 'thrust the country into a major role that its wealth and population scarcely justified' (Source 6). <u>It can therefore be argued that some of the success attributed in source 6 to Henry and Wolsey was in fact the result of external circumstances.</u> However, the reference also highlights the lack of resources that</p>	<p><i>Sources analysed and cross-referenced to set up alternative views for consideration. There is clear awareness that the claim in the question is a representation that can be tested against evidence and wider knowledge.</i></p> <p><i>Contextualisation of points from source 6 to begin assessment of whether policy was 'effective'.</i></p> <p><i>Inference from source 6 with wider knowledge integrated to develop the argument.</i></p>
---	---

was Henry's biggest problem. The war of 1512-14 that led to the capture of Therouanne and Tournai by the English had also used up Henry's financial legacy and limited his options. In that context Wolsey's pursuit of glory through peace, embodied in the Treaty of London in 1518, was sensible policy. Exploiting the Pope's desire to bring the European powers sin presenting England as the centre of European diplomacy and Henry as its main peacemaker. This supports the claim in source six that he brought 'glory, honour and prestige, which meant so much to Henry' and therefore the view that English foreign policy was 'effective'. At this point England did seem to stand alongside the greater continental powers as an equal, supporting the claim in the question. Source 4 adds further to this picture. The painting was commissioned by Henry to commemorate his great meeting with Francis in 1520, where again he is presented as an equal. The painting is not intended to be a realistic representation of how the event looked, but to convey the magnificence of the occasion. The size of the pavilion in the foreground, the temporary fountains and the golden tents that gave the occasion its name (the Field of the Cloth of Gold) illustrate the nature of the occasion, and are confirmed by contemporary descriptions. Most significantly, although the event took place near Calais, it was in English territory and with the King of England as its host.

It can therefore be argued that sources six and four sustain the claim in the question and show the success of Henry's (or perhaps Wolsey's) foreign policy. However, source six also also makes the point that it brought no 'great gains' to the country, while source 4 suggests that the costs of maintaining equality with Francis and Charles would be considerable even if war was avoided. Despite the meeting with Francis Henry's real ambitions lay in seizing French territory. The Treaty of London could not maintain the peace for long, and when war was looming in 1521, Henry chose to ally with Charles in the hope of taking territory in France. Co-operation with French rebels appeared to provide the opportunity. Unfortunately Charles gave him little assistance, and Henry's lack of resources meant that he could achieve very little by himself. In 1523 he was forced to abandon his campaign in France for lack of resources, and if the sources are interpreted together, it is clear that Henry was facing serious problems. Source 4 suggests the scale of expenditure required, source six implies that Henry's resources were limited, and source 5 suggests that attempts to raise more revenue would lead to rebellion at home. The evidence is not entirely reliable, since the

*Cross-referencing sources 6 and 4 to support the claim. Inference based on evidence from source 4, which is analysed and evaluated in context to support the claim.*

*Evidence re-interpreted to challenge the claim in the question, using sources 4 and 6 together.*

*Contextual knowledge integrated to develop points drawn from sources*

*Cross-referencing to develop the argument.*

*Evidence evaluated for reliability, and placed in context to assess its significance.*

authors of the letter, the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, were sworn enemies of Wolsey and had every reason to exaggerate the problems caused by his attempts to raise money for the war. However, there had already been resistance to parliamentary taxes in 1523, which was why Wolsey had turned to the idea of forced loans and gifts. By blaming Wolsey the king was able to defuse the crisis, but it was clear that he could not sustain an 'independent and active' foreign policy. By 1525 Henry had over reached himself and his resources, and the humiliation of being abandoned by Charles after Pavia was simply the final confirmation of his failure.

On balance, therefore, the claim in the question cannot be fully justified by the evidence of the sources and the events of the period. It is clear that Henry enjoyed some success, and did gain prestige and honour from the diplomacy of 1518-21. As source six says, Wolsey did 'serve his master' in this period, but for Henry, this was not sufficient. His preoccupation with glory, honour and prestige required greater success, and his 'vainglorious' desire for the French throne proved too great a temptation. He allowed England to be drawn into the Hapsburg-Valois conflict on the side of Spain, when he actually lacked the resources to play the 'major role' that he envisaged, and the result was failure and humiliation. After 1521 English foreign policy was reacting to decisions and events elsewhere rather than being 'independent and active', with very little of the 'glory, honour and prestige which meant so much to Henry'.

*Counter-argument based on sources interpreted and Evaluated in context.*

*Judgement based on range of evidence and wider Knowledge, drawing on different interpretations to establish an overall balance.*

*The sources are analysed and issues defined relating to the representation in the question. Discussion proceeds on the basis of reasoning from the sources and discriminating use of evidence that has been Contextualised and weighed to establish conflicting Arguments and a balanced conclusion.*

*AO2b - L4, 15 marks.*

*The focus is sustained and material selected for its Relevance to the issues. Integration is maintained*

*Throughout. AO1 - L4, 24 marks.*

*Total=39 marks.*

## CONCLUSION: KEY POINTS FOR UNIT 2

- Both questions focus on the analysis and interpretation of evidence from sources in the context of wider knowledge. Part (a) questions require contextual awareness. Part (b) questions require the deployment of contextual, knowledge and understanding.
- Both questions require a judgement to be made.
- Part (a) questions address AO2a and focus on the skills required in the handling of sources. Candidates demonstrate these skills through the process of analysing, cross-referencing and interpreting a body of evidence to make a judgement.
- Progression in AO2a is based on reasoning from evidence taken from a set of sources with awareness of their nature, purpose and historical context.
- Part (b) questions focus on the conceptual understanding of how historical judgements are made. They address AO1 - cause, effect, impact, development and significance - and AO2b - the nature of historical evidence.
- Progression in AO1 is based on the selection and deployment of contextual knowledge to develop a judgement from a given body of evidence. A high level response requires the integration of knowledge with evidence from sources as well as range, depth and accuracy.
- Progression in AO2b requires understanding that all historical judgements are based upon interpretation - of events and actions as well as evidence from sources - and can only be evaluated in those terms. Conflicting interpretations are not right or wrong, only valid and more/less secure in the light of the available evidence.
- The starting point for responses to both (a) and (b) questions is the analysis, cross-referencing and interpretation of evidence from sources in the light of their context and provenance. The resulting arguments can be
  - Set out in an introduction
  - Developed and supported in the body of the answer
  - Compared, weighed up and judged in the final conclusion.