

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE in History (6HI03/A)

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2015

Publications Code US041783

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## 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
<b>1</b>	<b>1-6</b>	<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> 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> 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> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>7-12</b>	<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> 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> 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> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>13-18</b>	<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> 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> 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> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>19-24</b>	<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> 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> 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> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>5</b>	<b>25-30</b>	<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> 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> 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> 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: AO1a and AO1b (7% - 16 marks) AO2b (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.

### AO1a and AO1b (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> 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: 2 marks</b> 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: 3 marks</b> 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> 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: 5 marks</b> 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: 6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>

<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>7-10</b></p>	<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> 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> 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> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>11-13</b></p>	<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> 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> 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> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>14-16</b></p>	<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> 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> The qualities of Level 5 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its</p>



		range/depth <b>or</b> the quality of written communication does not conform. <b>High Level 5: 16 marks</b> The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed.
--	--	---

*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> 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> 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. 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> 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> 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. 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> 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> 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> 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> 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> 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> 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 Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
<b>Section A Q</b>	30	-	30
<b>Section B Q</b>	16	24	40
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>% weighting</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>30%</b>

## Section A

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>1</b>	<p>This question targets developments in the financing of government of Henry and Edward, and candidates are asked to assess the success of these. Candidates are likely to examine a range of issues. The reforms that took place under Cromwell may well be a starting point for this; innovations such as the Court of Augmentations (1536) and the Court of First Fruits and Tenths (1540) were established to handle the gains from former monastic lands and clerical payments, alongside bodies established under Wolsey such as the Court of General Surveyors. It may well be argued that to some extent that whilst these bypassed the Exchequer, they were managed effectively by Cromwell's appointees and were successful in administering sources of revenue from across the nation. Candidates are likely to identify issues relating to Henry's expenditure, largely resulting from military issues, and may well examine this with regards to the tension between such demands and Cromwell's desire to reorganise finance on a stable footing. In particular, candidates are likely to examine the Great Debasement, which begun under Henry in 1542 and continued under Edward and may consider the extent to which the gains in raising funds were offset by the effects of hoarding and inflation. Candidates may well make use of Wolsey's financial legacy, possibly arguing that whilst he was not the innovator that Cromwell may be seen to be, the preference for use of sources of income such as the parliamentary subsidy continued under the Subsidy Acts of 1534 and 1540, and offered both a steady supply in a manner more efficiently and accurately levied than earlier measures. Alongside such issues, candidates may highlight the increased debt such as that raised through Antwerp. Candidates may also examine the attempt to rationalise the revenue courts, particularly under the guidance of Lord Treasurer William Paulet, from 1550. Thus, candidates can draw from a range of reforms and changes with regards to institutions and personnel, set against the significant gains resulting from the dissolution, which in turn may be set against the increasing demands on the purse which Henry placed. Whilst the consequences of these latter policies may not be on their own be seen as evidence of the success of financial administration, astute answers are likely to make use of these to assess the success in context. At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 a range of arguments may be examined although the response may be one-sided or lack balance across the period. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>Candidates are asked to give an assessment of diplomatic relations with Spain in the years 1558-1574. Whilst candidates should focus their argument on Anglo-Spanish relations, many will also make use of other material relevant to this relationship, such as considering Elizabeth's broader aims concerning trade, defence from invasion and the issue of marriage, examining these with reference to France, Scotland, and the Low Countries. Candidates may argue that, upon acceding to the throne, Elizabeth found relations that were essentially cordial. The issue of Elizabeth's Protestantism was less of a concern to Philip II than fears of France or Mary Stuart's claim to the throne, and from Elizabeth's perspective over matters such as trade and defence, good relations with Spain were beneficial. Candidates may argue though that whilst at this point religion did not appear to be an insurmountable obstacle – indeed it was Mary Stuart who Philip sought to have excommunicated – its potential to shape issues existed, through opinion in the Privy Council and through later events such as the Dutch revolt of 1566. In the early period, candidates may consider events such as the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis (1559) and the issue of Calais, or Philip's offer of marriage to Elizabeth. Candidates may examine the extent to which intervention in the French wars of 1562-4 risked provoking the ire of Philip, although it is likely that in this early period, many will argue relations did not significantly deteriorate, and that after Cardinal Granvelle's dismissal as Philip's Chief Minister in the Netherlands in 1564, relations were again cordial. The Revolt in the Netherlands of 1566 and subsequent trouble up to 1572 are likely to feature significantly, and the consequences of the policy of harassment may be seen to be far-reaching both domestically and in terms of relations with Spain. Candidates may refer to, from 1568 onwards, the escalating conflict in the Netherlands under the Duke of Alva, the Genoese Loan of 1568, fears of Catholic conspiracy surrounding Mary Stuart (such as the discovery of the Ridolfi Plot of 1571) and the continuation of piracy against Spanish shipping. It may be argued though that trade redirected and direct war avoided, and thus if a deterioration was occurring, it was not on balance disastrous.</p> <p>Stronger responses may explore these events in terms of relations with both Spain and France, and the negotiations with the latter leading to the Treaty of Blois in 1572. Whilst it is likely some will argue that the massacre of Huguenots in 1572 revealed the extent to which Elizabeth's diplomacy was largely at the mercy of events outside her direct control, both the support the Treaty offered her in 1572 and her continued reluctance to intervene more fully in foreign affairs may be seen in a positive light. Again, any forays into such broader issues should be firmly related back to relations with Spain. Candidates may also challenge the assumptions of deterioration by considering the improvements that took place towards the end of the period, such as the reopening of trade with the Netherlands under the Convention of Nymegen (1573) and the attempts to limit piracy in the West Indies with the Convention of Bristol in 1574. At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 a range of arguments may be examined although the response may be one-sided or lack balance across the period. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>3</b>	<p>This question targets the period from 1629-40 – largely of personal rule, although credit should also be given where there is analysis of the Short Parliament of 1640 and developments to the election of the Long Parliament in November 1640. Candidates are expected to offer an assessment of the varying factors which created opposition to Charles during this period. In arguing for the stated factor, candidates are likely to explore at length the influence of Archbishop Laud, and the extent to which his policies and how they were perceived created resentment. Whilst these are likely to focus extensively on religious issues such as the restoration of ceremonies to the Church, candidates should also be credited for consideration of opposition with regards to control of the Royal Council and friction between Laudian clergy and the gentry.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that 1637 was a turning point with regards to Laud's influence and policies, both in terms of the case of Prynne, Burton and Bastwick and developments in Scotland. Credit should be given for analysis of the role of Laud and individuals in particular events, such as the escalation of issues when the Short Parliament met. The role of the Earl of Strafford is also likely to be given consideration, particularly with regards to his recall during the Bishops Wars, although credit should be given for consideration of his role whilst in Ireland, where relevant. The influence of other advisors such as Windebanke (Secretary of State with Papist leanings who urged war in 1638), Finch (one-time Speaker and judge on the Hampden Case) and even Henrietta Maria herself may be examined, although these are not to be expected and should be treated on merit. Candidates may draw from a broad range of alternative factors, such as Charles' own actions and handling of affairs, the existence of personal rule, the international climate and the sense of Roman Catholic threat emanating from the Thirty Years War, the role of the likes of Pym and his associates such as those involved in the Providence Island Company, alongside concerns over particular policies relating to religion, finance and foreign affairs or particular events such as the Hampden Case. Whilst these may vary, higher response will begin to explore the interrelationship between these and those who advised Charles.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 a range of arguments may be examined although the response may be one-sided or lack balance across the period. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	<p>Candidates are expected to offer an assessment of the period of 1660-1667 and the extent to which, as a result of the settlement made after the Restoration in 1660, the nation was settled in the following years. Whilst the focus is on the detail of events within this period, candidates may draw upon notions of a somewhat restrained monarchy and a retreat from religious fervour as underpinning the basis for settled government in this period. With regards to religion, candidates may examine the restrictions on Dissenters under the Corporation Act (1661) and the Quaker Act (1661), and the extent to which these quelled concerns such as the fear of the Quaker menace, the issuance of the New Prayer Book and the Act of Uniformity (1662), resulting in the Great Ejection of over 1,000 ministers, or the failed attempts to introduce the Declaration of Indulgence in 1662-3. Candidates are likely to consider the broad retention by the Convention and Cavalier Parliaments of the reforms passed in 1641 with regards to the financial and prerogative powers of the monarch, against arguments of a conservative backlash against the extension of parliamentary powers into local freedoms and increased taxation that resulted from the Civil War. It can be argued that parliament conceded much of these powers, with the likes of the Militia Acts of 1661 and 1662 and the repeal of the Triennial Act in 1664. However, whilst elements of royal authority were undoubtedly restored, it may be argued that ambiguity resulted from this. In this sense, candidates may argued the nature of what was 'settled' depended upon the issue at stake and, and thus doubts over Charles' religious inclinations and disagreement over the restricted financing, exposed as inadequate to meet the needs of the Dutch War may be considered. Similarly, tension existed over pardons under the Act of Indemnity (1660) and the logistical difficulties of restoring confiscated estates were problematic, although candidates may concede that in such circumstances, settlement is relative. The protracted and fraught nature of events leading to the so-called Clarendon Code are likely to be cast as a failure, although it may be argued that Charles II's willingness to work with Parliament in Clarendon's downfall may be used as evidence of settled agreement.</p> <p>At level 5 look for sustained and well supported evaluation culminating in an impressive conclusion. At level 4 there should be a real debate although this may not be fully balanced. At level 3 a range of arguments may be examined although the response may be one-sided or lack consistent focus. At level 2 and below a narrative of these years is likely to be on offer.</p>	30

## Section B

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>5</b>	<p>Candidates are asked to assess the extent to which Edward's government was successful in controlling the rebellions of 1549, and the three sources offer a range of views on this. Source 1 is most likely to be used to argue the case for a success, suggesting that the government was correct to avoid and delay direct military intervention, whilst also arguing that when such a decision was made it was successful with regards to both the western and Kett Rebellion.</p> <p>Additionally, candidates may use Source 1 to raise the issue of success in terms of cost. Source 2 offers a different view, highlighting the local difficulties faced with regards to the East Anglian rebellion, and the subsequent failure of the initial force sent by Somerset. Source 3 may be to some extent be linked to Source 2, arguing how Somerset's options were limited, both by the unconvincing support of the gentry and military concerns with regards to France and Scotland. Source 3 also highlights division within the Council over Somerset's handling of the rebellions. Source 3 is also likely to be used alongside Source 1 in support of the contention of success, highlighting as it does how ultimately military force was successful in suppressing both of the major rebellions. Candidates may extend this debate drawing on their own knowledge in a manner of ways. The motives behind the rebellions may be considered; set against the generally difficult economic circumstances of 1549, and the particular religious concerns - and arguably their misunderstanding of implications of aspects of the English Prayer Book - of the rebels in the south-west may be set against the more economic and agrarian grievances of those in East Anglia. The lack of upper-class support may be considered as a factor limiting the seriousness of the threat, although candidates may equally explore the limitations of support within council for Somerset.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply 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, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the nature and extent of different rebellions, both in terms of their motivations and the success in quelling these. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which the rebellions were a threat, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At 1 may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be assembled into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing 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 are likely to score above level 2.</p>	40



Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The three sources offer differing perspectives on the extent to which Elizabeth's parliaments were a significant challenge. Candidates are likely to draw on source 4 as the strongest evidence of such opposition, considering the various examples of resistance faced over succession, the legacy of her religious settlement and Mary Stuart. Candidates are likely to consider Elton's references to such opposition being a 'determined group of men' and/or 'elements', and may do so with reference to Neale, linking this to Source 5. Candidates may examine the issue Source 5 raises with regards to Neale's methodology, and any doing so with regards to the nature of historical interpretations are likely to demonstrate higher level analysis. Candidates may also highlight how Source 5 challenges the contention in the question, suggesting cooperation was the norm, and that resistance from the Commons was only truly significant when in concert with the Lords and Council. Source 5 may also lead into an analysis of the extent to which opposition, and indeed Elizabeth's response, varied depending upon the issue at stake, and in this sense, there is evidence to support the given view with regards to Mary and free speech. Source 6 is also likely to be used to challenge the questioning, and candidates may focus their analysis on the extent to which Elizabeth's control of parliament limited the potential for opposition, both in terms of procedure and personality. However, candidates may also use the reference to imprisonment and other measures indicating some degree of force as indicative of opposition. Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge to examine these issues in a range of ways. The continued growth and changes to the 'quality' of MPs may be considered, with almost half of all MPs being university educated or possessing a legal education by 1584, an issue which may be linked to the references to Neale's thesis. The relative infrequency of sessions may also be considered, with only 13 sessions in Elizabeth's (full) reign. Candidates may also offer detailed knowledge on particular issues and events, such as dealings over Mary Queen of Scots from 1572 onwards, or the imprisonment of Wentworth in 1576.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply 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, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the nature and extent of opposition with regard to the policy areas it was centred upon. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which Elizabeth did face significant challenge, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At 1 may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be assembled into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing 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 are likely to score above level 2.</p>	40

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>7</b>	<p>This question clearly invites candidates either to examine the proposition that religious and cultural issues were central to side-taking, as argued in Source 7. Alternatively, candidates may argue, as does Source 8, that other issues, such as, in this case, economic self-interest, respect for the King's majesty and concerns over the threat of social disorder, were more significant. Source 7 may also be explored in terms of its rejection of social class and economic factors as being of particular significance. Source 9 offers another alternative to religious division, suggesting that regional and familial issues were often behind side-taking, whilst more generally pointing towards the complexity of issues. In this sense, the sources offer significant opportunity for candidates to cross-reference the evidence and examine the given interpretations, such as exploring the relationship between the sacrosanct nature of support for the King (Source 8) with the issue of religion as outlined by Source 7, or considering the interrelationship between all three sources in terms of economic and social factors. Candidates may develop these issues in a range of ways, such as using contextual knowledge to explore the geographical and class differences that existed, and may even explore the extent to which motivations were uniform with reference to notions of neutralism and other local factors.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply knowledge to offer a judgement on the relative strengths of the interpretations and /or to resolve the conflicts and offer an alternative hypothesis that successfully combines elements from different standpoints, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the nature and extent of religious and cultural motivations for the different sides. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which religion was the strongest motivation even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At level 1 may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be assembled into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing 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 are likely to score above level 2.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question targets the reasons for the limited success of the Protectorate, and candidates are asked to assess the extent to which this was a result of Cromwell's failure to manage successive parliaments during the Protectorate. Candidates are likely to begin with Source 10, which argues that Cromwell's failings were indeed apparent in this sense, seeing this as a result of a misguided belief in the freedom of parliament from such interference. Source 11 may be used to challenge this, with many candidates likely to pick up on the reference countering 'Parliamentary management' as a factor. Hill points more towards the Protectorate's willingness to concede over policy as being crucial, thus suggesting the difficulties displayed between the first Protectorate Parliament and the Protector (over the relative influence of military and civilian forces in government, which may be developed using own knowledge) were more significant, evidenced by the greater success with regards to the second Protectorate Parliament. Again, own knowledge may be used to refer to the issues, with having Cromwell acceded to the rejection of the proposed decimation tax and the subsequent ending of the rule of the Major-Generals in 1657, issues which are also referred to in Source 12. Candidates are likely to explore such issues in reference to Source 12, which also considers the second Protectorate Parliament, although the emphasis here is likely to be seen less in terms of Cromwell's willingness to 'surrender' (Source 11) as to Cromwell's action as a 'political realist', caught between civilian and military concerns. Candidates may explore these issues using contextual knowledge in a range of ways, such as examining Cromwell's management of parliament in the light of his own political views and personal qualities, whilst the significance of issues and events such as the resistance to the Major Generals and army rule, or Cromwell's refusal of the offer of the Crown and subsequent difficulties of the 1658 session.</p> <p>Responses at level 5 will apply 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, perhaps making critical distinctions concerning the different parliaments and the context in which Cromwell sought to govern. At level 4 they will both support and challenge the proposition and use contextual knowledge of the historical debate and of the period itself or to evaluate the claims made in the sources and/or offer different hypotheses. At level 3 candidates will be able to utilise both the texts and own knowledge to assess the extent to which Cromwell's management was at issue, even if many points are not addressed or developed. At level 2 the analytical focus will probably be weak, and there may be long descriptive passages of either the texts or historical events. At 1 may well take the sources at face value as simple sources of information to be assembled into a narrative. Candidates who are drawing 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 are likely to score above level 2.</p>	40

