

# Mark Scheme (Results)

## Summer 2010

GCE

GCE History 6HI03/A

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: 0844 576 0034

Summer 2010

Publications Code UA024092

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:
  - i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear
  - ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter
  - iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate

## GCE History Marking Guidance

### Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

### Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

### Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

## Unit 3: Generic Level Descriptors

### Section A

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

The essay questions in Part (a) will have an analytical focus, requiring candidates to reach a substantiated judgement on a historical issue or problem.

| Level | Mark | Descriptor   |
|-------|------|--|
| 1     | 1-6  | <p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified. The statements will be supported by factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>  |
| 2     | 7-12 | <p>Candidates will produce statements with some development in the form of mostly accurate and relevant factual material. There will be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p> |

|   |       |  |
|---|-------|--|
| 3 | 13-18 | <p>Candidates' answers will be broadly analytical and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Factual material will be accurate, but it may not consistently display depth and/or relevance.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 4 | 19-24 | <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, with some evaluation of argument. 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>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce a convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>  |

|   |       |   |
|---|-------|---|
| 5 | 25-30 | <p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis which directly addresses the focus of the question. They demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 29-30 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p> |
|---|-------|---|

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

## Section B

Target: A01a and A01b (7% - 16 marks) A02b (10% - 24 marks) (40 marks)

Candidates will be provided with two or three secondary sources totalling about 350-400 words. The question will require candidates to compare the provided source material in the process of exploring an issue of historical debate and reaching substantiated judgements in the light of their own knowledge and understanding of the issues of interpretation and controversy. Students must attempt the controversy question that is embedded within the period context.

### A01a and A01b (16 marks)

| Level | Mark | Descriptor   |
|-------|------|--|
| 1     | 1-3  | <p>Candidates will produce a series of statements, some of which may be simplified, on the basis of factual material which has some accuracy and relevance although not directed at the focus of the question. Links with the presented source material will be implicit at best. The factual material will be mostly generalised and there will be few, if any, links between the statements.</p> <p>The writing may have some coherence and it will be generally comprehensible but passages will lack clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1 mark</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 2 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>                                 |
| 2     | 4-6  | <p>Candidates will produce statements deriving from their own knowledge and may attempt to link this with the presented source material. Knowledge will have some accuracy and relevance. There may be some analysis, but focus on the analytical demand of the question will be largely implicit. Candidates will attempt to make links between the statements and the material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>The writing will show elements of coherence but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. The range of skills needed to produce a convincing essay is likely to be limited. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 4 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth and the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 5 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth or the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 6 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p> |



|   |       |  |
|---|-------|--|
| 3 | 7-10  | <p>Candidates attempt a broadly analytical response from their own knowledge, which offers some support for the presented source material. Knowledge will be generally accurate and relevant. The answer will show some understanding of the focus of the question but may include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus in places. Attempts at analysis will be supported by generally accurate factual material which will lack balance in places.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes will not normally be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate some of the skills needed to produce a convincing essay, but there may be passages which show deficiencies in organisation. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 7 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 8-9 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 10 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 4 | 11-13 | <p>Candidates offer an analytical response from their own knowledge which supports analysis of presented source material and which attempts integration with it. Knowledge will be generally well-selected and accurate and will have some range and depth. The selected material will address the focus of the question and show some understanding of the key issues contained in it with some evaluation of argument and - as appropriate - interpretation. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked although the selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing and cogent essay will be mostly in place.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 11 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 12 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 13 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>                           |

|   |       |   |
|---|-------|---|
| 5 | 14-16 | <p>Candidates offer a sustained analysis from their own knowledge which both supports, and is integrated with, analysis of the presented source material. Knowledge will be well-selected, accurate and of appropriate range and depth. The selected material directly addresses the focus of the question. Candidates demonstrate explicit understanding of the key issues raised by the question, evaluating arguments and - as appropriate - interpretations. The analysis will be supported by an appropriate range and depth of accurate and well-selected factual material.</p> <p>The answer will be cogent and lucid in exposition. Occasional syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but they will not impede coherent deployment of the material and argument. Overall, the answer will show mastery of essay-writing skills.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 14 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>and</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 5: 15 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 16 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p> |
|---|-------|---|

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

#### **Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication**

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

AO2b (24 marks)

| Level | Mark  | Descriptor  |
|-------|-------|---|
| 1     | 1-4   | <p>Comprehends the surface features of sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the view posed in the question. When reaching a decision in relation to the question the sources will be used singly and in the form of a summary of their information. Own knowledge of the issue under debate will be presented as information but not integrated with the provided material.</p> <p><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>   |
| 2     | 5-9   | <p>Comprehends the sources and notes points of challenge and support for the stated claim. Combines the information from the sources to illustrate points linked to the question.</p> <p>When supporting judgements made in relation to the question, relevant source content will be selected and summarised and relevant own knowledge of the issue will be added. The answer may lack balance but one aspect will be developed from the sources. Reaches an overall decision but with limited support.</p> <p><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-9 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>   |
| 3     | 10-14 | <p>Interprets the sources with confidence, showing the ability to analyse some key points of the arguments offered and to reason from the evidence of the sources. Develops points of challenge and support for the stated claim from the provided source material and deploys material gained from relevant reading and knowledge of the issues under discussion. Shows clear understanding that the issue is one of interpretation.</p> <p>Focuses directly on the question when structuring the response, although, in addressing the specific enquiry, there may be some lack of balance. Reaches a judgement in relation to the claim, supported by information and argument from the sources and from own knowledge of the issues under debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 3: 10-11 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 12-14 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p> |

|   |       |  |
|---|-------|--|
| 4 | 15-19 | <p>Interprets the sources with confidence showing the ability to understand the basis of the arguments offered by the authors and to relate these to wider knowledge of the issues under discussion. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from an exploration of the issues raised by the process of analysing the sources and the extension of these issues from other relevant reading and own knowledge of the points under debate.</p> <p>Presents an integrated response with developed reasoning and debating of the evidence in order to create judgements in relation to the stated claim, although not all the issues will be fully developed. Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence.</p> <p><b>Low Level 4: 15-16 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 17-19 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p> |
| 5 | 20-24 | <p>Interprets the sources with confidence and discrimination, assimilating the author's arguments and displaying independence of thought in the ability to assess the presented views in the light of own knowledge and reading. Treatment of argument and discussion of evidence will show that the full demands of the question have been appreciated and addressed. Presents a sustained evaluative argument and reaches fully substantiated conclusions demonstrating an understanding of the nature of historical debate.</p> <p><b>Low Level 5: 20-21 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 5: 22-24 marks</b><br/>The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.</p>   |

*NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.*

### Unit 3 Assessment Grid

| Question Number | AO1a and b<br>Marks | AO2b<br>Marks | Total marks for<br>question |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Section A Q     | 30                  | -             | 30                          |
| Section B Q     | 16                  | 24            | 40                          |
| Total Marks     | 46                  | 24            | 70                          |
| % weighting     | 20%                 | 10%           | 30%                         |

## Section A

### A1 Protest, Crisis and Rebellion in England, 1536-88

| Question Number | Indicative content   | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 1               | <p>The question is primarily focused on the reasons for the dramatic changes in the official religious practices of the country in the specified period, which can include both monarchs and their key advisers. Candidates may choose to support the opening statement, and can do so by reference to the lack of any significant challenge to the doctrine of royal supremacy mounted in this period. They are likely to assess the personal predilections of the monarchs and show how these accord with the details of the changes. The role and influence of advisers is likely to figure with reference to Cranmer, Somerset and Northumberland under Edward, Gardiner, Philip and Pole under Mary and Cecil and Bacon under Elizabeth. The role of popular sentiment in either support or opposition to change is also likely to figure. Responses at L1 and L2 will be characterised by limited range/depth of accurate and relevant knowledge, and/or by a weak focus on the question. An accurate narrative of the changes is likely at Level 2. At Level 3 there will be analysis but all three monarchs may not be dealt with effectively. At L4 candidates will offer different and possibly conflicting arguments as evidence of evaluation and cover all three monarchs although the coverage may not be equally thorough. For L5 they will be able to make a balanced choice on the basis of explicit evaluation and/or reconcile the conflicts by establishing a relationship between the arguments, for example that the royal will determined the advisers in the case of Mary and Elizabeth and even had an increasing bearing under Edward.</p> | 30   |

| Question Number | Indicative content  | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 2               | <p>The question targets the reasons for the changing relationship of England and Spain from the period of friendship and alliance under Mary and the early years of Elizabeth to the outbreak of open conflict after 1585. The religious accord of Mary's reign is likely to figure but also the common hostility to France and the dynastic link. Candidates should appreciate Philip's attempts to maintain good relations with Elizabeth, and the restraint that he exercised over Catholic campaigns against her, indicating that religion was not the dominant issue. However, the nature of her birth and the prevailing climate in England, as well as her personal preferences, ensured that she would create a Protestant settlement of the Church, and in the context of religious conflict across Europe this was likely to prove a problem. Spanish control of the Netherlands and of the New World routes, the interests of trade both in Europe and elsewhere were additional dimensions. Perhaps most important in determining the pattern was the shifting balance of power involving the growing weakness of France and the increasing power of Spain, particularly with the ending of the conflict with the Turks in the Mediterranean and the acquisition of Portugal. Within this framework candidates can consider the role of individuals such as Catholic priests and English seamen, Philip II, Mary, Queen of Scots and Elizabeth herself, as well as events in the Netherlands, and evaluate their contribution to assess how far they worsened relations. Responses at L1 and L2 will be characterised by limited range/depth of accurate and relevant knowledge, and by a weak focus on the question. At Level 2 a simple but accurate narrative of events is likely to dominate. At L3 candidates will clearly address the question, and despite the inclusion of narrative or descriptive passages, will offer a securely focused and supported argument possibly arguing for the primacy of religion as a cause of conflict. At L4 candidates will offer different and/or conflicting arguments as evidence of evaluation, and may show that several have validity. For L5 they will be able to make a balanced choice on the basis of explicit evaluation and/or reconcile the conflicts by establishing a relationship between the arguments, for example that religion exacerbated tensions but that 'determined' is too strong a word.</p> | 30   |

## A2 Revolution, Republic and Restoration: England, 1629-67

| Question Number | Indicative content   | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 3               | <p>The focus of the question is on the contentious subject of financing government in the years 1629-40. Responses are likely to focus on the considerable increase in royal revenue to nearly £1million a year and the achievement of a surplus over expenditure, in addition to the building and maintenance of an effective fleet in peace-time. The different sources for this improvement - Distraint of Knighthood, Forest Fines, Ship Money, Wardship etc. and improved customs revenue are all likely to figure. Some may point out the precarious nature of the surplus and the prerequisite of peace. The degree of resentment is likely to be hotly debated, with much offered on Hampden and the famous Ship Money Case. Against this there may be comment on the relative lack of resistance and the remarkably passive behaviour of much of the country at least until 1638/9. Responses at L1 and L2 are likely to be characterised by limited range/depth of support and/or lack of focus on the question. Level 2 answers are likely to offer an accurate description of the financial expedients adopted while those at L3 will have adequate focus and support, despite some narrative or descriptive passages. Responses at this level will clearly address either 'the degree of achievement' or 'resentment'. At L4 candidates will demonstrate awareness that more than one judgement is possible on one or both of these issues, by presenting alternative arguments, while those at L5 will be able to develop these into a balanced judgement by evaluating, adjudicating between, and/or reconciling, different views on both issues.</p> | 30   |

| Question Number | Indicative content   | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 4               | <p>The question is focused on the reasons for the failure to achieve a compromise settlement in the years after the First Civil War. Candidates are likely to be aware of the differing agendas amongst Charles' erstwhile enemies - Scots, the Parliamentary groupings around Holles and St John, the Army Grandees and the Army radicals and sectarians. Charles' duplicitous behaviour is likely to attract comment and his role in the onset of the Second Civil War. This can be set against the increasingly bitter divisions amongst the alliance that had won the First Civil War, and whose differing agendas made a settlement difficult if not impossible. It might be argued that it was the opportunity raised by the squabbles that made Charles more confident and difficult to deal with. Responses at L1 and L2 are likely to be characterised by limited range/depth of support and/or lack of focus on the question. Level 2 answers are likely to be accurate narratives of these years while those at L3 will have adequate focus and support, despite some narrative or descriptive passages. Responses at the top of the level will clearly address Charles' responsibility. At L4 candidates will demonstrate awareness that more than one judgement is possible on this issue, by presenting alternative arguments, while those at L5 will be able to develop these into a balanced judgement by evaluating, adjudicating between, and/or reconciling, different views, for instance Charles deliberately utilised the obvious divisions amongst his various opponents in the hope of reversing the result of the First Civil War, but these divisions were as much a cause of failure as Charles' deceptive behaviour.</p> | 30   |

## Section B

### A1 Protest, Crisis and Rebellion in England, 1536-88

| Question Number | Indicative content  | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 5               | <p>The three sources include a range of points about the nature and impact of events in 1536, with conflicting implications for a response to the question. Source 1 summarises the characteristics of the main rebellions in 1536, and points out the sheer scale of the challenge, a point echoed in Source 2. Source 2 can therefore be used to strengthen and develop this argument. However, Source 2 does also point out that the rebellion was in the North and as such less capable of exerting direct pressure on the focal point of Tudor Government in London. Candidates could relate this argument to their knowledge of the period, including other rebellions such as Wyatt's rebellion in 1554 (much closer to London) and the Northern Rising against Elizabeth, to evaluate the seriousness of this threat. Source 3 can be used inferentially to support the other two with regard to the scale of the rebellion but clearly presents a different 'take' on the nature of the threat posed, stressing the conservative and essentially deferential nature of the Pilgrims. Candidates own knowledge can be used with Source 3 to demonstrate Norfolk's role in 'saving' the King almost from himself and in taking up the point made in Source 1 about the weakness of the armed forces available to a Tudor Government and by implication its dependence on the Nobility. The fact that most of the landed classes stayed loyal is vital in assessing the degree of the threat posed. In weighing the case, the point made in Source 2 about Henry drawing back is likely to figure. Responses at L1 may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be cobbled together into a narrative, but at L2 and above candidates will draw out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross-referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge. At L2 the analytical focus will be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either debates or historical events. At L3 candidates will be able to utilise this to build a supported argument relating to the seriousness of the threats posed to the regime. At L4 they will both support and challenge the extent of the threat and utilise contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself, to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer an alternative hypothesis. At L5 they will apply such knowledge to offer a judgement on their relative strengths and/or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints.</p> | 40   |



| Question Number | Indicative content  | Mark |
|-----------------|---|------|
| 6               | <p>Source 6 illustrates the Queen's frequent irritation with some of her Parliaments' demands. The differing causes of conflict are clearly laid out in Source 5 but Source 4 stresses the success for the most part in managing Parliaments and demonstrates why they were called. Candidates are therefore able to both support and challenge the view given in the question by reference to the sources taken at face value, and this is likely to be the case at lower levels. However, if the implications of the evidence are drawn out and developed, by reference to both historical debates and wider knowledge of the period, the conflicting arguments can be assessed and evaluated. Contextual knowledge can show, for example, how much business was transacted without conflict, and that Elizabeth never demonstrated any sense of uncertainty in gaining a vote of subsidies, made explicit in Source 4. Similarly a more developed examination of conflicts will demonstrate the extent to which they arose precisely because of the 'community of interest' established between the government and MPs, as MPs sought to protect the queen and the kingdom (often encouraged by her closest advisers, who were themselves members of one or other house) with or without her approval. Source 5 of course makes the point that the irritation often arose from the House showing too much enthusiasm for a line of action tentatively promoted by the regime, rather than direct hostility to the government's policy. It can therefore be demonstrated that the relationship was a complex mix of both conflict and co-operation, based on both continuity and change. Candidates who can develop the arguments fully to evaluate different interpretations and resolve the apparent conflicts can access L5. Responses at L1 may well take the arguments at face value, but at L2 and above candidates will draw out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross-referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge. At L2 the analytical focus will be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either debates or historical events. At L3 candidates will be able to utilise this to build a supported argument relating to the nature of the relationship between Elizabeth and her parliaments. This will refer to the opinion related in the question. At L4 they will both support and challenge the view expressed in the question and utilise contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself, to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer an alternative hypothesis. At L5 they will apply such knowledge to offer a measured judgement.</p> | 40   |

## A2 Revolution, Republic and Restoration: England, 1629-67

| Question Number | Indicative content   | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 7               | <p>Source 7 provides the basis of the proposition that the fundamental division was by conscience not class. This can be partially supported by the opening sentence of Source 9 and is partially contradicted by the analysis offered in Source 8. Those who can effectively interpret and cross-reference the arguments presented here can demonstrate how religion appeared to be the dominant determinant. A more nuanced reading of Source 9, however, does give support that there was a degree of division along class lines with the admission that the bulk of the aristocracy supported the King and he partially based his appeal on distaste for the religious enthusiasts who exceeded their social status. Candidates will develop these points with own knowledge of the period and illustrate the influence of local and individual circumstances. Responses at L1 may well take the arguments at face value, but at L2 and above candidates will draw out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross-referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge. At L2 the analytical focus will be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either debates or historical events. At L3 candidates will be able to utilise this to build a supported argument relating to the role of class in deciding loyalties, while at L4 they will advance a variety of motives and utilise contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself, to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer an alternative hypothesis. At L5 they will apply such knowledge to offer a judgement on their relative strengths and/or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints.</p> | 40   |

| Question Number | Indicative content   | Mark |
|-----------------|--|------|
| 8               | <p>The question targets the reasons for the limited success of the Protectorate. Source 10 provides the quotation and argues that hostility to military rule lay at the basis of failure and this can be found repeated in Source 11 although here there is greater emphasis given to the hostility amongst the traditional elite to the agenda of the godly. This is plainly advanced in Source 12. Candidates can draw on their own knowledge of events to develop analysis of Cromwell's radical religious views and his defence of toleration to explain the failure of the Protectorate. Look here for treatment of the Naylor case as well as expansion of the reception given to Barebones Parliament, referred to in Source 12. Candidates should explore the proposition that it was military rule that was primarily unpopular and here extensive treatment of the role of the Major Generals in 1655 is likely. The better responses will analyse the role of the traditional elites and the reasons why Cromwell was so anxious to work with them. Responses at L1 may well take the arguments at face value, but at L2 and above candidates will draw out the implications of the arguments and attempt to support and/or challenge them by both cross-referencing the sources and/or applying contextual knowledge. At L2 the analytical focus will be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either debates or historical events. At L3 candidates will be able to utilise this to build a supported argument relating to the role of the suggested factors in accounting for the limited success of the Protectorate. At L4 they will advance a variety of factors and utilise contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself, to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer an alternative hypothesis. At L5 they will apply such knowledge to offer a judgement on their relative strengths and/or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints.</p> | 40   |



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA024092 Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH