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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.
**Generic Level Descriptors: Sections A and B**

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–3  | • Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.  
      |      | • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.  
      |      | • The overall judgement is missing or asserted.  
      |      | • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision. |
| 2     | 4–7  | • There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.  
      |      | • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.  
      |      | • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.  
      |      | • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision. |
| 3     | 8–12 | • There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.  
      |      | • Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.  
      |      | • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.  
      |      | • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision. |
| 4     | 13–16| • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.  
      |      | • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.  
      |      | • Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.  
<pre><code>  |      | • The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | 17–20 | • Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.  
• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.  
• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.  
• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision. |
**Section C**

**Target:** AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–3  | - Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.  
- Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.  
- Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence. |
| 2     | 4–7  | - Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.  
- Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.  
- A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues. |
| 3     | 8–12 | - Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.  
- Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.  
- A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation. |
| 4     | 13–16| - Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them.  
- Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.  
- Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation. |
| 5     | 17–20| - Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.  
- Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.  
- Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate. |
Section A: indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.  
Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which republican rule (1649-60) was different from the personal rule of Charles I (1629-40).  
Arguments and evidence that republican rule (1649-60) was different from the personal rule of Charles I (1629-40) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
• Under the republic, the monarchy was overthrown, the House of Lords was abolished and a single-chamber parliament was established  
• Under the republic, the House of Commons existed in a series of limited forms e.g. the Rump, the Barebones and Protectorate Parliaments  
• Under the republic, a new church system replaced the traditional episcopal one e.g. the reversal of Laudianism  
• The prominent political role played by the army during the republican period e.g. the reliance of the Rump on the army and the rule of the major-generals in 1655-56.  
Arguments and evidence that republican rule (1649-60) was similar to the personal rule of Charles I (1629-40) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
• During the Protectorate, Oliver Cromwell, as Lord Protector, more or less replaced the role of the king  
• In practice, religion remained much the same after Charles I since in the localities there was often little attempt made to enforce religious changes  
• The limitations placed on Parliament were not confined to republican rule since Charles I deliberately ruled without one in the years 1629-40  
• There was no fundamental restructuring of society under the republic as, broadly speaking, the same elite groups retained power and influence.  
Other relevant material must be credited. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. 

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate is it to say that religious nonconformity survived persecution during the Restoration (1660-88) mainly due to the actions and attitudes of Charles II and James II.

Arguments and evidence that religious nonconformity survived persecution during the Restoration (1660-88) mainly due to the actions and attitudes of Charles II and James II. Relevant points may include:

- Charles II demonstrated some sympathy for non-conformists by attempting to suspend the Act of Uniformity in 1662
- In 1672 Charles II suspended the Conventicle Act and other persecuting laws by means of a Declaration of Indulgence which permitted dissenters the freedom not to attend church and to hold their own licensed gatherings
- In 1667 Charles II appointed a group of advisers, including two closely associated with moderate Puritanism, in order to challenge the High Church Anglicans and their parliamentary allies, for control of religious policy
- James II issued a Declaration of Indulgence in 1687 allowing dissenters to worship freely and a further Declaration in 1688 allowed them to meet without a specific licence.

Arguments and evidence that religious nonconformity survived persecution during the Restoration (1660-88) mainly due to other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- In 1682-83, the failure of Exclusion, the Rye House Plot and the collapse of Whig support led Charles II to allow a renewed attack on dissent in a campaign of persecution which lasted from 1683-86
- Non-conformity survived due to the commitment of dissenters to their beliefs and their need to hold on to them e.g. George Fox
- Various non-conformist sects were well established by 1660 which made them more difficult to uproot during the Restoration
- The level of support given by sympathisers who were opposed to measures designed to remove the dissenters e.g. the Whigs and influential families such as Hewleys and the Stricklands
- The opponents of religious non-conformity made a number of mistakes e.g. by defining uniformity on a narrow basis, the number and range of dissenters was increased and therefore more difficult to combat.

Other relevant material must be credited.
Section B: indicative content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3        | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement about the extent to which the social structure of Britain was transformed in the years 1625-88.

Arguments and evidence that the social structure of Britain was transformed in the years 1625-88 was transformed should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The growth of ports and shipping promoted social change by providing new employment opportunities for 10-20 per cent of the non-agricultural working population
- London, and other major towns saw the rise of a small but very wealthy class of merchants e.g. the number of merchants trading increased from 34,000 in 1580 to 64,000 in 1688
- The development of a consumer society in London and other large towns led to the development of a new class of small shopkeepers and traders
- Religious and legal changes led to some changes in the status of women e.g. 1653 Marriages Act and greater freedom for Quaker women after 1650
- The rising living standards experienced by the gentry and merchants, and the expansion of government, stimulated the growth of the professional classes.

Arguments and evidence that the social structure of Britain was not transformed in the years 1625-88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The traditional aristocracy and its influence in society remained largely unchanged during the years of Stuart and republican rule in the years 1625-88 e.g. the nobles continued to possess considerable power and wealth during this period
- Although there was widespread change in agriculture, existing social structures in England remained largely intact in rural areas
- Foreign migration to the cloth towns of East Anglia (e.g. textile workers from the Low Countries settled in Norwich) did not affect local social structures
- Limited industrial and trading developments in Ireland and Scotland left their predominantly rural social structures largely intact.

Other relevant material must be credited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the significance of the role of the East India Company in the expansion of overseas trade in the years 1625-88. Arguments and evidence that the East India Company played a significant role in the expansion of overseas trade in the years 1625-88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• From the 1620s the East India Company focused on India, trading successfully in saltpetre, pepper and calico textiles, and opening up trading opportunities on the Indian west coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• By the 1640s the East India Company had expanded its successful activities to Basra to develop Persian trade interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The importance of the East India Company was demonstrated in 1672 when it was given the right to mint coins in India. The company also exerted authority over, and protected, English citizens and trading interests in India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• By the 1680s the company was a popular choice for investors and generated profits equalling or exceeding those of the North American tobacco and sugar trades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The significance of the East India Company can be gauged from the fact that it was Britain’s largest joint stock company with three times the capital of the next biggest. Arguments and evidence that other developments played a significant role in the expansion of overseas trade in the years 1625-88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The development of the lucrative tobacco trade between England and North America in the early seventeenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660 regulated colonial trade and encouraged mercantilism in ways which benefited English traders and commercial interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The importance of British control of the triangular trade (from the mid-17th century) between North America, the Caribbean and Europe based on the profitable slave trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The growing economic importance of the Caribbean between 1655 and 1688 based on the development of the sugar trade. Other relevant material must be credited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Section C: indicative content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **5**    | Answers will be credited according to candidates’ deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.  
Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians’ viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the Glorious Revolution ‘did not have revolutionary effects’.  
In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:  
Extract 1  
- If revolutionary changes had been proposed in 1689, William III would almost inevitably have opposed them  
- Those who wanted radical constitutional or ecclesiastical changes at this point had been marginalised  
- Most politicians and political groups had only limited aims – the restoration of order and old liberties – and were not interested in addressing theoretical or abstract issues.  
Extract 2  
- The revolution of 1688-89 ensured that sovereign power now rested with parliament  
- By the 1701 Act of Succession, parliament rejected the traditional form of hereditary succession in favour of a new succession it could accept  
- The events of 1688-89 enhanced the status of parliament relative to the king and began the transition to a constitutional monarchy.  
Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Glorious Revolution ‘did not have revolutionary effects’. Relevant points may include:  
- William’s well-known dislike of constitutional constraints and the perceived need to re-establish orderly government quickly meant most politicians rejected the idea of extensive reform  
- William was still able to choose his own ministers and advisers  
- The Bill of Rights was a limited document representing a response to the immediate situation with its potential for disorder rather than a considered plan of constitutional and ecclesiastical reform  
- Many of the demands limiting royal power made in the Declaration of Rights of 1689 were not implemented and the monarch could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy  
- William III remained head of the Church of England and so was able to influence the religious settlement.  
Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Glorious Revolution ‘did not have revolutionary effects’. Relevant points may include:  
- Under the Bill of Rights 1689 the king’s power was limited in various ways e.g. he could no longer suspend the law or release individuals from its effects |
The Bill of Rights weakened the hereditary principle re-stated in 1660 and asserted the rights of Parliament.

The Act of Settlement 1701 provided for the Hanoverian succession to the throne thereby weakening the concept of hereditary monarchy and asserting Parliament’s right to decide this issue.

From 1689 financial reforms provided parliamentary scrutiny of government income and expenditure.

Regular parliamentary elections and annual parliamentary sessions were ensured by the Mutiny Act (1689) and the Triennial Act (1694).