

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report June 2010

GCE History 6HI03 A

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

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 Examiners' Report 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



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2010

Publications Code UA024090

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

History

This was the first time that this specification has been examined, and judging by the queries raised by centres in the run up to the examination in June, there was considerable trepidation on their part. It is to be hoped that they will have been re-assured, first by their sighting of the questions and more importantly by the results they receive. No complaints about the paper were received and it is to be hoped that this indicates that candidates found it fair and accessible. Clearly the ability range of those entering was wide but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched and the less talented were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination.

The new specification is a direct descendant of the old Unit 4, which has become part A of the new examination and the old Unit 6, which has taken on a renewed life-form as part B of the new examination. There are, however, important differences, particularly between old Unit 6 and the new part B. As far as part A is concerned, the traditional essay, the major differences relate to the mark scheme. The essay is now marked out of 30 not 60 and the level 5 is broader so that essays which formerly would have attained high level 4 in old Unit 4, will now be awarded level 5 in the range 25-27. Part B like the old Unit 6, addresses AO1 and AO2 but it is important to realise that it is AO2 b not AO2 a. Candidates are not required to evaluate the sources in terms of provenance for the most part and are not invited to assess their reliability. All the extracts are from secondary sources and it is to be hoped that candidates will recognise the differing 'views' presented or emphasised and be able to set them in the wider context of the nominated controversy. A minority of candidates appeared to believe that they were required to assess the reliability in terms of the date when the extract was written or in terms of the title of the book, from which it was taken. In general this was a mistake and added little to the quality of the responses. Part B answers are given two marks, one out of 16 for AO1, both a and b, and one out of 24 for AO2b.

As expected, there were far more entrants for the Tudor option than for the Stuart and within the Tudor option more candidates chose the first controversy option, Tudor Rebellions. On the 1629-67 alternative, both controversies attracted roughly equal numbers of takers. On all four controversies, almost all candidates were able to appreciate some of the differences within the sets of extracts and in this sense all were accessible. However a clear area of differentiation was in appreciation of the nuances of meaning and emphasis and this is addressed in detail below. In each of the two alternatives, Part A questions addressed, two bullet points of the specification.

Question 1

Question 1 was the most popular of the four and there were some excellent evaluative answers which covered all three monarchs with a wealth of telling detail deployed both for and against the proposition. The commonest error was a tendency to get bogged down in Edward's reign with lengthy descriptions of the religious changes to such a degree that Elizabeth received short shrift as the candidates ran out of time rather than knowledge. It was perfectly acceptable to deal with the monarchs one by one but the best answers then produced, in addition to an introduction and conclusion, six paragraphs, three arguing for the stated factor of the importance of royal personal beliefs in influencing change and three arguing the contrary. An excellent introduction was :-

"Whilst personal religious beliefs undoubtedly had some influence over religious changes, especially during the reign of the Protestant Edward VI to 1553 and Catholic Mary to 1558, there were a number of other factors which either encouraged change, such as the personell surrounding the monarch and foreign relations could at times halt reform .However it is perhaps the changes of Elizabeth from 1558-66, who was always so ambiguous in her personal faith, which had the least to do with personal faith. The key aim of her changes was not 'to make her church to seem too far from Rome or Wittenberg' and this therefore explains her settlement."

The same candidate showed a superb mastery of detail, such as the dropping of the 'black rubric' from the 1559 Prayer Book and a facility of expression which was pleasing. Returning to the theme of the introduction towards the end of the essay;-

"The ambiguity of her settlement was therefore perhaps due in part to personal ambiguity but more likely it can be attributed to a pragmatic desire to keep the peace."

Question 2

Question 2 was marginally less popular than question 1 but still attracted plenty of candidates. Several weakened their responses by ignoring Mary's reign altogether, choosing to begin the saga of Anglo-Spanish relations in November 1558. Perhaps the commonest error was simply accepting that religion was the root factor determining relations. However, a pleasing number appreciated the complexity of the relationship, placing it in the broader context of commerce and European power politics.

SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Elizabeth's accession to the throne in 1558. Marked an end to the pro-Catholic Queen Mary and has been by some claimed the starting point to an Anglo-Spanish war. When she became queen Elizabeth was a moderate protestant. It has been believed that her religious views would clash with her former brother-in-law Philip II of Spain who was a zealous Catholic. Yet did religion really cause the two monarchs to change their relations and that of their countries?

~~Before~~ In 1553-58 Anglo-Spanish relations despite both Mary and Philip being married and strong Catholics were not in truth warm and co-operative. It was mainly in the acts of foreign policy that changed their relationship and religion only had a limited effect.

(Section A continued)

When Elizabeth did accend^{EN 1558} to the throne both her and Philip were not the types to willing go into an unnecessary war. Philip was willing to tolerate her ~~same~~ religion in exchange for non-hostile relations. He even proposed to her and did what he could to prevent an excommunication of England. The fact was that despite religion both countries and monarchs had similarities and needs from each other.

They had been joined in previous years by a strong anti-French feeling that kept them in neutrality. They also had to consider the impact of war and warring with each other. Both relied heavily on the need for Antwerp a Dutch trading city. It benefited both economies. It was also unlikely ~~one~~ could dominate the other if a war did break out. Spain couldn't manage England as a controlled vessel and certainly vice-versa with England. To this the initial years 1533-56 were in fact cardinal in the sense neither

(Section A continued)

went against the other. Religion did not cause too great a rift as Elizabeth was fairly lenient and Philip ~~did~~ did not wish for an Anglo-French alliance. The main reason why it did not progress further was partially a mixture of religious views. But also a dislike for each others' countries and cultures among the common people.

The turning point however, came ~~in 1568~~ from the Netherlands, when revolts broke out under William of Orange and Protestant leaders. Elizabeth did not wish to make war to help the Protestant forces. Yet her views on Protestantism conflicted her judgement.

In this case religion guided her change in policy as it caused tensions to rise. Also the result of Elizabeth taking Philip's need silver bullion caused a rift. She originally didn't believe it to have caused much problems. Yet it was highly needed for Genoan banks to pay off Spain's massive debts.

(Section A continued)

Philip had started wars with countries before over religion as seen in the Netherlands, Also too against the large Ottoman empire. Yet he still was unlikely to use this as an excuse to war with England. When England and Spain disconnected their trading with each other. Both saw the damage it did to the economy and how it caused problems. Trading soon returned and it showed that there were more important matters than religion.

Elizabeth's own flirtations of a Anglo-French alliance caused tensions to mount. The proposed marriage to the Duke of Anjou would have seen Spain against a force it was unlikely to defeat. The St Bartholomew's Massacre in France however, was a violent religious act against Protestants. This did in fact help Anglo-Spanish relations as it showed that Spain was a better friend compared to France. This also reflects Elizabeth's own aims in the Netherlands as she did not want a French-Netherlands, or even an independent one.

(Section A continued)

but simply to lessen Spain's hold over the Dutch States.

A second major turning point was that of Mary Queen of Scots.

Her arrival caused tensions aboard and internally of a possible Catholic conflict.

Despite these views it is highly unlikely,

Philip would have supported Mary Stuart

over Elizabeth. She was a member of

the Guise family and had pro-French

views. Thus religion does not overtake

international security. Her presence in

England however rose suspicion. It was

also claimed that during the attempts

to have Elizabeth assassinated known as

the Ridolfi and Babington plot, Spain

played a role in this. This of course

role anti-Spanish feelings and caused

a less likely friendship between the

countries. The excommunication for example in

1570 ~~the~~ was not a reason for strained

Anglo-Spanish relations.

The main events leading to a

Spanish armada being launched in 1588.

Came from the international conflicts

(Section A continued)

due to the Netherlands. Elizabeth with the will of her council became more involved and had sent Leicester into the Netherlands with an English army.

This caused tensions, as Philip saw this as a direct attack on his right and power, yet he still did not wish to go into open conflict. Yet his taking of English ships were what caused England's involvement to happen in 1585. After 3 years he finally decided that England's actions needed to be punished. His armada launch in 1588 signalled a end to a possible Anglo-Spanish alliance and friendship.

From looking over the selected years of 1553-88 the first 5 years saw a cordial alliance between England and Spain. Mary indeed married Philip for religious reasons and religion did guide her on many issues. Yet Philip's actions against the papal did cause a hostilities rift between them. It is likely that this was the reason for ~~her~~ Mary trying to act

(Section A continued)

as a peace maker and not ~~giving~~ giving Spain all the resources asked for during the war with France. It was after all an attempt invasion backed by France that saw England intervene.

Yet Religion I feel did not determine the Anglo-Spanish relations from 1558-88. Although it did indeed play a vital ^{role} ~~effect~~ in ~~the~~ the Netherlands war and with regards to Mary Stuart. ~~I do not feel that it was the sole reason for the eventual war~~ ~~was as seen. In that both monarchs overlooked this. That both did not wish war with each other and that what determined Anglo-Spanish relations was a mixture of events and reasons, with religion as only one of them.~~ I do not feel that religion truly governed Anglo-Spanish relations. As both were willing to overlook this to prevent war with each other the change in Anglo-Spanish relations. It was the result of many factors such as foreign powers, plots and individuals and although religion was a ~~an~~ significant

(Section A continued)

Catalyst for causing certain events. It
did not ^{however} determine the ^{true} nature of their
relationship.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

It was always a good sign to encounter the following nuanced point of view, even if the candidate did not have an easy facility of expression.

"A second major turning point involved Mary Queen of Scots. Her arrival caused tensions abroad and internally of a possible Catholic conflict. Despite these views it is highly unlikely Philip would have supported Mary Stuart over Elizabeth. She was a member of the Guise family and had pro-French views. Thus religion does not overtake international security"

The best answers did appreciate the significance of the Treaty of Joinville and the reconciliation of Philip with the Guise at a time when his power had grown with the acquisition of Portugal and the ending of the conflict with the Ottomans. Elizabeth's options of proxy aid to the Dutch rebels appeared to have run out at the same time and direct involvement and confrontation with Spain ensued.

Question 3

Question 3 challenged many candidates with its demands for a detailed knowledge of Charles' financial policies and expedients during the period of the personal rule. Those who lacked the requisite information resorted to a generalised survey of 1629-40 and answered a different question on why certain groups were alienated by Laud's religious policies. Common errors of fact were failing to appreciate that Ship Money was used to build up the navy and transposing the Five Knights Case of 1627 to the period of personal rule. The best answers did appreciate the wide range of financial expedients that Charles and Lord Treasurer Weston (to 1635) came up with and did debate the two propositions of how far it was a remarkable achievement and how far it elicited resentment. Hampden's case figured extensively with regard to the latter point but only a small minority used the evidence of the grumbles and grievances voiced in the Short and Long Parliaments to point up the resentments felt. It was always a pleasure to encounter candidates who could quantify success with precise figures: £80,000 was imposed in Forest Fines but only £25,000 came to the exchequer; Ship Money brought in £190,000 a year in the first three years of its imposition and Distraint of Knighthood fines raised £175,000. The better answers, even if they did not have all of such precise detail, did appreciate that the system 'worked' only in times of peace.

Question 4

Question 4 clearly required a precise knowledge of 1646-48 and as long as candidates were in possession of the salient facts of these years it was comparatively easy to structure a response evaluating the 'stated factor,' Charles, against other factors-the divisions within Parliament, the growing politicisation of the Army and the Scots.

SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Failure to reach a settlement 1646 - 48

① YES - Charles → - hardened attitude / bided his time - led to being seized by Army in 1647 WANTED FULL PREROGATIVE POWERS BACK.

- Engagement with the Scots 1648 - led to 2nd Civil War / Pride's Purge & Execution of Charles. Refusal to accept Newcastle Propositions.

② No - 2 warring parties - War party vs. peace party (Cromwell etc vs. Mollis) Newcastle Propositions 1646 vs Heads of Proposal 1647 -

Mollis' use of Mob to disperse those who wanted to accept it from parliament. ③ Scots - got nothing from parliament, turned to the

King.

In the years following the English Civil War, it was clear to both sides that some agreement needed to be reached.

~~On~~ On one hand, Charles' staunch refusal to accept any of the settlements proposed to him by parliament or the Army was undoubtedly a hindrance to any possible negotiations. However, more important was the divisions within parliament and the Army, who could not agree on a settlement to present to the King together, and therefore made a political settlement extremely difficult.

(Section A continued)

On one hand, Charles I certainly made it difficult for the other side to make negotiation with him. Following his defeat in the 1st English Civil War, Charles' attitude towards the parliamentarians had hardened considerably - he believed that all the men who had fought him had gone against his God-given right as King, following his philosophy of the Divine Right of Kings, which had previously caused problems, especially during the Personal Rule 1629-40. Therefore, Charles was unwilling to make a settlement unless his prerogative powers were fully re-instated. He was reluctant to accept the humiliating terms of the Newcastle Propositions¹ of 1646, presented to him by parliament which as well as abolishing episcopacy and handing control of the military to parliament for 20 years, also implemented punishments for named Royalists, and thus made Charles little more than a figurehead monarch. Therefore, by refusing these terms, Charles was showing his refusal to bow to parliament. Instead, seeing the divides appearing in the other side, he waited for them to 'fall out amongst themselves', again making settlement near-impossible. However, when he waited too long and was seized by the army in summer 1647 and brought to London, instead of then agreeing a settlement with parliament, Charles decided in place to make an Engagement with the Scots in 1648, which led to the 2nd Civil War in which the Royalist / Scottish troops were crushed by Cromwell's

(Section A continued) in the battle of Preston. It is undeniable that this was a vital mistake for Charles, and the parliament and Army reunited in their cause against him and passed a Vote of No Address, which led to Pride's Purge in December 1648 and the subsequent execution of Charles in January 1649. It can be clearly argued, then, that Charles' deeply rooted belief in the Divine Right of Kings and unwillingness to settle with parliament, instead preferring to fight them, led to a failure to reach a settlement and ultimately, his execution. Had Charles instead compromised, it is likely that he would have been able to reach a better settlement for himself and avoid being executed in 1649.

However, it can also be argued that the divisions in parliament meant that a coherent and united proposal was not able to be presented to Charles. Straight after the 1st Civil War ended in spring 1646, there was divisions between the war time 'peace party' (moderates) such as Mordaunt, who wished to negotiate with the king, and were mainly Presbyterians, and the 'war party' (hardliners) such as Oliver Cromwell, who wished to beat the king outright. ^{and were often religiously independent} The divisions between the two became more apparent when parliament issued the Newcastle Propositions in 1646, and the Army followed with the Heads of Propositions in 1647. Both were fundamentally different; for example the Newcastle Propositions called for the abolishment of episcopacy, whilst the Heads of Propositions proposed not abolishment, but restriction on power of

(Section A continued) bishops. However, more important was that the two proposals underlined the fundamental differences between the two parties and their failure to work together, which the King attempted to take advantage of in order to determine better terms for himself. Indeed, Mulles even used a mob in 1647 to force those MPs who were considering accepting the Heads of Proposals to force them out of parliament. * It seems that the only time the two worked together effectively was when they passed the Vote of No Address against the King. Had they worked well together from the end of the civil war in 1646, the King would have no need to attempt to manipulate them and wait for their divisions to become insurmountable, so a negotiation and fair settlement would have been much more likely.

Another hindrance to creating a settlement with the King were the Scots. After the Solemn League & Covenant made with the roundheads during the Civil War in 1643, they then hoped to establish a Presbyterian church in England. However, they were sorely disappointed, ended up handing Charles I back to the English in 1647, and received nothing. Therefore, probably wishing revenge on parliament and also wishing to express their natural Royalist leaning, the Scots made an Engagement with Charles in 1648, which led to the 2nd civil war and almost undoubtedly was one of the main reasons that parliament could not settle with the

(Section A continued) King. Had the Scots not intervened, it is likely that settlement would have been much more possible.

To conclude, although the importance of Charles' behaviour during the period 1646-8 in failure to reach a settlement must not be diminished, it seems that, had the parliamentarian side managed to work together and had the Scots not made an Engagement with Charles in 1648, settlement would have been much more likely, and it is probable that the ~~event~~ execution of King Charles I would not have happened in January 1649.

✦ In addition, the army rank and file began to hold suspicion that the 'Grandees' were attempting, with the Heads of Proposals, to give the king ^{too much} ~~more~~ power - creating divisions within the Army as well as between the moderates and hardliners.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The introduction laid out the answer in a simple plan and a simple but effective opening paragraph.

Question 5

Question 5 on the Pilgrimage of Grace was the controversy question answered by the most candidates and there were some very good answers with candidates appreciating the obvious and less obvious differences between the three sources. It is important that responses be source driven with additional knowledge integrated where possible with the sources. It is of course highly appropriate that issues not touched on by the sources be also brought in to the response. An excellent opening paragraph is the following:

"Whilst source 3 makes it evident that the rebels did not seek to depose the king, sources 1 and 2 show that unrest of any kind was threatening to the government and loyalty to the king did not ensure loyalty to the regime. Thus, though the Pilgrimage of Grace was unsuccessful, it was a threat at the time as shown by Henry's actions following the rebellion (not enforcing the Subsidy Act) and the violence with which he suppressed the leadership (Robert Aske) after it had been safely disbanded but perhaps not a 'major' threat."

This is excellent in referring to all three sources, throwing in well deployed own knowledge and picking up on key words in the question - 'major' and the distinction between the king and his 'regime'

The candidate then goes on to argue the case for it being a threat with the well chosen opening words

"Sources 1 and 2 together highlight the sheer magnitude of the rebellion which made it a threat"

It is worth pointing out that AO1 involves not only recall of appropriate facts but the ratiocination requisite for structuring a response.

Question 6

Question 6 was far less popular but attracted some excellent answers. Most candidates appreciated the general outline of the controversy and could set the extracts into the debate. The following does it simply but effectively.

SECTION B

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Queen Elizabeth managed parliament successfully.
How far.

Williams → agrees → co-operation but issues of conflict.

The relationship between Elizabeth and her parliaments has always been a topic that has been widely debated. There are some who like Williams argue that it was a relationship characterised by co-operation and was therefore successfully managed by Elizabeth. Others such as Macaffery or even Neale, who have argued that the relationship between the monarch and parliament was fraught with conflict and therefore unsuccessfully managed. On the most part the sources cover all the main issues for debate and overall I would be inclined to argue that Elizabeth managed her parliament well but there were

(Section B continued) Some circumstances in which she was unsuccessful in ~~get~~ managing them.

Williams, appears to be of the general revisionist view of Elizabethan parliament. Williams argues that whilst the Queen has to manage parliament by using members of the privy council, she is able to do so successfully. However it would appear that Williams has an overly optimistic view of the privy council. It was often on occasion that the privy council would use the parliament to try and co-erce the Queen into decisions that she had been ~~edit~~ deliberating on for ~~long~~ too long. The issue of the Succession and action against Mary Queen of Scots would be two examples. However it must be noted that Elizabeth never really gave into the pressure from the parliament to secure these things and it must be argued that barring the issue of the Wentworth's, which according to Guy, were not supported by the Houses of commons and lords who instead supported the Queen, that no one challenged the authority of the Queen. This idea is supported by Turvey and Heard, who argued that there was to be respect towards the Queen at all times and even questions put to the Queen had to be respectful. ~~Both Williams and Gilkes~~

(Section B continued) ~~argue that Elizabeth were reluctant to attend parliament~~ This is Williams appears to be of the position that whilst parliaments were generally co-operative with the Queen, she had to work for this co-operation. This suggests that ~~she was~~ her parliaments were ~~generally~~ generally harmonious, with a few issues of discontent. This view in itself is shared by a lot of historians. Guy, Elton, Dawson, Loch to name but a few. In itself it is an accurate assessment of Elizabeth's relationship with parliament, on the whole she was able to pass through the Elizabethan Religious Settlement, a fact that Williams picks upon, the issue of a succession, whilst caused friction in her council and parliaments, showed that effectively she was in charge and the fact that there was little opposition to her deliberation suggests mainly co-operation and a success ~~and~~ at managing parliament ~~issues~~. There were instances however that suggested that sometimes Elizabeth wasn't in control, ~~Williams mentions the significance of the 1572 parliament~~ whilst Williams does not mention this directly the pressing of ~~Queen~~ Elizabeth to sign the warrant of arrest for Mary Queen of Scots is an issue that arose that broke the successful managerial role she had in parliament. Williams also concedes, something that

(Section B continued) Gilkes picks up on the fact that Elizabeth is reluctant to call ~~general~~ parliament into session. They both are to be credited on this. Elizabeth called parliament only 13 times in her reign and even then she had to be forced by her privy council. This in itself suggests that maybe Elizabeth had trouble within her parliament. Williams on the whole appears to suggest that Elizabeth was successful in her ~~management~~ managing of the parliaments.

Macaffery appears to take a completely different style from Williams on whether ~~there~~ Elizabeth managed parliaments ~~as~~ successfully. Macaffery appears to agree with the Neale view of parliaments. He argues that the Commons tried to push through legislation that was opposed to the Queen and that this was decided to changing the religious settlement. This line of argument is directly in line with the Neale argument of a 'Pontan Chair'. Whilst some historians, such as Angela Anderson and to an extent Lockyer have conceded there was a pontan threat in parliament, Neale has been discredited for his theory. ~~Neale~~ ~~Argue~~ ~~Macaffery~~ The existence of a pontan group in government pushing through legislation would suggest conflict and unsuccessful management.

(Section B continued) but this idea can be contested. The puritan element in parliament has been over-exaggerated as claimed by Elton. Also the pushing through of more protestant legislation in the ERS was not due to the few puritan members but in response to stubborn Marian Bishops outside of parliament. ~~whilst Macaffery is the only~~ The mention of the House of commons is significant as Neale also argued that there was an influx of ~~more~~ intelligent men to the House of commons. This meant the House was more likely to stand up to the Queen. This idea has been contested on the grounds that it was the patronage of the House of lords that made the development of the House of commons possible and it actual fact according to Guy there was no real evidence of the House of commons rising against her until after 1588. This suggest that Macaffery's idea that Elizabeth was unsuccessful in managing parliaments is invalid. Although unlike Williams and Gilkes Macaffery mentions Mary Queen of Scots it must be argued that Elizabeth showed great skill and ~~managed~~ through that ordeal as she deliberated until 1584 vetoed legislation, which to me suggests that whilst parliament was frustated, her ability to have control ~~could~~ in parliament could be

(Section B continued) ~~convicted~~ argued meant that ~~the~~ Parliament realised it was futile to rise against her as she overall had ~~on~~ the final say. This again points to her success as a monarch in parliament.

Gilkes argued that Elizabeth punished people severely for pressuring her on the edge to marry and clarify the succession, and issue raised by Williams. ~~It must be countered that firstly Eli~~ suggesting that she had to punish people to get them to co-operate. This could tie in with Williams analysis that "she had to earn co-operation." It must be countered with the argument that Elizabeth was well in her right to punish these people as the issue of the succession and marriage fell under the Royal prerogative. Therefore invalidating Gilkes argument.

on the whole it would seem that Elizabeth managed her parliament successfully. There are strong arguments against Neale and also against MacCaffery's negative view of parliament. Whilst it should be argued that Williams' interpretation is ~~his~~ overly optimistic it is his assessment that is the most believable.

(Section B continued) and valid. I would therefore suggest that I strongly agree with the suggestion that Elizabeth managed her parliaments.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Candidates were able to develop on the points raised in the extracts drawing attention to Cecil's management skills or details of the conflicts over Mary Queen of Scots, the shape of the religious settlement and the Queen's marriage. Most raised the issue of Peter Wentworth in 1576, pointing out that the Commons themselves took the initiative in silencing him.

Question 7

Question 7 offered plenty of scope for discussing side-taking in 1642 and most candidates who attempted this question were able to relate the extracts to the old chestnut of whether the Civil War can be seen as 'class war'. The use of the three extracts proved to be excellent discriminators. Clearly most could recognise Source 7 as the supporter of the proposition under debate and that this could be challenged by use of source 8. It was source 9 that misled many with the unwary being seduced by the opening sentence but not appreciating the significance the next, where Royle concedes that the majority of the aristocracy fought for the King. Very few appreciated the final sentence of the Royle extract and how this could be related to the issue of class divisions in the Civil War. Many of the better answers made reference to contemporary commentators such as Baxter and Clarendon and their observations on the proposition for debate.

Question 8

Question 8 was almost equally popular amongst the Stuart entrants. Once again the proposition for debate comes from the first extract and is in part contradicted by the second which stresses Cromwell's 'godly agenda as the root cause of his political failure to achieve consensual government. The third extract might be taken as supporting the second by inference but there is an important reference to the Major Generals to be picked up upon and developed. Most responses were aware of the parameters of this well known debate which was of course central to the old Unit 6 Stuart option. There was plenty of additional knowledge supplied on the rule of the Major Generals 1655-56 and Cromwell's troubles with his parliaments. The James Nayler case figured prominently as an example of the clash between the political elite and Cromwell's religious idealism.

The following is an example of an effective introduction, perhaps more reliant on own knowledge than the sources, but still indicating an awareness of where the first two extracts fit into the debate and providing a broad general context and most important, as in every History essay, focus on the question.

"Oliver Cromwell owed his position to that of the New model Army, being first commander of the horse in 1645 and then Lord General of the Army in 1650. As the Army's power and influence rose so did that of Cromwell. While Cromwell had been placed in power by the Army, he ruled with the support of the military, which inevitably created conflict between the Army and Parliament, one that Cromwell could not quell. From source 10 we see that Cromwell 'was the nominee of the soldiers' through the Instrument of Government, a constitution that was only signed by a number of senior officers and no civilians. However, there are other factors that prevented Cromwell from achieving broad consent. Firstly the brevity of Cromwell's time as Lord Protector (five years), the deep divisions that had opened during the Civil War. Royalists against Parliamentarian, Puritan against Anglican and in many cases brother against brother. Yet arguably the biggest factor that prevented Cromwell from receiving the consent that he so desired was his radical religious policy as source 11 shows"

Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	70	60	53	46	40	34	28
Uniform boundary mark	120	108	96	84	72	60	48

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 UA024090 January 2010

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

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

