

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2011

GCE

GCE History (6HI02/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.

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**

January 2011

Publications Code

US026446

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

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.

6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

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

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	6-10	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	11-15	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	16-20	<p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

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

Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

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

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both 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>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and 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. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</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. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>

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

AO2b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of the sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	13-16	<p>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

NB: 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.

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

A1 Henry VIII: Authority, Nation and Religion, 1509-40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the claim in the question. Taken at face value Source 1 says that James IV posed a threat because he might attack the north in Henry's absence, while Source 2 shows that he did. However, Source 2 also shows that the threat was comprehensively dealt with. Source 3 refers to its continued existence, at least until 1523. Developed responses of this kind can reach L2. However, if the sources are interpreted in context and cross-referenced as a set, a more complex argument can be developed. Source 1 implies that James was looking for an occasion to attack, but also that he would need some incentive such as discontent in the north to give him a hope of success. Cross-referenced with Source 2, this suggests that the threat was not great. The complete defeat of the Scots army and the death of the King imply that, if there was a threat, it no longer existed. At the same time, Catherine suggests that it had been significant, because the victory was 'the greatest blessing' and more important than winning 'all the crown of France'. Given Henry's ambitions, this suggests that something important, such as the safety of England, was at stake. Candidates may suggest that Catherine was seeking to exaggerate her achievement in Henry's absence, but they can also argue that, given their happy marriage at this time and Henry's own desire for glory, this would be unlikely. However, Source 3 contradicts the implications of Source 2 and argues that the threat continues. The source itself points to Scottish links with France, thereby explaining the continuation of a danger from Scotland, regardless of the strength of Scottish government at any given time. Candidates may challenge this evidence by reference to Wolsey's desire to raise money by highlighting the danger of Scottish links with France - at this time, or shortly after, Cromwell was employed in Wolsey's household - but the argument cannot be conclusive. The claim can therefore be both supported and challenged (L3) while an assessment of the extent of the threat can offer the basis of an overall judgement for L4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question is focused on the effectiveness of Wolsey's domestic administration, and the extent to which he strengthened Henry's power in domestic matters. The sources provide conflicting evidence, relating to a number of areas. Sources 4 and 6 are broadly favourable to Wolsey, addressing law and justice, control of the nobility and the application of royal authority across the country. Candidates can both develop and challenge these claims by reference to contextual knowledge. The use of Star Chamber to control the nobility, Wolsey's extensive restriction of access to the King, the example made of Buckingham and the work of the regional Councils can all be used to argue that Wolsey did indeed strengthen Henry's power, while consideration of his own position can be used to challenge and evaluate the claim. However, Source 4 can be queried on the basis of Cavendish's relationship to Wolsey, while Source 5 suggests that Wolsey's ambition, unpopularity and handling of taxation led to unrest and resistance that could threaten Henry's power. Candidates can develop this by reference to financial problems and Wolsey's difficulties with parliaments, as well as his own wealth, greed and unpopularity, which could reflect on the King. To balance these claims, candidates can consider the source of financial problems and Henry's expensive foreign ambitions, arguing that Wolsey was not primarily responsible for the problems, particularly the cost of foreign wars, and served Henry well by minimising their impact. In particular, it can be pointed out that in the affair of the Amicable Grant, Henry was certainly able to use him as a scapegoat. If the sources are cross-referenced in the context of wider knowledge, candidates can successfully support, challenge and evaluate the representation in the question.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the impact of Wolsey's actions, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The question is focused on the causes of the Reformation, and in particular, on the significance of the divorce as a factor. Source 9 supports the claim, suggesting that, whatever ambitions Henry developed in the 1530s, the origins of the issue and the motive for his initial challenge to the Pope's authority lay in his desire for a divorce. Candidates do not need to address his reasons for wanting a divorce, although they may consider the influence of Anne Boleyn as a factor in bringing about the Reformation. However, developed analysis of his motives in terms of love for Anne and desire for a male heir is unlikely to be clearly relevant. Candidates can develop the significance of the divorce issue by reference to Henry's earlier relations with the papacy, and his conservative attitude to doctrinal change in the later 1530s. They can also consider the process in which the claim to Royal Supremacy emerged in 1530-33, to argue that Henry began by wishing to intimidate the Pope and regain control of the divorce issue after Catherine's appeal to Rome, and only slowly moved towards wider claims and the break with Rome.</p> <p>Sources 7, 8 and some parts of Source 9 suggest an alternative argument, that there were other factors behind the Reformation, in particular the existence of anti-clerical and anti-papal ideas among reformers such as Tyndale, and the extent of Henry's ambitions when he realised that Royal Supremacy was a possibility. Candidates can develop this argument by reference to the influence of the reformers, their links to Anne Boleyn, the role of individuals such as Cranmer and Cromwell, both in encouraging the king's ambitions and in making it possible for him to achieve them. It can be argued that the ideas presented by these reformers pre-dated the desire for divorce, and that there was already a widespread dislike of aspects of the Catholic Church in England that would have encouraged reform at some stage. Reference can also be made to Henry's personality, ability and control of the process to suggest that the main cause of the Reformation was his political ambition. By placing the sources within wider knowledge and context, candidates can therefore support, challenge and evaluate the claim. The best responses may also explore the interaction of different factors, and attribute relative significance, for example defining the divorce issue as a significant cause of Henry's challenge to the Church, as the issue that shaped developments from 1529-33, or as simply the trigger that allowed other factors to come into play at that time.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the causes of the Reformation, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

A2 Crown, Parliament and Authority in England, 1588-1629

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Taken at face value all three sources offer information about threats to stability. Source 10 refers to subsidies 'breeding discontent' and the possibility that they might 'endanger Her Majesty's safety', which would be a great threat to stability. Source 11 supports this by referring to a planned rising in Oxfordshire, while Source 12 says that Elizabeth had to defuse a crisis over monopolies. Between them, the sources cover much of the decade. Developed responses based on these arguments can reach L2. However, if the sources are interpreted and cross-referenced in context, a more complex judgement can be developed. In Source 10 Bacon expresses concern, but Heneage, speaking for the Queen, suggests that his fears are exaggerated, implying that the threat is not significant. Source 11 suggests that three years after the debate the government has concerns, but is only issuing instructions to JPs, which does not suggest that the threat is great. As the provenance shows the threat did not materialise, suggesting that the government was simply taking normal precautions rather than facing a significant threat. Source 12 can be interpreted in different ways. In the one hand Elizabeth thanks the Commons for their care, and the use of the term 'Golden Speech' suggests that her attempt to defuse the crisis was highly effective. On the other hand, she had been forced to make concessions, suggesting that she was sufficiently concerned to forestall a potential threat. Candidates can therefore consider the sources as a set that both supports and challenges the claim in the question [L3] while they can also weigh the evidence to assess its significance to make a judgement as to whether the threat should be deemed 'serious' [L4].</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The question is focused on an assessment of James I's abilities and handling of affairs during his reign. The sources provide evidence to both challenge and support the claim, relating to a number of areas of policy. Source 13 presents evidence that could be used to build a case supporting the view of James' personal weaknesses, concerning his misreading of attitudes amongst the English people and Parliament concerning matters of religious, foreign and financial policy, as well as the balance of authority between King and Parliament. Candidates could, however, make use of this to develop an argument concerning the difficult context of his accession to the throne or the potential advantages his background offered concerning religion. This could be linked to Source 14, which offers a more detailed consideration of his religious policies in action, which could be used to explore his attempts to bring a moderating influence to accommodate a range of views. Source 15 predominantly focuses on religious policy, specifically concentrating on parliamentary debate in 1621. The critical approach this takes could be utilised to analyse the divide between James and Parliament over his handling of foreign affairs, although this also touches upon the question of authority between the two. Both of these issues could be cross-referenced with Source 13. As regards own knowledge, candidates may consider the extent to which James successfully handled foreign policy before the Thirty Years' War, in the face of strong opposition to his peaceful approach on one hand, against a desire to maintain a balance in relations with France and Spain on the other. Candidates may also explore the financial constraints that dogged James from his accession, and the extent to which his approach to this could be considered a weakness, perhaps pointing to some moderate successes in reducing his deficit after the appointment of Cranfield. Relations with Parliament may also be linked to this matter. Responses may explore the extent to which poor relations were indeed a weakness of his own making, possibly couched in terms of an examination of the impact his belief in the Divine Right of Kings had on a Parliament that was sensitive over prerogative and privilege. If the sources are cross-referenced in the context of such wider knowledge, candidates can successfully support, challenge and evaluate the representation in the question.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reign of James, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question asks candidates to make a judgement on the extent to which Charles was responsible for the difficulties that arose from 1625. The sources provide conflicting evidence, relating to a number of areas. Candidates may opt to start with reference to Source 17, from which the stated view is taken. This may lead candidates into an analysis of various aspects of Charles' reign. With regard to foreign policy, analysis may lead candidates to reach differing conclusions of equal validity. Whilst Charles had indeed taken on a leading role in foreign policy well before he became king, the impact of the Thirty Years War and developments in Europe were not in the first place of his own making and there existed no clear course of resolution over this. The issue of advisers raised in Source 17 is also likely to be played upon. Buckingham was a divisive character and the close confidence he enjoyed with Charles clearly made relations difficult with elements in Parliament. The extent to which this was of Charles' own making is open to debate though. At face value Source 18 presents evidence that seems to challenge the stated view, laying out the difficulties Charles faced almost immediately upon ascending the throne, in part concerning finance and arguably running deeper over the issue of parliamentary privilege. The refusal over tunnage (tonnage) and poundage was a political attack on Buckingham by Coke and Phelips over issues that had began prior to 1625. However, Charles' reaction could be related to the issue of his character and personal suitability to the throne in such circumstances. Candidates may point to the dismissal of the 1625 Parliament, only to be recalled in 1626 when finance was required and then subsequently dismissed again as evidence that Charles held some level of responsibility. The issue of Buckingham's response in attempting to strengthen his position after 1625, and the attack on Buckingham by Eliot then Bristol could also be seen as evidence of problems that were in part down to the making of those close to Charles. Source 16 could be linked to a range of the above issues, alluding to the situation Charles inherited in terms of foreign policy, finance and his own familial relations. The issue of marriage may also be one that is developed to consider the extent to which the match with Henrietta Maria worsened the situation or was of Charles' making. Own knowledge could also be deployed to consider Charles' religious views, although as many of the developments in this area took place from 1628 onwards candidates need to be watchful that responses keep within the time frame of the question.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the difficulties faced by Charles, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</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

Order Code US026446 January 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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