

## **GCSE (9-1)**

### **History B (Schools History Project)**

#### **J411/81: The First Crusade, c.1070-1100**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

### **Mark Scheme for June 2022**

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2022

**MARKING INSTRUCTIONS****PREPARATION FOR MARKING****RM ASSESSOR**

1. Make sure that you have accessed and completed the relevant training packages for on-screen marking: *RM Assessor assessor Online Training; OCR Essential Guide to Marking*.
2. Make sure that you have read and understood the mark scheme and the question paper for this unit. These are posted on the RM Cambridge Assessment Support Portal <http://www.rm.com/support/ca>
3. Log-in to RM Assessor and mark the **required number** of practice responses (“scripts”) and the **required number of** standardisation responses.

**MARKING**

1. Mark strictly to the mark scheme.
2. Marks awarded must relate directly to the marking criteria.
3. The schedule of dates is very important. It is essential that you meet the RM Assessor 50% and 100% (traditional 40% Batch 1 and 100% Batch 2) deadlines. If you experience problems, you must contact your Team Leader (Supervisor) without delay.
4. If you are in any doubt about applying the mark scheme, consult your Team Leader by telephone or the RM Assessor messaging system, or by email.

**5. Crossed Out Responses**  
Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

**Rubric Error Responses – Optional Questions**

Where candidates have a choice of question across a whole paper or a whole section and have provided more answers than required, then all responses are marked and the highest mark allowable within the rubric is given. Enter a mark for each question answered into RM assessor, which will select the highest mark from those awarded. (*The underlying assumption is that the candidate has penalised themselves by attempting more questions than necessary in the time allowed.*)

### **Contradictory Responses**

When a candidate provides contradictory responses, then no mark should be awarded, even if one of the answers is correct.

### **Short Answer Questions** (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. (*The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.*)

### **Short Answer Questions** (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

### **Longer Answer Questions** (requiring a developed response)

Where candidates have provided two (or more) responses to a medium or high tariff question which only required a single (developed) response and not crossed out the first response, then only the first response should be marked. Examiners will need to apply professional judgement as to whether the second (or a subsequent) response is a 'new start' or simply a poorly expressed continuation of the first response.

6. Always check the pages (and additional objects if present) at the end of the response in case any answers have been continued there. If the candidate has continued an answer there then add a tick to confirm that the work has been seen.

7. Award No Response (NR) if:

- there is nothing written in the answer space

Award Zero '0' if:

- anything is written in the answer space and is not worthy of credit (this includes text and symbols).

Team Leaders must confirm the correct use of the NR button with their markers before live marking commences and should check this when reviewing scripts.

8. The RM Assessor **comments box** is used by your team leader to explain the marking of the practice responses. Please refer to these comments when checking your practice responses. **Do not use the comments box for any other reason.**

If you have any questions or comments for your team leader, use the phone, the RM Assessor messaging system, or e-mail.

9. Assistant Examiners will send a brief report on the performance of candidates to their Team Leader (Supervisor) via email by the end of the marking period. The report should contain notes on particular strengths displayed as well as common errors or weaknesses. Constructive criticism of the question paper/mark scheme is also appreciated.

10. For answers marked by levels of response:

- To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)

Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

## 11. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
✓ 1	Level 1
✓ 2	Level 2
✓ 3	Level 3
✓ 4	Level 4
✓ 5	Level 5
✓ 6	Level 6
SEEN	Noted but no credit given
NAQ	Not answered question
~~~~	Extendable horizontal wavy line

## 1. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

### INTRODUCTION

Your first task as an Examiner is to become thoroughly familiar with the material on which the examination depends. This material includes:

- the specification, especially the assessment objectives
- the question paper and its rubrics
- the mark scheme.

You should ensure that you have copies of these materials.

Please ask for help or guidance whenever you need it. Your first point of contact is your Team Leader.

### INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXAMINERS

- 1 The practice and standardisation scripts provide you with *examples* of the standard of each band. The marks awarded for these scripts will have been agreed by the PE and Senior Examiners.
- 2 The specific task-related indicative content for each question will help you to understand how the band descriptors may be applied. However, this indicative content does not constitute the mark scheme: it is material that candidates might use, grouped according to each assessment objective tested by the question. It is hoped that candidates will respond to questions in a variety of ways. Rigid demands for ‘what must be a good answer’ would lead to a distorted assessment.
- 3 Candidates’ answers must be relevant to the question. Beware of seemingly prepared answers that do not show the candidate’s thought and which have not been adapted to the thrust of the question. Beware also of answers where candidates attempt to reproduce interpretations and concepts that they have been taught but have only partially understood.

## Mark scheme

## Section B: The First Crusade c.1070 – 100

Question 1 – 7 marks	
<p><b>What can Source A tell us about the siege of Antioch in June 1098?</b></p> <p><b>Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.</b></p>	
<p><b>Levels</b></p> <p><b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 2 marks</b>  <b>AO3</b> Analyse sources (contemporary to the period). <b>Maximum 5 marks</b>  <b>Please note that that while the weightings of AO1 to AO3 are equal in levels 1, AO3 carries greater weight in level 2 and greater weight again in level 3.</b></p>	
<p><b>Level 3 (6–7 marks)</b></p> <p>The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows strong awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify a wide range of features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).</p>	<p><b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b></p> <p><i>Valid features that answers could identify include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Surface features</b> (L1) – Crusader leaders, tactics, death toll</li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the source's content</i> (L2) – Turkish leadership was poor – fooled by the Franks, garrison wasn't aware of the Frankish army being moved to the city walls; Crusader leadership was unified; nature of Crusader warfare – brutal Crusader tactics, large casualties.</li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the source's tone</i> (L3) – The source seems to delight in the many deaths of the Muslim defenders. This gives us an insight into the mindset behind the First Crusade – that Crusaders, churchmen and all Christians would have seen the deaths as a good thing, almost like an offering to God.</li> </ul> <p><i>There is no requirement to mention any possible limitations of the source. Candidates will be credited for recognising features of the source such as its production or tone and explaining how these are helpful to historians. These could include the purpose of the source as outlined above.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (3–5 marks)</b></p> <p>The response shows knowledge and understanding of relevant key features and characteristics (AO1). Shows some awareness of how sources can be used critically and constructively by e.g. considering the limitations and/or benefits of the source, using wider contextual knowledge to confirm, challenge or raise questions about what the source says or shows to analyse the source to identify some features that relate to the focus of the question; some of which may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).</p>	<p><i>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations of the source unless this is explicitly used to help to say what the source "can tell us" in relation to the focus of the question.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b></p> <p>The response shows knowledge of features and characteristics (AO1). Analyses the source to identify at least one feature that relates to the focus of the question; this may be inferred rather than directly stated in the source (AO3).</p>	<p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>
<p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

<p><b>Question 1 – 7 marks</b></p> <p><b>What can Source A tell us about the siege of Antioch in June 1098? Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Guidance and indicative content</b></p>	
<b>Level 3 (6-7 marks)</b>	<p>Explains what the source reveals about the intensity of emnity / attitudes / mindsets of the Crusaders and their sponsors in the Church e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The source gives us an insight into the mindset of the Crusaders at Antioch. The tone is celebratory and seems to delight in the carnage which the Crusaders caused to the Turks, seeming to be pleased that so many Turks were killed and thrown over the walls.</i></li> <li>• <i>The tone of the source seems to delight in the many deaths of the Muslim defenders, particularly where it states that the Crusaders hurled the Turks to their deaths over the walls. This gives us an insight into the mindset behind the First Crusade – that Crusaders, churchmen and all Christians would have seen the deaths as a good thing, almost like an offering to God.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source gives us an insight into the mindset behind the Crusaders at the siege of Antioch – that it was acceptable (even laudable) to use trickery and lies to defeat the Turks because they were Muslims.</i></li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Valid inference with valid <b>source</b> support = 7 marks, no valid <b>source</b> support = 6 marks</p>
<b>Level 2 (3-5 marks)</b>	<p>Explains what source tells us about the siege of Antioch by using a valid inference from the content of source, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The source tells us about tactics used by the Crusaders – breaking their word with the Turks to gain victory.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source tells us about the main reason for the success of the Crusaders – breaking their word with the Turks to gain victory.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source tells us that the Crusaders worked together effectively, with all the princes agreeing on the plan to move their troops up secretly.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source tells us the Crusader leaders were clever and ruthless.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source tells us that the fighting was brutal, with many Turks being killed.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source tells us the Crusaders at Antioch were very pleased with their victory. (3 marks)</i></li> </ul> <p>NOTE: Valid inference(s) with no <b>relevant</b> support from the <b>source</b> = 3 marks.</p>
<b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>	<p>Lifts surface detail from source or general comments on provenance to address question, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The source tells us how the Crusader leaders approached the gates but then brought up their troops without the Turks realising it and fooled the Turks into opening the gates.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source tells us that a lot of Turks were killed.</i></li> <li>• <i>The source tells us who led the Crusaders.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, makes valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</p> <p><i>The source tells us that leaders used trickery when they fought.</i></p>

<b>Question 2 – 15 marks</b> <b>How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying why the People's Crusade failed?</b> <b>In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.</b>	
<b>Levels</b> <p><b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b></p> <p><b>AO3</b> Analyse, evaluate and use sources (contemporary to the period) to make substantiated judgements, in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b></p> <p><b>AO4</b> Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations in the context of historical events studied. <b>Maximum 5 marks</b></p> <p><b>Please note that while the descriptors for AO3 and AO4 are given separately in the levels, the analysis and evaluation of sources and interpretations may be combined in responses.</b></p>	<i>Analysis of the sources and interpretation could identify features such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – e.g. D is useful because it shows us there were churchmen as well as knights. C is useful because it tells us the Crusaders didn't have enough resources. B is useful as it tells us they were easily defeated by the Hungarians in the castle</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3–5) – e.g. B is useful for showing the People's Crusade made little progress due to the nature and attitude of the Crusaders and the trouble they invited along the way. B also suggests a lack of ready money prohibited these Crusaders from continuing. C is useful for suggesting a lack of support from Constantinople – despite being in Asia Minor the Crusaders are without resources (market privileges were given, but actions of those on the People's Crusade – such as plundering – meant that Byzantine support was limited). D is useful for showing the People's Crusade lacked clear military organisation, D is useful because it shows us the Crusaders weren't a formidable military force which was the case e.g. Peter the Hermit departed before the set date, and various groups travelled independently of each other. This could also be drawn out from the Crusaders' behaviour in B – lack of a unifying leader and goal led to insolent Crusader forces. The poor appearance of the participants in D also suggests a reason for failure – presumably the Crusaders would not have had enough ready money or equipment to complete the journey.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).  Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3).  Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences etc.). Sets out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing evaluation reaching a well-substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Surface features of sources (L2) – e.g. D is useful because it shows us there were churchmen as well as knights. C is useful because it tells us the Crusaders didn't have enough resources. B is useful as it tells us they were easily defeated by the Hungarians in the castle</i></li> <li>• <i>Inferences from the content of the sources (L3–5) – e.g. B is useful for showing the People's Crusade made little progress due to the nature and attitude of the Crusaders and the trouble they invited along the way. B also suggests a lack of ready money prohibited these Crusaders from continuing. C is useful for suggesting a lack of support from Constantinople – despite being in Asia Minor the Crusaders are without resources (market privileges were given, but actions of those on the People's Crusade – such as plundering – meant that Byzantine support was limited). D is useful for showing the People's Crusade lacked clear military organisation, D is useful because it shows us the Crusaders weren't a formidable military force which was the case e.g. Peter the Hermit departed before the set date, and various groups travelled independently of each other. This could also be drawn out from the Crusaders' behaviour in B – lack of a unifying leader and goal led to insolent Crusader forces. The poor appearance of the participants in D also suggests a reason for failure – presumably the Crusaders would not have had enough ready money or equipment to complete the journey.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1).  Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3).  Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a sustained and generally convincing evaluation reaching a substantiated judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Understanding of appropriate characteristic features - The nature of the People's Crusade ie who went, commanded etc; The motives of those on the People's Crusade; The problems of leadership; The difficulties faced.</i></li> <li>• <i>Less well-developed comments will probably include – (L3) Comments which support or challenge the evidence presented in sources with candidates' own knowledge, rendering sources more or less useful in terms of typicality or reliability. Candidates may show how the sources/interpretation agree and/or disagree with each other.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> <p>Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>(L2) Undeveloped comments on how provenance of sources make them unreliable and therefore not useful, e.g. D was drawn a long</i></li> </ul>

<p>understanding of them (AO1).            Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3).            Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Sets out a partial evaluation with some explanation of ideas reaching a supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<p><i>time after the event and C maybe someone didn't like Crusaders who weren't French.</i></p> <p><i>Candidates should not be rewarded above Level 1 for simply saying what is 'missing' from the sources e.g. 'Not useful because it has no information about the Battle of Civetot'.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b></p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1).            Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about usefulness of the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO3).            Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question (e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, etc.). Gives a basic evaluation with some limited explanation of ideas and a loosely supported judgment about the usefulness of the interpretation(s) in relation to the issue in the question (AO4).</p>	<p><i>No reward can be given for raising concerns over the limitations unless this is explicitly used to help to say how it affects usefulness for the context given. Evaluation of usefulness may also involve making valid substantiated suggestions of other lines of enquiry for which the collection may be useful, but the focus given in the question must also be addressed.</i></p> <p><i>No reward can be given for wider knowledge of the period that is unrelated to the topic in the question.</i></p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b></p> <p>Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1).            Analyses the source(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO3)            Analyses the interpretation(s) to identify features appropriate to the question e.g. by considering specific details, provenance, making valid inferences, making appropriate cross-references or identifying significant themes that they have in common.(AO4)            There is either no attempt to evaluate and reach a judgment about usefulness of the interpretation(s) and the source(s) in relation to the issue in the question, or there is an assertion but this lacks any support or historical validity</p>	
<p><b>0 marks</b>            No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 2 – 15 marks	
How useful are Sources B and C and Interpretation D for a historian studying why the People's Crusade failed? In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.	
Guidance and indicative content	
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Supported inferences (<b>support from sources</b>) from <u>content of two</u> of B, C or D to explain why they are <b>useful</b> as evidence about why the People's Crusade failed (i.e. 2 x L4), e.g.</p> <p><i>B is useful as evidence about the way the People's Crusaders behaved in the lands they travelled through, which resulted them being attacked by people in those lands. The source shows how the Crusade was damaged by the attacks of the Hungarians. The source blames the People's Crusaders themselves for these attacks. It mentions the People's Crusade's 'usual disrespect', suggesting that the People's Crusaders treated the locals badly when they travelled through their lands.</i></p> <p><i>Source C is useful for showing that the People's Crusade were not properly prepared or supplied for the journey. They were obviously going to travel through hot and dry lands in order to reach the Holy Land. The source suggests they were clearly unprepared for this and were reduced to drinking the blood of animals or urine.</i></p>
Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p>Supported inference(s) (<b>support from source</b>) from <u>content of one</u> of B, C or D to explain why it is <b>useful</b> as evidence about why the People's Crusade failed e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B is useful for showing that the members of the People's Crusade were responsible for their own failure because of the way they behaved on their journey to the Holy Land. The source mentions 'their usual disrespect', which suggests that the people's Crusade behaved poorly in the lands it travelled through. As the source says, this in turn led the Hungarians to attack them.</i></li> <li>• <i>Source C is useful for showing that the People's Crusade were not properly prepared or supplied for the journey. They were obviously going to travel through hot and dry lands in order to reach the Holy Land. The source suggests they were clearly unprepared for this and were reduced to drinking the blood of animals or urine.</i></li> </ul>

<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	<p>Valid but <b>unsupported inference(s)</b> from content to explain why one or more of B, C, D are <b>useful</b> as evidence about why the People's Crusade failed, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B is useful for showing that the members of the People's Crusade were responsible for their own failure because of the way they behaved on their journey to the Holy Land.</i></li> <li>• <i>Source C is useful for showing that the People's Crusade were not properly prepared or supplied for the journey.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, <b>uses specific contextual knowledge (or purpose of C)</b> to argue that one or more of B, C or D are <b>useful or not useful</b> because they are <b>(un)reliable</b>, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>C is unreliable because it was trying to undermine the reputation of the People's Crusade. The writer fought in the official Crusades and people like him did not approve of the People's Crusade. So he is exaggerating the suffering and making the People's Crusaders look bad by talking about drinking urine.</i></li> <li>• <i>D shows Peter the Hermit leading the People's Crusade. This is useful because it's accurate. He was famous leader who preached the crusade across central and northern France and the Rhineland. He had a big effect on the people who listened to him preach, as we can see in the image.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	<p>Uses <b>surface features or extracts</b> to argue source(s) are <b>useful</b> about why the Crusade failed e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B is useful as it reveals they lost in Hungary. (4)</i></li> <li>• <i>Source C is useful as it tells us they suffered from thirst. Some of them were squeezing water out of their clothes and even urinating in each other's hands. (5)</i></li> <li>• <i>Interpretation D is useful as it shows that Crusade was not just knights, it was also priests and women and children. Source B is also useful because we learn that the Crusaders were attacked in Hungary after they tried to besiege a castle. (6)</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, argues <b>useful or not useful</b> on the basis of <b>undeveloped provenance</b>, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>B is not useful because the church did not like the People's Crusade. (4 marks)</i></li> <li>• <i>C is useful as it is a reliable source. It is a knight criticising his own expedition and he would only do that if he was telling the truth. (4 marks)</i></li> <li>• <i>D is not useful as it was aimed at children and would show a very simplistic version of events. (4 marks)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE: undeveloped provenance – limit to 4 marks</b></p>
<b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>	<p>Valid but general assertion(s) and/or descriptions of the sources e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Source B is useful because it tells us about the places the People's Crusade travelled through.</i></li> <li>• <i>Interpretation D is useful as it gives a sense of what the Crusade looked like.</i></li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, argues <b>not useful</b> because of <b>what information the source(s) do not contain</b>, e.g.</p> <p><i>Interpretation D is not very useful because it doesn't show anything about how the People's Crusade attacked the Jews. I know that ...</i></p>
<b>0 marks</b>	

<b>Question 3* – 18 marks</b> <b>“Pope Urban II called for a crusade in 1095 because of the weakness of the Byzantine Empire”.</b> <b>How far do you agree?</b>		<b>Notes and guidance specific to the question set</b>
<b>Levels</b> <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied. <b>Maximum 6 marks</b>  <b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b>		
<b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1). Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering both evidence to support and to challenge the statement.</i>	<b>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (reasons for the calling of a crusade), and consequences of threats to and weaknesses of the Byzantines but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</b>  <b>Grounds for agreeing may include:</b> Weakness caused by internal divisions in religion (split between Byzantine and Latin Churches); the inability of the Byzantine Army to deal with threats; internal challenges to imperial rule. This background should be explained in the context of Alexios' rule and the death of Malik Shah which led to a further lapse in relations between the Seljuks and Byzantines, prompting Alexios to make a plea to Urban to help him recover Byzantine lands and protect Constantinople from non-Christians.  <b>Grounds for disagreeing may include:</b> the wider context of crusading – Muslim expansion into Sicily and Spain, which created an atmosphere ripe for the papacy to defend Muslim incursions to Christian territory; Urban II's desire to strengthen the papacy (and call for a crusade to unite people under a common cause); reports of Muslim actions towards Christians and religious sites in the East; Urban's aim to repair the divisions between East and West in the Church. The feudal system and system of vassalage could be established as a contributor – the Christian obligation to defend God's territory. Threats to the Byzantines (rather than internal weakness) could also be addressed: the threat the Seljuk Turks posed to the Byzantines (including Manzikert, 1071 and its consequences); Muslim threats to Christian Byzantines; the growth of the Norman Empire posing threats to the Byzantine
<b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b> Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i>		
<b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i>		
<b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i>		
<b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2). <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i>		
<b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2).		

<i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i>	<i>Empire</i>
<b>0 marks</b> No response or no response worthy of credit.	

Question 3* – 18 marks “Pope Urban II called for a crusade in 1095 because of the weakness of the Byzantine Empire”. How far do you agree? Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p>Balanced argument, two valid supporting examples each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways the statement is correct. The Byzantine Empire was weaker at this time than it had been in the past because the army was struggling to find enough troops of their own to fill its ranks. As a result, they were forced to employ mercenaries who were generally less loyal and reliable than native troops. For Pope Urban, a weakened Byzantium was a concern. Even though there were divisions between Latin and Orthodox Christianity the Byzantines were still Christian. So Urban called a crusade to prevent Byzantium from falling.</i></p> <p><i>Another challenge which made Byzantium weak was the advance of the Seljuk Turks. The Seljuks had defeated the Byzantines in 1071 at the Battle of Manzikert and by 1077 the Seljuks controlled most of Asia Minor. They were a constant source of concern to the Byzantines and there was regular conflict on the borders between the Seljuks and Byzantines. This was also a cause of the Crusade because Urban was concerned that if Byzantium fell, then Christians in Eastern Europe would be under threat from the Muslim Seljuks.</i></p> <p><i>However, there were other reasons why Urban called for a Crusade. In the 1070s Muslim states in Sicily and Spain had been divided and had been fighting with each other. Christian forces had taken advantage of these divisions. They captured the Spanish city of Toledo in 1085 and captured Sicily in 1091. Urban believed that this was a sign that the tide was turning in favour of the Christians and he wanted them to continue to advance against the Muslims so he thought this was the right time to call a crusade.</i></p> <p><i>Finally, another reason why Urban called the Crusade was to strengthen his own position as leader of the Christian world. The Reform Movement in the Church had increased the power of the Papacy, especially under Pope Gregory VII. However, Gregory VII's actions had alienated many rulers in Europe. Urban wanted to find a way to unite the Christians of Western Europe and he saw a Crusade against the Muslims as a way to do this. He thought a crusade might improve relations between the Latin Church and the Eastern Orthodox Church.</i></p> <p><i>So, overall, the weakness of the Byzantine Empire was an underlying reason for the calling of a crusade; however, the timing was decided by the opportunity to strike against the Muslim world in Spain and Sicily because they seemed just as weak at this point.</i></p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Balanced argument supported by three valid supporting examples (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</p> <p><i>In some ways the statement is correct. The Byzantine Empire was weaker at this time than it had been in the past because the army was struggling to find enough troops of their own to fill its ranks. As a result, they were forced to employ mercenaries who were generally less loyal and reliable than native troops. For Pope Urban, a weakened Byzantium was a concern. Even though there were divisions between Latin and Orthodox Christianity the Byzantines were still Christian. So Urban called a crusade to prevent Byzantium from falling.</i></p> <p><i>Another challenge which made Byzantium weak was the advance of the Seljuk Turks. The Seljuks had defeated the Byzantines in 1071 at the Battle of Manzikert and by 1077 the Seljuks controlled most of Asia Minor. They were a constant source of concern to the Byzantines and there was regular conflict on the borders between the Seljuks and Byzantines. This was also a cause of the Crusade because Urban was concerned that if Byzantium fell, then Christians in Eastern Europe would be under threat from the Muslim Seljuks.</i></p> <p><i>However, there were other reasons why Urban called for a Crusade. In the 1070s Muslim states in Sicily and Spain had been divided and had been fighting with each other. Christian forces had taken advantage of these divisions. They captured the Spanish city of Toledo in 1085 and captured Sicily in 1091. Urban believed that this was a sign that the tide was turning in favour of the Christians and he wanted them to continue to advance against the Muslims so he thought this was the right time to call a crusade.</i></p>
Level 4 (10-12	One sided argument, supported by two examples, e.g.

marks)	<p><i>The statement is correct. The Byzantine Empire was weaker at this time than it had been in the past because the army was struggling to find enough troops of their own to fill its ranks. As a result, they were forced to employ mercenaries who were generally less loyal and reliable than native troops. For Pope Urban, a weakened Byzantium was a concern. Even though there were divisions between Latin and Orthodox Christianity the Byzantines were still Christian. So Urban called a crusade to prevent Byzantium from falling.</i></p>
	<p><i>Another challenge which made Byzantium weak was the advance of the Seljuk Turks. The Seljuks had defeated the Byzantines in 1071 at the Battle of Manzikert and by 1077 the Seljuks controlled most of Asia Minor. They were a constant source of concern to the Byzantines and there was regular conflict on the borders between the Seljuks and Byzantines. This was also a cause of the Crusade because Urban was concerned that if Byzantium fell, then Christians in Eastern Europe would be under threat from the Muslim Seljuks.</i></p>
	<p><b>Alternatively, a balanced argument, supported by one example on each side, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>In some ways the statement is correct The Byzantine Empire was weaker at this time than it had been in the past because the army was struggling to find enough troops of their own to fill its ranks. As a result, they were forced to employ mercenaries who were generally less loyal and reliable than native troops. For Pope Urban, a weakened Byzantium was a concern. Even though there were divisions between Latin and Orthodox Christianity the Byzantines were still Christian. So Urban called a crusade to prevent Byzantium from falling.</i></p>
	<p><i>However, there were other reasons why Urban called for a Crusade. In the 1070s Muslim states in Sicily and Spain had been divided and had been fighting with each other. Christian forces had taken advantage of these divisions. They captured the Spanish city of Toledo in 1085 and captured Sicily in 1091. Urban believed that this was a sign that the tide was turning in favour of the Christians and he wanted them to continue to advance against the Muslims so he thought this was the right time to call a crusade.</i></p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by one example, e.g.</b></p>
	<p><i>I agree because the Byzantine Empire was weaker at this time than it had been in the past because <b>the army was struggling to find enough troops</b> of their own to fill its ranks. As a result, they were forced to employ mercenaries who were generally less loyal and reliable than native troops. For Pope Urban, <b>a weakened Byzantium was a concern</b>. Even though there were divisions between Latin and Orthodox Christianity the Byzantines were still Christian. <b>So Urban called a crusade to prevent Byzantium from falling.</b></i></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p><b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, I agree because of the threat of the Seljuk Turks.</li> <li>• No, Pope Urban wanted to unite Christians.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Alternatively, description of events without linking this to the question or without full explanation, e.g.</b></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 1095 Pope Urban sent out a call to all Christians to fight against the Muslims who controlled the Holy Lands. Many Christians joined this Crusade.</li> </ul>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p><b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b></p>
	<p><i>No, there were other bigger factors like the Muslims.</i></p>
0 marks	

<p><b>Question 4* – 18 marks</b>  <b>‘Rivalry between crusader leaders was the main reason it took so long for the crusaders to reach Jerusalem after they defeated Kerbogha at Antioch.’</b>  <b>How far do you agree?</b></p>	
<p><b>Levels</b>  <b>AO1</b> Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the periods studied.  <b>Maximum 6 marks</b></p> <p><b>AO2</b> Explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts. <b>Maximum 12 marks</b></p>	Notes and guidance specific to the question set
<p><b>Level 6 (16–18 marks)</b>  Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show very secure and thorough understanding of them (AO1).  Shows sophisticated understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained, consistently focused and convincing explanation and reaching a very well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).  <i>There is a well-developed and sustained line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<i>It is possible to reach the highest marks either by agreeing or disagreeing or anywhere between, providing the response matches the Level description. To reach Levels 5 and 6, this must involve considering both evidence to support and to challenge the statement.</i>
<p><b>Level 5 (13–15 marks)</b>  Demonstrates strong knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows very strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and convincing explanation and reaching a well-supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).  <i>There is a well-developed line of reasoning which is coherent, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<i>Answers are most likely to show understanding of the second order concepts of causation (reasons for delays and indecision), and consequences of the siege of Antioch but reward appropriate understanding of any other second order concept.</i>
<p><b>Level 4 (10–12 marks)</b>  Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of the period in ways that show secure understanding of them (AO1). Shows strong understanding of appropriate second order concepts in setting out a sustained and generally convincing explanation to reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).  <i>There is a developed line of reasoning which is clear, relevant and logically structured.</i></p>	<i>Grounds for agreeing may include: indecision about the fate of Antioch led to weeks of indecision and quarrels between Raymond and Bohemond (Raymond wanted to honour the Crusaders' promise to return conquered lands to Alexios whereas Bohemond wanted personal control of Antioch); infighting between secular lords (e.g. Maarrat); the death of Adhemar of Le Puy in August 1098 left the Crusaders without a spiritual leader; a range of leaders vying for leadership of the Crusade.</i>
<p><b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b>  Demonstrates sound knowledge of key features and characteristics of period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows sound understanding of appropriate second order concepts in making a reasonably sustained attempt to explain ideas and reach a supported judgment on the issue in the question (AO2).  <i>There is a line of reasoning presented which is mostly relevant and which has some structure.</i></p>	<i>Grounds for disagreeing may include: the Crusade leaders' decision to take stock and recoup after defeating Kerbogha; Alexios' reluctance to leave Constantinople to claim Antioch for the Byzantines; Crusaders' preoccupation with claiming booty and taking territory en route (e.g. the departure of some to Edessa after Baldwin's promise of bounty); the inability of any one leader to take Jerusalem due to insufficient military force.</i>
<p><b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b>  Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period in ways that show some understanding of them (AO1). Shows some understanding of appropriate second order concepts managing in a limited way to explain ideas and reach a loosely supported judgment about the issue in the question (AO2).  <i>There is a line of reasoning which has some relevance and which is presented with limited structure.</i></p>	
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b>  Demonstrates some knowledge of features and characteristics of the period (AO1). Shows some basic understanding of appropriate second order concept(s) but any attempt to explain ideas and reach a judgment on the issue in the question is unclear or lacks historical validity (AO2).  <i>The information is communicated in a basic/unstructured way.</i></p>	
<p><b>0 marks</b>  No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	

Question 4* – 18 marks 'Rivalry between crusader leaders was the main reason it took so long for the crusaders to reach Jerusalem after they defeated Kerbogha at Antioch.' How far do you agree? Guidance and indicative content	
Level 6 (16-18 marks)	<p>Balanced argument, two valid supporting examples each side (or three on one side and one on the other). Clinching argument = 18 marks , e.g.</p> <p><i>The statement is certainly correct to some extent. For example, after the success at Antioch, the Crusader leaders Raymond and Bohemond fought bitterly with each other about exactly who should be in charge of the captured city. Bohemond held the citadel while Raymond controlled the port. They also argued over whether any cities conquered by the crusaders should be returned to Byzantine rule. Each one refused to compromise with the other. These disputes delayed the move towards for Jerusalem for several months.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, a particular event linked to this rivalry was the attack on Marrat. In November 1098, instead of setting out for Jerusalem, Raymond led his troops to attack Marrat in an attempt to disrupt Bohemond's supply lines at Antioch. He launched a full-scale attack in December and crusaders ransacked the city. Over the winter months, supply lines were broken and some crusaders turned to cannibalism. But it took until January for Raymond to give up on establishing his own power base and finally lead his troops towards Jerusalem.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there were other reasons why the Crusaders took so long to reach Jerusalem. One reason was the actions of Emperor Alexios. The Crusaders had an agreement that if they captured Antioch then the Emperor Alexios would join them on their move to Jerusalem. However, Alexios' rule was threatened by enemies inside Byzantium. He did not feel safe enough to take his forces far away from the city in case his rivals tried to overthrow him. This meant the Crusaders were forced to wait, and eventually gave up waiting for him.</i></p> <p><i>A final reason why the Crusade took so long was the poor decision by Raymond in March 1099 to siege the town of Arqa whilst he waited for reinforcements from the other crusaders. because he knew his own forces were too small on their own. The siege lasted until mid-May. This wasted time and resources and the crusaders ended up leaving for Jerusalem without capturing the town anyway.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, I think that rivalry was the main reason that it took the crusaders so long. This is because even the other reasons can be traced by to rivalry. For example, there were arguments over whether or not to wait for Alexios, and Raymond's decision to siege Arqa was motivated by needed to wait for the other crusaders, but they wouldn't have been divided had he not separated from them and gone to Marrat in the first place.</i></p>
Level 5 (13-15 marks)	<p>Balanced argument supported by three valid supporting examples (i.e. two on one side and one on the other), e.g.</p> <p><i>The statement is certainly correct to some extent. For example, after the success at Antioch, the Crusader leaders Raymond and Bohemond fought bitterly with each other about exactly who should be in charge of the captured city. Bohemond held the citadel while Raymond controlled the port. They also argued over whether any cities conquered by the crusaders should be returned to Byzantine rule. Each one refused to compromise with the other. These disputes delayed the move towards for Jerusalem for several months.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there were other reasons why the Crusaders took so long to reach Jerusalem. One reason was the actions of Emperor Alexios. The Crusaders had an agreement that if they captured Antioch then the Emperor Alexios would join them on their move to Jerusalem. However, Alexios' rule was threatened by enemies inside Byzantium. He did not feel safe enough to take his forces far away from the city in case his rivals tried to overthrow him. This meant the Crusaders were forced to wait, and eventually gave up waiting for him.</i></p> <p><i>A final reason why the Crusade took so long was the poor decision by Raymond in March 1099 to siege the town of Arqa whilst he waited for reinforcements from the other crusaders. because he knew his own forces were too small on their own. The siege lasted until mid-May. This wasted time and resources and the crusaders ended up leaving for Jerusalem without capturing the town anyway.</i></p>

Level 4 (10-12 marks)	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by two examples, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>The statement is right because, after the success at Antioch, the Crusader leaders Raymond and Bohemond fought bitterly with each other about exactly who should be in charge of the captured city. Bohemond held the citadel while Raymond controlled the port. They also argued over whether any cities conquered by the crusaders should be returned to Byzantine rule. Each one refused to compromise with the other. These disputes delayed the move towards for Jerusalem for several months.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, a particular event linked to this rivalry was the attack on Marrat. In November 1098, instead of setting out for Jerusalem, Raymond led his troops to attack Marrat in an attempt to disrupt Raymond's supply lines at Antioch. He launched a full-scale attack in December and crusaders ransacked the city. Over the winter months, supply lines were broken and some crusaders turned to cannibalism. But it took until January for Raymond to give up on establishing his own power base and finally lead his troops towards Jerusalem.</i></p> <p><b>Alternatively, a balanced argument, supported by one example on each side, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>The statement is certainly correct to some extent. For example, after the success at Antioch, the Crusader leaders Raymond and Bohemond fought bitterly with each other about exactly who should be in charge of the captured city. Bohemond held the citadel while Raymond controlled the port. They also argued over whether any cities conquered by the crusaders should be returned to Byzantine rule. Each one refused to compromise with the other. These disputes delayed the move towards for Jerusalem for several months.</i></p> <p><i>On the other hand there were other reasons why the Crusaders took so long to reach Jerusalem. One reason was the actions of Emperor Alexios. The Crusaders had an agreement that if they captured Antioch then the Emperor Alexios would join them on their move to Jerusalem. However, Alexios' rule was threatened by enemies inside Byzantium. He did not feel safe enough to take his forces far away from the city in case his rivals tried to overthrow him. This meant the Crusaders were forced to wait, and eventually gave up waiting for him.</i></p>
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	<p><b>One sided argument, supported by one example, e.g.</b></p> <p><i>The statement right because, after the success at Antioch, the Crusader leaders Raymond and Bohemond fought bitterly with each other about exactly who should be in charge of the captured city. Bohemond held the citadel while Raymond controlled the port. They also argued over whether any cities conquered by the crusaders should be returned to Byzantine rule. Each one refused to compromise with the other. These disputes delayed the move towards for Jerusalem for several months.</i></p>
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	<p><b>Identification of reason(s) to support/challenge without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, I agree because of the arguments between Godfrey and Bohemund</li> <li>• No, it was the Emperor's fault because he did not join them</li> </ul> <p><b>Alternatively, description of events without linking this to the question or without full explanation, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After the Crusaders took Antioch it was several months before they set off for Jerusalem in January 1099. By July 1098, the crusaders had secured Antioch. It should have taken them three weeks to march from Jerusalem but it took them over a year.</li> </ul>
Level 1 (1-3 marks)	<p><b>Valid but general assertion(s), e.g.</b></p> <p><i>No, there were other bigger factors like the Emperor.</i></p>
0 marks	

## Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

### Call us on

**01223 553998**

Alternatively, you can email us on

[support@ocr.org.uk](mailto:support@ocr.org.uk)

For more information visit

-  [ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder](http://ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder)
-  [ocr.org.uk](http://ocr.org.uk)
-  [Twitter/ocrexams](http://Twitter/ocrexams)
-  [/ocrexams](http://ocrexams)
-  [/company/ocr](http://company/ocr)
-  [/ocrexams](http://ocrexams)



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2022 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA.

Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up-to-date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.