



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel AS Level
In History (8HI0) Paper 1B

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2017

Publications Code 8HI0_1B_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates engaging effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of the reformed AS Level paper 1B: England, 1509–1603: authority, nation and religion.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3).

Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section b questions covering broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from the within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

Question 1

This was a popular question, and was generally tackled effectively in order to reach the two higher levels, with most candidates demonstrating sufficient knowledge and understanding to discuss a range of factors contributing to the growth of trade in the given period. The given factor of overseas exploration was largely understood and addressed with some depth, although there was a noticeable preference among candidates to discuss the significance of immigration, in particular Dutch immigrants, on the development of the textile trade. A minority of responses blurred the distinctions between overseas exploration and trade, treating established overseas trade as an aspect of exploration; confident responses explored the interplay between these and other issues, in some cases demonstrating the sustained evaluation beyond the requirements of AS Level. Some responses attempted to discuss Dutch immigration as an aspect or result of overseas exploration, and struggled to convince over this. Other factors commonly covered were innovations in cloth production, developments resulting from the growth of London, the role played by the government and the consequences of broader developments in agriculture. There were also some good discussion of the significance of the decline of Antwerp. Generally, most candidates were clearly able to focus the material they had towards the demands of the question.

Exemplar 1

This response demonstrates some of the qualities of a level 3 response. There is an attempt at analysis, structured towards the question around different factors. There is some range of knowledge, although this lacks depth. However, some of the development is unconvincing, in either the accuracy of the supporting material, or in the connection to the outcome of developments in trade. Attempts are made to reach judgement, although the reasoning and support is limited.

Chosen question number: **Question 1** **Question 2**

The argument that over seas exploration was the main reason for developments in trade from 1550s to 1588 can be argued as a key, main cause ~~as~~ as not only does this include developments of trade ~~but~~ but also the Dutch immigrants that assisted in the development of further cloth trade. However this view can be criticised as it was the development of England itself that resulted in developments in trade as well as other factors.

Developments in trade due to exploration over seas was a large impact as it meant that the English trade markets were expanding and the English 'name' and 'brand' was becoming more of a demand ^{even resulting in German companies entering} for example large expansions and trade agreements largely took place in the 1580s with countries such as Russia, ~~the~~ the Muscovy trade, which traded with fur and timber also the Barbary company, with Marasco, which traded sugar (a delicacy that ~~was~~ showed wealth in England with people using it for ~~art~~ with sugar structures

(Section A continued) and plates). And finally the trade with Turkey, the Turkish company, which traded English tin for carpets, this trade development was one of the more largely successful trade routes. Also due to English settlements in America, like Jamestown, this led to the establishment of the trade triangle, the slave trade. Although this was a dark development in English history, it increased the levels of trade and goods with England gaining sugar, rum, tobacco etc. from America.

Another aspect that factors into overseas exploration that impacted English trade is the Dutch immigrants that came to work in England. These Dutch immigrants were key for developments in trade as in these 'aliens' were skilled cloth weavers and with them brought new cloth making ideas and products, for example the Dutch immigrants came up with products that were more light weight and colourful. These clothes were in high demand in Mediterranean countries with hot climates, expanding English trade. As a result of these Dutch weavers meant that towns like Maidstone asked for more Dutch workers, asking the government for 60 families,

(Section A continued) With the government agreeing to allow SO. This boosted the ~~an~~ English trade resulting in further overseas ~~expansion~~ explorations.

Although another possible reason for the development of trade was not down to overseas explorations but to developments of England's structure of trade and the expansion of London as a major port. Due to a increase in trade in England it was vital that ~~the~~ the country had one large port that would become the centre of trade, and since the 1550s this became London, overtaking ports like Bristol. This development of London as a port meant that more trade could take place here and lead to the ordering of 12 'levies' and the development of the ~~many~~ merchant adventurers ^{also new drapers were close to London in the south east (Kent)} that were based in London. Also due to the development of groups such as ~~the~~ fishmongers, and Butchers it meant that there were more products that were able to be sold and traded, increasing ~~and~~ England's trading opportunities to allow England to develop more trade.

(Section A continued) However overall the key aspect for the development of trade is due to the over-seas exploration, but this goes hand-in-hand with the introduction of Dutch immigrants into England developing new Draperies to develop trade from just with Antwerp but with further countries also.

Question 2

This was the less popular of the two questions in section A, and it produced a range of responses. There was a clear trend within this question whereby some candidates tended to produce arguments explaining the survival of Catholicism, seemingly misunderstanding the focus of the question, or lapsing from this focus to some degree or other during the essay. The issue of a preference for questions on causation has been evident across all options, and whilst reduced from 2016, it is worth reminding candidates that a range of second-order concepts can and will be addressed across the paper, and that in section A, questions will target consequences or causes. Where candidates did successfully target their knowledge, some very impressive responses were offered, with at times a depth of knowledge that should be noted and commended. In the strongest responses, this often focused on a the term 'implementation', relating this to an understanding of Elizabeth's own desires, set against her practical actions in government, where many recognised her as a politique. In terms of other issues addressed, an analysis of the impact on the rise of Puritanism commonly featured, as well as the long-term acceptance of her religious settlement. Others brought in information concerning relations with Spain, or attempted rebellion and plots, although success in doing so depended upon convincingly linking these issues to the focus of the question.

Exemplar 2

This response demonstrates the qualities of a level 4 response. There is a confident grasp of religious issues, and the impact the Elizabethan Religious Settlement had on the Catholicism in England is explored with reasoned analysis. The responses considers Puritanism as an alternative consequence, again with articulate reasoning. Whilst responses at this level to similar questions would more typically offer a more distinct range of consequences (or indeed factors), the quality of material, reason and judgement ensures this is a secure level 4.

mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

The Elizabethan Religious Settlement was a compromise of religion, allowing but not encouraging Catholicism to survive but also performing the same function for Puritanism. Both extremist forms of religion managed to exist simultaneously after the settlement, but neither had the ability to push the country or the Queen in either direction. ~~The~~ Ultimately, the main consequence of the Religious Settlement was a decrease in popular tension surrounding religion, leading to a period of cohabitation of Catholicism and Protestantism, with Elizabeth acting as the authority of both.

Catholicism during Elizabeth's reign was still in existence, but lacked the precedence it had held previously.

~~The~~ Much of the Northern nobility had been reluctant to sacrifice their religion and tradition throughout Henry and Edward's steps towards a protestant

(Section A continued) society. The Elizabethan Religious Settlement can in some ways be seen to make it easier for Catholicism to survive. This is because despite bringing back the book of common prayer of 1547, which had caused western Catholics to rebel during Edward's reign, it was adapted according to the ERS to be more ambiguous on the controversial issue of ~~transubstantiation~~ transubstantiation. This adaptation therefore allowed Catholics to practice the Eucharist in the more literal way which they believed in. However, this is not to say Catholics were content with the implementation of the ERS. The Throckmorton, and Babington Plots along with other schemes to remove Elizabeth and replace her with the Catholic Mary Queen of Scots demonstrate the discontent felt by much of the Catholic nobility. While none posed too significant a threat in reality, their existence is still indicative of the fact that the ERS may have allowed some aspects of Catholicism to

(Section A continued) survive, but not to flourish or be practiced as it was pre 1527.

The Elizabethan Religious Settlement can also be seen to have let Puritanism survive in the late 1500s. While remaining ambiguous on some levels, the settlement very clearly removed any ties to the Papacy, reinforcing Elizabeth instead as the Supreme Governor of the Church. The 42 articles written by Cranmer were adapted into the new 39 articles, much of which supported common Puritan ideals. However, much like with Catholicism, many Puritans felt the Settlement was not extreme enough. The ideas of classical presbyterianism were not supported by Elizabeth, and she ~~vetoes~~ vetoed the ~~1550~~ 1552 alphabet bills posed to parliament. This is demonstrative of the fact that while this form of extremist protestantism was allowed to survive, it was not encouraged through the settlement.

The Settlement ought to be viewed as a shift from conflict

(Section A continued)

to compromise in English religion. It encouraged the merging of ideals such as the marriage of the clergy alongside the upkeep of traditional vestments of bishops.

This development is reflected in Elizabethan culture, where much of the music merges the traditional Latin of Catholicism with the shorter and less layered ~~more~~ melodies of Protestantism. The settlement was mostly accepted by both extremes with only one archbishop refusing to take the oath to Elizabeth.

Although Catholicism was able to survive in the 1560s and 70s, this ought not to be viewed as the main consequence of the ERS.

Puritanism ~~also~~ survived on a much larger scale, but again, was not allowed by its terms to flourish into extremes. This meant the main consequence of the ERS was compromise, where a blend of ~~the~~ aspects of each denomination began. By the time the older generation of Catholics had died, much less resistance was posed as

(Section A continued)

The Elizabethan Religious Settlement discouraged ~~the~~ its development but allowed it to somewhat exist.

Question 3

Many candidates provided broad responses covering the period in question, and responses were found across the mark range. The more popular topics to feature were the role and authority of parliament, alongside the part played by key characters – monarchs aside, this predominantly meant Wolsey and Cromwell, although Somerset and Cecil also featured frequently. Aside from this, there were discussions of the Privy Council, the Star Chamber, as well as consideration of regional and local governance, including the developments of the Marcher Council, and the Council of the North, and the role of Lord Lieutenants and Justices of the Peace. Stronger responses tended to offer good chronological range and balance, and explore the extent of change throughout, confidently harnessing the material used towards the demands of the question. Less successful responses tended to be limited by only partial coverage of the period, unsupported assertion, or difficulties in focusing on change. With regards to the second-order concept of change, some candidates seem less familiar or confident with addressing questions on this. Whilst there is no ideal formula for such essays, stronger responses tended to ensure the essay is driven by argument over the extent of change, with detail selected to support and exploration, rather than the other way round, risking lapsing into description. Candidates should also be minded to address the full question, in terms of both the given date range, and the extent of change – in some otherwise well-argued responses, areas of continuity were at times given limited treatment, making it difficult to address the extent of change.

Exemplar 3

This response demonstrates the qualities of a level 3 response. There is an understanding of the demands of the question, attempting to relate material to the second-order concept of change. There is valid and accurate knowledge applied, although this lacks depth, and is not all convincingly developed. There is chronological coverage. There are attempts to reach reasoned judgements, such as seeing more or less change in some parts of the period, or aspects of the debate, than others, although such judgements are not securely developed.

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

It can be argued that the Tudor Government changed significantly in the years 1509-1588. Some historians would call it a 'revolution in Government'. A number of events have to be considered with this, such as the reforms of Wolsey and Cromwell, ~~the~~ ^{changes under Edward and Mary,} ~~the~~ ~~reforms~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~parliament~~ and parliament under Elizabeth.

During the reign of Henry VIII, Thomas Wolsey was the ^{first} Chief minister, ~~the~~ ~~minister~~ ~~of~~ ~~that~~ ~~time~~ so ~~that~~ he made a number of changes to the government. The first of these was the Star Chamber, which was able to prosecute nobles. The second of these was the Court of no requests, which had no fees so was available to everyone including the poor. These reforms were significant as it meant that

(Section B continued)

parliament was now more powerful as it was able to put nobles on trial, and was more widely accessible ~~also~~ to the public due to the Court of No Requests. However, it can be argued that Wolsey was only using the Star Chamber for personal ~~own~~ grievances, which would mean it was not as significant.

Thomas Cromwell also made significant changes to the structure of parliament when he became chief minister. Cromwell reorganised the structure of parliament to make it more streamlined, ~~more efficient~~ and removed some of the government tasks from the Royal Household. Although Cromwell's changes were significant, they did not outlive him, so may not be considered as changing government to a large extent.

Most of the changes in the structure

(Section B continued) of the government, in the Tudor period, happened under the ~~the~~ reign of Henry VIII (1509-1547). During this time parliament began to meet more or previously they had met very rarely. ~~There~~ There also became the idea of 'king in parliament' rather than 'king and parliament'. This meant that Henry was more involved in the running of parliament ~~and~~ ^{which} gave both of them more power.

However, it can be debated that there were not many significant changes to government from 1547-~~to~~ 1558, during the reigns of Edward 2nd and Mary I. Throughout this time most of the reforms in the country were to do with religion, as Edward was a strict protestant and Mary was a strict catholic it could therefore be argued that there was not much government change during this period ~~and~~ for a large part of it it remained

(Section B continued) the same.

Finally, during the reign of Elizabeth I, there was a lot of factions in parliament. Elizabeth attempted to remove freedom of speech from ~~the~~ parliament, as she believed they should only have say in ~~commentary~~ matters to do with the commonwealth, and should not be able to comment on things such as royal marriage laws or succession. The tensions in parliament during this time meant that not ~~many~~ many significant structural changes occurred.

In conclusion, it can be said that whilst a lot of changes happened from 1509-1547 during the reign of Henry VIII, not many occurred during the reigns of the other Tudor monarchs. However the changes during the reign of Henry can lead us to conclude that it could be described as a

(Section B continued) "Revolution in Government":

Question 4

This was the marginally more popular question within the option, and candidates produced a range of responses. Where candidates were less successful, this tended to be due to one or more of the following factors: (i) description limited focus on the question, (ii) limited material on poor relief, or material more relevant to the problem of poverty, e.g. the growth of vagrancy, rather than poor relief itself, (iii) confusion over the measures introduced to tackle the problem of poverty, and (iv) limited chronological range. The extent of change was not always explicitly assessed. A number of responses were able to successfully introduce wider contextual detail such as that on the dissolution of the monasteries, harvest failure, the debasement of coinage amongst an analysis of the issue, although stronger responses did so alongside focused material detailing the various acts introduced, with a confident grasp of what exactly these entailed, framed within an analysis in order to exemplify the extent of change in historical context. The advice given in relation to Question 3 concerning change as a second-order focus applies equally in this case.

Exemplar 4

Whilst brief, this response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 4 response. There is a direct focus on the analytical demands of the question, and accurate knowledge is applied to consider the changes to poor relief. Whilst issues could be explored further, the supporting knowledge is specific, and the response considers the extent of change across the period. Judgements are reasoned and critical, and the exposition is cogent and precise.

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

The provision for poor relief changed quite a lot from 1509-1588 as it increased in sheer scale and efforts to help rather than punish the poor, and also changed source from the church to government and the people. However, it changed much less when the impact it had on people is considered, as there was still in general little to help the poorest in society.

The amount of provision for poor relief increased a lot during the period, largely due to the increase in poverty Tudor England was experiencing. ~~At the~~ There was little ^{concern for} poverty at the start of Henry VIII's reign in 1509 due to a smaller population and so higher standard of living. Population ^{growth} experienced its sharpest increases from 1520-30 and 1570-80, and the government system for coping with poverty was not prepared for due to low initial poverty levels. The 1547 Vagrancy Act and the 1552 Poor Law show the government under Edward ~~had~~ known they had to deal with the growing number of vagrants and poverty, but did not know how and so were having to learn through experience. The Vagrancy Act was repealed in 1550 showing a misjudgement on Somerset's part. The 1552 poor law was added to by Elizabeth with further poor laws. All of this shows the ^{great} change in amount of provision there was, but also that it was largely ~~unsuccessful~~ unsuccessful and had to keep being replaced.

The type of provision for poor relief had to change hugely in the period, especially from 1547 to 1572. The harshest response to vagrants was in the 1547 Vagrancy Act, where they were branded with a V and could

(Section B continued) spend a lifetime in slavery. In contrast, the 1572 poor law encouraged the opening of 'Houses of Correction' in each county, and shows a utilisation of vagrants to help work and also to give them ~~things~~ ^{support} to do. This dramatic shift highlights the change from a punish to a help mentality. Additionally, provisions change as they began ~~to~~ ^{to be} funded by donations, first in 1552, and then enforced donations ^{the Act of Relief of the Poor in 1563} in 1572. Previously monasteries had been a source of alms and help, but with their dissolution ^{in 1536}, more pressure was put on the government ^{for} ~~to~~ support, and so this came from donations. Under Elizabeth recusancy fines also went towards aid of the poor. This all culminates to be the biggest change in poor relief as it shows a changing attitude. Although London had been requesting donations since 1547, once it became countrywide it had a much greater impact and made everyone feel in part responsible for helping the poor.

The ~~extent~~ ^{extent} to which the impact of this ~~change~~ relief changed is much less. There were more provisions, but also more poverty. Ultimately only one house of correction per county was not enough. The Tudor system simply was not set up to deal with high levels of poverty. This is shown through the constant increase in poverty levels through the period. Some areas were changed more than others, under Edward some crown properties were converted into ~~places~~ ^{places} to help the poor such as St Bartholomew's hospital in London. However most importantly for the poor, the provisions did not change enough to greatly help them.

In conclusion, the provisions for poor relief underwent the most dramatic changes ⁱⁿ the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, not Henry & Mary. The amount of provision increased, and both its focus and source changed a huge amount, however there was much less change in regards to

(Section B continued) its impact and benefit to the poor. This means that from the government's ^{perspective} ~~perspective~~ there was a great deal of change as they took over from monasteries, but ~~for~~ for those living in poverty the change seemed much smaller.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to access the higher two levels, generally by recognising and explaining the arguments in the two extracts, and building on this with own knowledge. The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Most candidates were able to identify differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, seeing the former as focusing on the difficulties parliament presented, set against Extract 2's questioning the extent to which this amounted to a problem, emphasising Elizabeth's handling of this. More nuanced responses also tended to pick up points of agreement. Issues that limited some responses were relatively limited use of the extracts, or to use these in a manner not fully suited to Section C, e.g. through attempts to analyse provenance in a manner more suited to AO2. Section C is focused around A03. Responses which made consideration of the argument and evidence within the extracts central to their responses, applying their contextual knowledge to consider the validity of the arguments offered, were more successful. For some, it seemed the breadth of this particular question was of great benefit in allowing scope to what contextual knowledge they brought to the argument, but it was those candidates who applied this within a response which consistently considered the extracts and their arguments which achieved the higher levels. Responses tended to be more successful when they addressed the issues drawn from the specific question and extracts. Some candidates appeared to offer pre-prepared material 'for' or 'against' the general historical debate ('a general crisis of government'), and whilst this could be productive, at times this amounted to material not directly relevant to the specific question and extracts. One further issue that limited some responses was a tendency to make use of quotations from the extracts in support of their own arguments, at the expense of analysis of the actual interpretations. Explicit analysis of the arguments within these, with carefully integrated contextual knowledge was a more successful approach.

Exemplar 5

This response demonstrates the qualities of a level 4 response. There is a clear understanding of the different perspectives taken by the two extracts, and the response gives a considered analysis of the arguments offered by the two historians. The candidate deploys their own knowledge to discuss the two views, integrating this into an analysis of the historians' arguments, and reasoned judgements are reached as a result of this discussion.

Simpson and Williams both present the conflict in parliament in the last years of Elizabeth's reign as being an issue of efficiency but not one of authority. There is some disagreement as to how far this conflict damaged procedure, how far it limited the Queen's desires and fulfilled parliaments, but ultimately it is possible to conclude from both extracts that the problems raised were of minimal threat to Elizabeth herself.

Both extracts concede that conflict prevailed over the Commons in Elizabeth's latter years but hold differing attitudes towards its impact on parliamentary procedure. Simpson ~~re~~ repeats the issue of "delay" in the Commons,

(Section C continued)

while Williams places more emphasis on "business" being "at a standstill." The contrast between this language shows the way in which the historians evaluate the damage of strain on time in parliament. This could be ~~seen~~ seen as reflective of the pressure placed on parliament and Elizabeth in the latter years of her reign because of the passing cost of war with ~~the~~ Spain. "Government business" was likely not "at a standstill" but the added need to "vote heavy taxes" for the "continuing war against Spain" could make it seem as though any debate was preventing efficiency altogether.

Simpson places more ~~an~~ emphasis on the Queen's wishes being directly defied by parliament whereas Williams shows that her desires were mildly contested but ultimately met. Simpson suggests that monopolies were an issue which "the Queen had made it plain" that such matters

(Section C continued)

were "intruding on her prerogative." It can therefore be inferred from § Extract 1 that parliament having "raised the issue of monopolies" was a direct denial of Elizabeth's wishes. However, § Extract 2 focusses more upon Elizabeth's successes in parliament, ~~giving a positive view~~ and her "faithful commons." This ~~view~~ is further reflected in the fact that Elizabeth was granted by parliament 9 subsidies which she had requested in the last years of her reign. This shows that despite mild contempt from parliament demonstrated by Simpson, Williams is correct to portray parliament as ultimately "faithful" and ~~as~~ eager to please.

Both extracts suggest that Elizabeth would have to address the issue of "monopolies." Monopolies were causing major issues in the economy. ^{for example} the price of salt had risen to 11 times its usual price and Elizabeth was making profit

(Section C continued)

directly defied as she still managed to achieve all forms of taxation she had desired. Both extracts show that no real threat was placed by parliament to her authority, as ultimately the Commons was "faithful" and "agreed in principle" with her. Furthermore, while Elizabeth made some minor concessions in terms of monopolies, this can be seen as an easy compromise and not the dominance of parliament, who still obeyed Elizabeth's rulings on ~~political~~ succession, religion and war. Both historians can therefore be seen to evaluate the problems caused by parliament as minimal issues of efficiency, and not of crisis, or threat.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits

- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground

