

Examiners' Report  
June 2012

GCSE History 6HI03 A

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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) for our BTEC qualifications.

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).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



### Get more from your exam results

#### ...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). To set up your ResultsPlus account, call us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 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).

June 2012

Publications Code UA032422

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the third session of the 6HI03 A examination. Many candidates wrote insightful comments which placed them in the higher tier bracket.

The paper was divided into two sections: Section (A) was an In-Depth Study question. Section (B) an Associated Historical Controversy question. Unfortunately some candidates continue to write too much. As a consequence of this their responses lacked factual detail. Whilst this has been commented upon previously, a significant number of candidates still follow this approach. Factual relevance is the key to achieving high marks. Examiners want to see candidates who can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the questions set.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than enough for full marks.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions. The ability range of those entering was diverse but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. There were also very few rubric errors. As expected, there were far more entrants for *A1 – Protest, Crisis and Rebellion in England, 1536-1588* than for *A2 – Revolution, Republic and Restoration: England, 1629-67*.

One pleasing trend is that very few candidates produced essays which were not at least attempting to be analytical. The main weakness in responses which scored less well tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis.

The paper provided candidates the opportunity to develop their essays writing and to include resource material as and when necessary.

There appears to be an increasing tendency for candidates to analyse and produce judgements in the main body of the answer and have cursory conclusions. In the sense that candidates can indeed sustain arguments by these means, this does not in itself prevent a barrier to reaching the highest levels. However, in some cases judgements on individual issues and factors tended to be somewhat isolated, and ultimate conclusions were left as rather stated. In this sense, candidates should be minded that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

The answers of a minority of less successful candidates in Section A suggested that they were unable to make a choice between Questions 1 and 2, which both covered the same topic and produced an attempt at a catch-all answer, with obvious repercussions. The best answers to these questions – and indeed those on the Stuart option - showed that there is some very good study of Tudor and Stuart history, with students producing incisive, scholarly analysis.

In terms of the Section (B) questions, a small number of candidates did seem to engage more with the general debate of the set controversy, rather than the specific demands of the question and source package. This was most evident on Question 7, although it was still a small minority. The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## Question 1

This proved to be a popular essay question with the majority of candidates providing strong answers. The most successful responses placed examples of factional rivalries within the context both of religious change and the personal ambitions that existed around an ageing Henry VIII and young Edward VI. Most candidates were able to analyse the relative balance of factors in each case. Most answers from level 3 upwards still made some purposeful points about the fall of Cromwell, the deathbed of Henry VIII and Edward's minority. A small minority of candidates displayed considerable knowledge of either factional struggles of the reign of Henry VIII, or those that featured under Edward VI, but not both.

The vast majority recognised the importance of the terminal dates - the full range specified for this issue - although a minority produced overviews of Mary's reign. If anything, there tended to be better analysis of the reign of Edward. It was common for candidates to spend more time considering Henry's reign, and some did offer argument and focus regarding 'personal ambitions' yet did not develop religious aspects when referencing factional groups as 'reformist' or 'conservative'.

An encouraging number of candidates were able to argue convincingly that the two issues were intertwined, and some did undertake consideration of the use of the term 'bitter' in the question.

(Section A continued) against him would be like turning against the king, which of course is treason. Unfortunately this failed to have the desired effect and Somerset was removed from power in the early 1540s.

After Somerset's over-ambitious ambitions came the Duke of Northumberland. He did not ignore the privy council as ~~but~~ <sup>Somerset</sup> had before him but he ruled with it. This proved to be a great advantage for Edward as the council kept Northumberland where he belonged, an advisor not ruler. His ambitions were far smaller and his promises to end enclosure kept the peace at the grass roots. It was not until a few years into his reign that things began to turn sour. His promises to end enclosure had fallen flat and so the grass roots began staging

spontaneous riots throughout the country. Northumberland had diverted from the king's wishes and tried to fulfill his own. Perhaps to dampen rebel causes, Edward declared himself of age at the age of 14 in 1547. This removed Northumberland from power and so the riots began to stop.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This extract shows a response which achieved a level 2. The candidate displays valid and at times specific knowledge. However, whilst there is some hint of a reference to the 'ambition' of Northumberland, the work was largely descriptive.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Candidates should ensure every point or paragraph is clearly focused on the demands of the question. In this case, that would mean offering argument and analysis on personal ambition or religious differences, examining the role these played in creating faction.

## **Question 2**

Although a significant part of the specification, this was a less popular choice for candidates. A wide range of responses were found. At the lower end, there were some generalised answers, which offered a focus and structure but provided limited material to develop issues. As with question (1), a small minority did struggle to stay within the date range, despite clear instructions provided in the specification.

Some candidates concentrated on the issue of personal rule with passing reference to the Privy Council. That said, there were good answers found that did not offer extensive material on the make up or functions of the Privy Council, but achieved into the higher levels by offering reasoned comparisons to other potential sources of power and influence such as the monarch, parliament, key individuals, the Privy Chamber and more localised government such as the Council of the North.

Candidates who scored at the highest levels, provided a range of successful approaches, analysing the role and function of the council as opposed to other institutions, particularly Parliament, and could show its changing role through the reforms of Cromwell, divisions in the 1540s, isolation under Somerset and extension in use and importance under Northumberland. A number also successfully applied aspects of the historiography relating to Elton's 'revolution in government'.

In terms of typical content covered, membership usually concerned the obvious figures of Cromwell, Somerset and Northumberland, and knowledge of Denny & the dry stamp or Paget & Wriothesley was sometimes used to good effect. Few answers referred to the relationship of the Privy Council with the shires, its judicial functions or conduct of diplomacy.

Para 1 - Henry

Para 2 - Edward - Somerset (base from privy council)

Northumberland

Between the period of 1540 to 1553, the centre of political power and government appeared to stem from a relatively wide variety of sources. It is apparent <sup>that</sup> through the wider legitimacy and personal strength of Henry he was able to successfully govern England. While this legitimacy remained with Edward VI, due to being of just 7 years of age by his succession in 1547, he required external support to retain a firm grip on the country. However, the revised view of Edward's reign in fact suggests him to have been a fairly strong monarch, despite his minority. It is also evident that a group of essential individuals drastically altered political power, most notably Thomas <sup>Common</sup> Somerset and Northumberland. The essay will argue that although the Privy Council had a certain extent of power, it was more a figure head, undermined by the individual figures of the period.

Throughout the first seven years of Henry's reign (1540-47), his own physical health was deteriorating, potentially shifting the source of power in England. However, this is somewhat undermined by his attendance in parliament and leading England to war with France in 1545, although this

(Section A continued) was somewhat detrimental to England, which further declined into financial decay as a result of Henry's exceedingly expensive foreign policy. This also required the significant debasement of the coinage, with silver content reaching below 20% of its content in 1530, the final debasement came in 1562. Henry's blatant political power is further highlighted by his movement in religious policy, moving further towards protestantism, something which remained unpopular in the Privy Council. However, Henry's own political beliefs were brought into question when he watched the execution of conservative John Lambert.



in 1538, perhaps suggesting a statement of his religious movements, although deeming them to be necessary. His own personal beliefs are then further questioned by him leaving \$20,000 to churches to pay for his soul suggesting endorsement of catholic beliefs, as protestants had no belief in purgatory. This suggests that Henry may have been extremely influenced in his religious movements, although it may have been inevitable after his divorce from ~~the~~ Catherine of Aragon acted as a catalyst.

There is little evidence or suggestion that Henry was influenced in terms of government or political power by either one of his wives. However, it is undeniable that each individual marriage allowed for influence from differing factors. For example, Henry's marriage to Catherine Howard, Norfolk's niece, allowed influence to Henry from Norfolk, whilst this further reduced the credibility of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> former, who had arranged the disastrous marriage to Anne of Cleves in 1540, which Henry had rapidly annulled. However, the power of Thomas Cromwell was hugely relevant to government and political power, highlighted by his ordering of the visitation act.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This extract, showing the first two pages of a response, achieved a high level 3. The candidate did display a good range of knowledge which was mostly relevant – mainly on alternative arguments. However, whilst there was an attempt to examine where the centre of political power was, the focus on this was often implicit, and the material on the Privy Council itself was thin.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Responses at the highest level often have a strong argument that runs throughout the essay. A common thread of argument in such high-level answers to this question was to see the authority of the Privy Council, or other organs of state for that matter, as being corollary to the needs and condition of the monarch.



### **Question 3**

This was the more popular option of the two Stuart questions. Many candidates showed a very impressive knowledge of the opposition to Charles and were able to construct analytical and targeted answers. Most candidates explored the common issues such as: Ship Money, the Hampden Case and the Bishops' War. Whilst high level answers were offered which structured responses around issues before and then during the last three years, in some cases this tended to produce rather two dimensional responses. Within this, those achieving the highest levels were sharply focused on examining the degree of opposition, with consideration of 'seriousness', and within these responses a common argument saw the roots of the opposition coming from the period before 1637. Many candidates evaluated the resentment caused by financial exactions, Laud's policies, Star Chamber and local government, and Stafford in Ireland before commenting in detail on events in Scotland.

Some candidates did struggle to focus on the period of the personal rule. Whilst some valid issues were made relating to opposition before 1629 or even considering issues past 1640, candidates should be minded of the demands of the specification.

One other issue that impinged upon essays which were otherwise well reasoned was the seeming need for some to delve into consideration of Whig and Marxist schools, showing a lack of real understanding and focus of what the two "schools of thought" provided.

In conclusion, it does appear that it was predominantly in the last three years of his personal rule that Charles I faced serious opposition to his wishes and policies. While there is evidence of opposition throughout the Personal Rule, it was often dispersed and not severely obstructive to Charles I's Personal Rule. For instance, while Robert Woodford may have resented landianism, he was unlikely to vocally oppose it. However, after 1637 Charles I faced simultaneous attacks on his religious, financial and administrative policies throughout his Kingdom, creating a serious threat to the successful running of the Personal Rule.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Whilst not as extensively weighed as some examples that were found, this offers clear and reasoned judgement, critically examining the nature of opposition before and after 1637 in order to assess the extent to which it can be seen as 'serious opposition'. This was a good level 5 response.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Organisation is crucial to high level answers. Many of the most successful responses organised answers thematically. On this particular question, that meant structuring answers around finance, religion, avoidance of war, other issues of governance, etc.

## Question 4

This was the least popular question in Section A. The question itself seemed to give good scope for debate over the nature of the relationship between Charles II and the Cavalier Parliament, in which the vast majority of students wrote about.

Of those assessed, the standard was relatively high, with many displaying good knowledge of the period, exploring the royalist expectations of Charles II, religious divisions, the Clarendon Code, finances and the unintentional nature of the under-funding of royal government.

Less successful responses tended to be able to focus to some extent on the question, but could not sustain this or substantiate issues in sufficient depth.

(Section A continued) That Charles expected or even wanted these laws to be reinstated, thus I don't think that ~~the fact that~~ this had much of an effect on the King and Parliament's relationship.

The issue over money was settled between the King and Parliament. The cavaliers granted Charles an income of ~~the~~ £200,000 from customs and excise duty. The King was also expected to raise £100,000 from crown lands every year. This left the King with an annual income of £1,200,000. This is far a huge amount of money for the time, and far more money ~~to~~ his father could ever have dreamed of earning. This again clearly demonstrates the difference in the relationship between King Charles II and Parliament and Charles I and Parliament. It is clear evidence that the Cavalier Parliament was committed to their task of providing a workable solution to prevent the functional breakdown that was seen towards the end of Charles I. Parliament also sold Dunkirk to the French for £400,000. They also raised an 11 month Poll Tax to pay off the Army, who could ~~off~~ have derailed the whole process if given the chance. Charles II died solvent, an incredible fact when comparing the financial situation of Monarchy from the similar period. This was mainly down to the Cavalier Parliament, who voted him enough money, thus I think it would be fair to state that the Cavalier Parliament was against Charles, thus he did not find them that difficult to manage.

(Section A continued) On religion however it is an entirely different story. Charles and Parliament wanted entirely different things. Charles wanted to pursue liberty of conscience, but Parliament did not. Charles issued the Declaration of Indulgence, looking for increased toleration for radical religious sects such as Quakers, in 1662-1667. He faced such massive opposition from the Cavalier Parliament that he was forced to withdraw it in 1663. Various negotiations discussing religious reform also broke down. The Cavalier Parliament passed a series of acts that aimed to persecute any religious sect they did not agree with. The Corporation Act of 1662 forced every individual who wanted to hold public office to take holy communion in the Church of England every year and renounce the engagement. The Quaker Act of 1662 placed harsh penalties on Quakers - the most feared radical sect as they did not believe in the scripture but believed in freedom of expression. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 made the compulsory Elizabethan Prayer Book compulsory and made ministers swear an oath to abide by it. 15 of church ministers were forced out as a result. In 1664 the Conventicle Act was passed, making it illegal for religious groups of 5 or more to meet unless the prayer book was used. In 1665 the Five Mile Act banned radical preachers coming within five miles of a town possessing a royal charter. It is clear that the Cavalier Parliament's ambitions are different to the beliefs of Charles. However there is debate over how radical these bills were. This is what many people derived and in fact although there could be seen overly repressive, there was de facto toleration of radical sects, apart from Quakers and Baptists. It is clear that on the basis of the issue of religion, Parliament and the



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This was part of a high level 4 response. It displayed relevant and essentially focused assessment of relations between Charles II and parliament over the issue of finance. The response understands the difficulties in achieving a workable financial settlement between the two.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

This answer was mostly analytical, but not as directly focused or evaluative as it could have been. More consistent development of points to judgements would have improved this.

## **Question 5**

This was a popular question which produced some very good analysis. Good answers provided comments on the Tudor rebellions in depth. Some candidates did tend to get bogged down in detail from the sources and at times struggled to do more than re-state points from the sources. Whilst such responses often managed comparative cross-referencing, focused analysis tended to be patchy and lacking organisation.

There were also occasions in which candidates misread sources or accepted points too readily at face value, e.g. the reference in Source 1 to Wyatt's 'remarkable' success was not always seen in context of comparison with other revolts pending.

In terms of strengths, the majority were able to focus on the issues in the sources and evaluate Wyatt's skills, the proximity of Kent, the nature of his support, the importance of the Londoners, the role of Mary and the collapse of regional risings. Some candidates made valid comparisons to other risings, such as consideration of the relative numbers involved in the Pilgrimage of Grace, although at times there was digression of this or points served as only narrow comparisons.

A minority of students chose to write in detail about the causes of the rebellion, without relating this to its level of seriousness. Examples were seen though of well-informed candidates offering detailed knowledge of the fine details of the rebellion, Wyatt's background and that of his co-conspirators in detail, relating this well to the question. Some less successful responses ignored the concept of historical debate and controversy for this question and took the sources at face value.



However, this level of involvement was only planned, and even since acknowledges this fact. The long list that Amy offers of ~~other~~ potential risks, i.e. 'Jervis', 'Larente-die', 'Ker', and 'on the Welsh borders' is in a way made obsolete undermined by Fletcher's reference to the 'dread future' of the other rebellions, Richard's admission to the 'only serious' fact that the 'only... serious threat' was Wyatt's and indeed his own later acknowledgement that only Wyatt's succeeded. The fact that, if Amy acknowledges, the rebels were 'forced into positive acts', a fact confirmed by the reference of Fletcher's to the Wyatt's ability to 'collect a force quickly when he need arose', ~~is a fact which~~, I would suggest, identifies the future of the initial plan, or also explains the future of the threat to the part.

~~But to what extent~~  
But to what extent does the future of the plan diminish the 'very serious threat' to them?

(Section B continued) The fact that Richard's support was undermined seems, I think, to diminish the threat significantly, yet Richard acknowledges that Wyatt's rebellion did still offer a 'serious threat', that was according to Fletcher 'enormous'. Indeed, one could use Amy's claim that both 'were not', and Fletcher's simple claim that 'the government was weakened' as evidence support for this 'serious threat': threat was, of course established earlier, reliable, and one this greatly diminished.

rebellion offered a revealing force for the government. The ignorance of the government, that Richard Little identifies, of the freedom of the Whites' further supports this idea of the threat being 'very serious' if only in relation to the government's weaknesses.

However, the threat to deny peacefully seems quite different to that of the government in general: indeed, there was considerable opposition to Henry's planned marriage within government - that P. Thomas identifies as the key issue in this rebellion, and with whom I am inclined to agree - within government itself, and ~~the law~~ is <sup>demonstrated</sup> identified by the power of political ideas it was suggested, and even the reluctance of Stephen Curdie to



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This was part of a high level 5 response. It mostly displayed clear and structured analysis, confident assimilation of given views with each other and own knowledge. It achieved high level 5 for both assessment objectives.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

In order to evaluate issues, it helps to establish clear criteria to be used to reach judgement. This applies on both Section A and Section B questions. For this question, candidates reaching level 5 often used the issues mentioned above, such as leadership, proximity, size, intent, etc.



## **Question 6**

As in previous examinations, this was the less popular of the two Tudor controversies, with candidates gaining a wide spread of marks.

In some responses it did allow candidates to enter into the debate and controversy more readily, especially in terms of debating the viewpoints of the likes of Graves, Neale and Elton.

The details in source (4) were used by many to argue that Parliament was limited by the powers of the monarch, although few examined the emphasis on regional gentry, whose perception of proceedings might provide a different angle (highlighting on instance where the title of the book was at least noteworthy). The subtleties of source (5), concerning how Elizabeth's approach may have alienated many with genuine concerns over the succession were more successfully explored.

Source (6) provided an opportunity to reflect on the Puritan Choir, which many did with confidence by analysing the careers and impact of the likes of Wentworth, Cope and Strickland, although in some cases source (6) was under used.

However, whilst the use of historiographical knowledge to extend the debate is obviously worthy within the controversy question, a minority of candidates did not apply this effectively, either misapplying Neale's thesis or drifting from the specifics of the debate. Thankfully, such instances were reduced in number. One issue worth raising is the need for candidates to carefully consider the demands of the question, rather than answer a pre-prepared debate, as a small number of otherwise well-constructed answers seemingly interpreted this as a question about opposition to Elizabeth rather than influence on her, where parliamentary success might be gauged in the extent to which they managed to persuade the queen, rather than confront her. Thus Elizabeth's irritation with Parliament (source 5) was argued to be a success rather than a failure of influence. Own knowledge for those not addressing the sources carefully and critically could get in the way of candidates thinking their way independently round the question. At the highest levels, students were able to reference and apply some excellent own knowledge on this topic, including data regarding the number of sessions of parliament, use of veto and granting of subsidies.

A mutualistic relationship of co-operation existed between Elizabeth and Parliament, in which democracy and sovereign authority co-existed. This is shown by the issue of Mary, Queen of Scots, whereby Elizabeth would not execute her as Parliament wanted, so instead reached a joint agreement to exclude her from the succession. Added to this was involvement in the Netherlands, in which Elizabeth had no significant conviction to go against Spain, yet under the

(Section B continued) advice and influence of Parliament

she offered support and financial aid to Dutch rebels. Where source 6 states the puritans' "subversion of royal authority and their constitutional challenge was undebated"

is of huge significance. This is due to the fact that Parliament gave its support of Elizabeth's decision to imprison some and remove others from Parliament. Highlighting the co-operation between Parliament and the monarch. Cooper supports this, "stating the Elizabethan Parliaments period "a general climate of cooperation"; again highlighting the exertion of influence from both sides"

However this is directly refuted by source 5, "The succession, and the fate of Mary, Queen of Scots, also drove members of the lower house to offer her majesty a lot of unsolicited and unwelcome advice". This

clearly highlights the tense conflict between Elizabeth and Parliament, and ~~shows~~ the limitations of leader's interpretations. This conflict is further shown as even though Elizabeth agreed to exclude Mary, Queen of Scots from the succession, the legislation was never implemented. This undoubtedly shows that even



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This extract came from a response which had overall focus and analysis. At best, it showed clear recognition of the differing views and engaged in debate between these, integrating arguments and own knowledge. This wasn't seen consistently though, and at other times the sources tended to take a back seat to own knowledge. It achieved a level 5 for AO1 and a high level 4 for AO2(b).



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Studying the sources carefully and critically, and planning answers before writing helps structure an answer, and so ensure consistency across the essay.

## Question 7

Following on from previous examinations this question was the more popular of the two. Candidates produced a range of responses. Less successful responses tended to be towards uncritical assertion, offering a generalised overview of historiographical debate or a ranging run through the different factors determining side-taking, without full consideration of the argument in the given sources.

The best answers tested the claims of the sources with reference to their own knowledge. Some very good candidates were able to take make an insightful view of Source (7), seeing that 'respect' and 'scorn' for Charles reflected two sides of the same interpretation - and thus develop a more credible argument about what the central concerns might have been for those on opposite sides.

The issue of 'reverence for monarchy' was well understood and produced good sections analysing divine right, obedience, patronage and social order. Religion, as a motive in side taking, was also examined in detail with an understanding that both sides used religion to extenuate the fears of the other.

Stronger responses were often able to use the sources provided with skill and also discuss the cases of individuals, families, cities, areas in detail, whilst retaining a sharp focus on the overall themes.

Many good answers saw the trust of Charles as a key issue, and that support for the monarchy was not the same as trust for Charles.

An impressive number developed the analysis further by including other factors and could give detailed statistics and examples of localism, geography, family and neutrality, and included discussion of historiography particularly Marxist interpretations of class, although success in this depended on an ability to keep this squarely focused.

(Section B continued) grounds and thus Catholic sided with the king and Puritan with parliament. ~~Religion seems~~ Religion seems to have been important for Royalists as Charles was seen as 'defender of the faith' (Source 7) and portrayed Parliamentarians as 'men intent on restoring the bishops' (Source 8). Anderson argues that England divided into those who wanted to protect the Anglican Church (Royalist) and those who wanted to reform it (Parliamentarians). Cromwell's presentation of Charles as 'defender of the faith' (Source 7) certainly seems to endorse this. Religion appears to have been important for some, but it is too simplistic to argue that Catholics backed the king and Puritans backed parliament as there are always exceptions to this rule.

Class seems to have been an important factor in side-taking. In Source 8, Oremy talks about the gentry 'we thought it a matter of honour to serve their sovereign' (Source 7). Many historians have argued that people split into those aristocrats who wished to preserve their status (Royalist) and those who wanted to rise (Parliamentarian). Baxter, the contemporary commentator, argued that the gentry encouraged their friends, families, neighbours, tenants, and dependents to side with the king. However, yeomen and financially independent tradesmen were able to freely choose which side to take. It is true that many were gentry sided with Charles - Lucy Hutchinson states 'the gentry were

(Section B continued)

wholly for the king' - but 5 out of 6 parliamentarian leaders in Gloucester were very well off. Christopher Hill has stated that 'The civil war was a class war', and it certainly seems that class did have a part to play, but Royle has stated 'this was not a war of class as such', and this appears more convincing, as people did not divide solely on class.

Neutrality seems to have been key in side-taking. It has been demonstrated that there were those who were keen to engage and defend either side, but the point remains that many people delayed taking sides. It is true that neutrality was not a permanent option, but it certainly appears to have been popular. In Cheshire, the Burkhurst pact meant that ~~it~~ it was declared neutral and no armies were to fight within county boundaries. Indeed, Morrill has found 22 neutrality pacts in England, showing the extent of the desire not to take sides. Indeed, in ~~the~~ debates over

the Grand Remonstrance, it was 'carried by 159 votes to 148', but as Lockyer states 'the closeness of the result showed that the House of Commons, like the country as a whole, was split down the middle' (Source 9). There were 567 MPs present for the debate so ~~the~~ majority abstained, meaning that Cressy's assertion that 'Parliament was against him [Charles]' is flawed, as not all of them were.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This extract had confident focus and at times truly excellent use of sources; clearly integrated and assimilated, selective quotations use to drive arguments, with views and arguments picked up on, analysed and taken on without recourse to overstated rejections. Evidence and views were weighed throughout the essay. High L5 for both assessment objectives.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Exploring the relationship between different factors and issues is often a hallmark of high-level responses. Some really outstanding answers showed the connection between themes by linking monarchy with Anglicanism & concepts such as Defender of the Faith, and the upholding of traditional rights and liberties including the constitution which benefited those with a vested, economic interest in the maintenance of the social order.



## Question 8

Fewer students opted for this question and set of sources. However, despite the range of responses most candidates explored the key issues. Most candidates were able to place Cromwell at the centre of an evaluation of the Protectorate and use the sources to evaluate relevant issues. There were some very well-balanced and evaluative responses produced, which perhaps reflect the degree of controversy that exists over this debate. Given the potential own knowledge that could have been added, it was disappointing to see a small minority of candidates fail to add much other than brief historical context. Those candidates who were able to develop this further through their own knowledge often examined the difficulties of the position Cromwell held, through analysis of the composition and expectations of his parliaments, the issues over religion, often citing the Nayler case with reference to religious persecution and the influence of Cromwell, the Humble Petition and the role of the army and the Major Generals. Many good answers were able to focus on the issue of accepting the crown to illustrate the contradictions.

During the years 1657-58, Cromwell attempted to form a settled government that moved away from ~~the~~ monarchy and towards England becoming a Godly land. However, as source 12 notes, there are two fatally contradictory aims of the protectorate, as healing and settling the nation becomes less achievable when attempting a Godly Reformation at the same time. Cromwell was in many ways a force of political stability as he held ~~together~~ together the protectorate and worked with parliament but his rule can also be ~~be~~ interpreted as ~~an~~ an unstable military dictatorship that revolved around power.

Source 10 describes how Cromwell attempted to 'restore a sense of stability' that had been lost ~~at~~ during the turmoil of the civil war and the regicide. This was

(Section B continued) partly achieved by Cromwell's moderation and his desire to work with parliament. He called two protectorate



parliaments, a total of three sessions during his role as lord protector and in many ways was willing to incorporate the ideas of others into the regime. The source 10 again says 19 the twenty men of his executive council, ~~was~~ none were regicides. This is powerful evidence for Cromwell's attempt at stability and his pragmatism ~~is~~ in trying to form a settled country.

However, ~~that~~ Cromwell was not open to all opinions. ~~Source~~ Source 11 describes his intolerance of the second session of the second protectorate parliament that he dissolved because of the opposing views of the re-admitted MPs. This is similar to the way in which Cromwell dissolved the first protectorate parliament in January 1655, after only the bare minimum of 5 months. ~~He~~ This was perhaps because he disliked the way parliament was opposing his ~~own~~



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This extract came from a good level 4 response. It sets out some of the issues within the question, and examines these with some relation to the sources. The different views expressed within the sources could be more tightly debated though, and the answer lacks real sharpness of argument and the kind of cross-referencing of views and evidence found in the example for question 7.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

When planning your answer, one method is to read through the sources carefully and list all the support and challenge points you can. This will help you to cross-reference effectively in your answer.

## Paper Summary

The following recommendations are divided into two parts:

### In Depth Study question

Candidates must provide more factual details. Candidates need to ensure their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth of analysis.

Stay within the specific boundaries of the question – for example, some candidates explored issues outside of the relevant time periods.

More candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.

In order to address the question more effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis not provide a descriptive or chronological account. Many candidates produced answers, which were focused and developed appropriately.

Some candidates need to analyse key phrases and concepts more carefully.

Some candidates could have explored links and the interaction between issues more effectively.

### Associated Historical Controversy question

It is suggested that the students who perform best on Section B tended to be those who read the sources carefully, accurately and critically; recognised themes and issues arising from the sources, then used these to address the question. Some candidates potentially limited themselves by closing off potential areas of enquiry by seeking to make the evidence of the sources fit the contention in the question, without full thought to the issues within the sources, or by using the sources to illustrate arguments without relating evidence to other sources or own knowledge.

Candidates need to treat the sources as a package to facilitate cross-referencing and advance a convincing line of argument. Many weaker candidates resorted to 'potted' summaries of each source which failed to develop a support/challenge approach.

Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little or no own knowledge was included.

Candidates should avoid memorised 'perspectives' essays and base their responses on the issues raised by the sources instead. The Associated Historical Controversy question is an exercise in interpretation not historiography.

That said, there were very few really weak responses. The impression was that the substance of the source at least enabled candidates offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases though, candidates often struggled to extend issues with own knowledge, or really analyse the given views.

There was also a correlation between those candidates who reviewed all sources in their opening paragraph and high performance. Whilst a telling introduction is not essential, it is suggested that the process of carefully studying the sources with a view to how they relate to the contention in the question, prior to embarking upon the bulk of essay writing, allows candidates to clarify and structure their thoughts and arguments.

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA032422 June 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit


[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning