

Examiners' Report
June 2016

GCE History 6HI03 A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2016

Publications Code 6HI03_A_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the seventh session of the 6HI03 A examination. Many candidates wrote insightful comments which placed them in the higher grade categories. The paper was divided into two sections: Section (A) was an In-Depth Study question, and Section (B) an Associated Historical Controversy question. Unfortunately, some candidates continue to write too much generalised comment. As a consequence, their responses lacked precise analytical focus and detailed supporting evidence. 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. As expected, there were far more entrants for

A1- Protest, Crisis and Rebellion in England, 1536–88

than for

A2 – Revolution, Republic and Restoration England, 1629–67

One pleasing trend is that very few candidates produced essays which were devoid of analysis. 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 with the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include source 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. Candidates can indeed sustain arguments by these means and this approach does not, in itself, prevent access to the highest levels. However, in some cases, judgements on individual issues and factors tended to be somewhat isolated, and ultimate conclusions were either only partially stated or implicit. Consequently, candidates should be aware that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a solid framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

The answers of a minority of less successful candidates in Section A suggested that they lacked the detailed knowledge base required to tackle questions such as Question 4. The best answers to these questions – and indeed those across the option – showed some impressive study of Tudor and Stuart history, with students producing incisive, scholarly analysis.

When attempting the Section (B) questions, a small number of candidates engaged 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

On Question 1, stronger responses had a sharp focus on the extent to which the motivations for factional rivalry were more personal and religious. High scoring candidates tended to explore the ambiguities, such as (1) going beyond accepting the charges of heresy against Cromwell as simply demonstrating religious motivations to explore personal rivalry (2) the extent to which the failed plots against Cranmer and Parr can be explained in terms of conservatives and reformists and (3) the extent to which Dudley's rise reflected personal ambition, or indeed displayed genuine religious convictions. Weaker responses tended to (1) focus more on the reign of one or other monarch (2) produce narratives with weak links to factional intrigue (3) offer analysis, but which drifted too far to considering other questions, such as the extent to which faction existed or manipulated Henry.

1539 - 53 - Factional Rivalry - personal ambition / religious motives

- | Personal | Religious |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Norfolk - Howards• Edward Seymour - Cott• Somerset - Rise/Fall• Northumberland - LG | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fall of Cromwell 1540• Somerset's religious Charge• Northumberland's rise |

It can be argued that religion ~~do~~ was the driving force behind factional when looking at the fall of Cromwell in 1540, the ~~religious~~ ^{conservatives} attempted ~~fact~~ plots against Archbishop Cranmer in 1543/ Catherine Parr in 1546 as well as

(Section A continued) the changes made in Somerset's protectorship. However, ^{as the greater force behind} personal ambitions ^{factional rivalries} can be seen when looking at Norfolk's ambitions within the conservative faction, Somerset's rise and fall as well as Northumberland's Lady Jane Grey plot.

In 1540, Cromwell had played a big role in Henry VIII's reformation but it can be said that religious motives of the conservative faction led to his fall. The more Catholic conservatives despised Cromwell's religious changes and so Norfolk and two others convinced Henry that Cromwell had committed heresy and his fall from power was needed after ~~the~~ Cromwell's deception in ^{Henry's} ~~the~~ marriage to Anne of Cleves. Thus, Cromwell's fall is an example of religious motives pushing factional rivalries as the more Catholic conservatives didn't agree with Cromwell's protestant changes.

(Section A continued) Religious motives again was the driving force behind the conservative party (led by Norfolk) trying to eliminate the reformist leader, Archbishop Cranmer due to him also pushing for protestant changes. However, Henry decided to put trust in Cranmer and ignore the conservative factions claims that Cranmer was a heretic - showing Henry still had authority over faction in 1543.

The religious motives ~~was~~ were again shown by the conservatives aim to bring down Catherine Parr who was a protestant. By ~~rem~~idding Henry of a protestant wife, the conservatives would have gained more power in the council against the reformist. Henry again ignored conservative claims of adultery against Catherine. ~~This again~~ These more catholic plots against leading protestant figures again show that religious motives drove factional rivalry more than personal ambitions did.

(Section A continued) Under Edward in 1547, factional rivalries were less of a threat concern due to Somerset having taken control of the king as well as the council. Thus, the reformist faction were free to make the religious changes they want, swaying the country toward protestantism gradually under Somerset and then even more so with reforms under Northumberland from 1550-1553. The fact that when the reformist faction gained power after Henry's death and most of their reforms were religiously motivated shows the ambitions behind ~~the~~ factional rivalry were largely religious rather than personal.

However, personal ambitions can be argued to be the greater force behind factional rivalries, as seen when looking at Norfolk's ambitions. After engineering the fall of Cromwell, Norfolk gained favour with the king - increasing his power in the council.



ResultsPlus **Examiner Comments**

The sample script highlights many of the features of a very strong response. It offers a clear focus, with developed analysis, strong support and considerable evaluation throughout the essay, building to overall judgement considering the motivations behind factional rivalry during the period. The response was marked at level 5.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses had a good focus on the extent to which religious change was welcomed, and addressed both sides of the argument. At this level, candidates included consideration of developments or issues such as (1) the extent to which measures such as the removal of icons and the First Prayer Book under Somerset displayed evidence of having been welcomed (2) the degree to which the response to religious reform under Mary was genuinely welcoming, or more indicative of acceptance of the continuation of the Tudor dynasty (3) and the degree to which the Elizabethan settlement was truly welcomed, or just acceptable by the likes of 'Church papists'. Less successful responses tended to offer (1) narratives about some or all of the period, often with considerable detail, but less consistent focus and analysis (2) answers with restricted range across the chronology (3) assumptions based on the burnings under Mary, or any of the rebellions within the time period, without consideration over the extent to which these reflected the response of wider society to religious change.

Many stronger answers gave critical consideration to the notion of 'welcomed', e.g. responses which appreciated the distinction between 'welcoming' and merely 'accepting' change, and/or consideration of the problems of evidence of a reaction.

agree	disagree
<p>Edward: Repealed Act of Six Articles Act of uniformity + First prayer book iconoclasm Book of Homilies</p>	<p>Edward: Repealed Act of Six Articles Act of uniformity + First prayer book iconoclasm Book of Homilies</p>
<p>Repeal of six Articles Mary 1553 - known ^{cath} prayer, little op restoration of Act of Six Articles ↳ Head of church (2nd Act of repeal)</p>	<p>Iconoclasm - council opposed Book of Homilies - Gard + Bonner First prayer book - Western Elizabeth could easily revert = Mary did not change it enough</p>
<p>Throughout the years 1547 - 1566 there England experienced a lot of back and forth religious change, mainly due to the fact this time period saw three monarchs.</p>	

It can definitely be argued that religious change was welcomed by Tudor society in 1547 to 1566 as a lot of the change like Edward's repeal of the Act of Six Articles and Mary's second statute of repeal did not experience much resistance. Also, both the accessions of

(Section A continued) Mary Tudor, a known Catholic and Elizabeth Tudor, known to ~~be~~ have been brought up Protestant, were not opposed and were rather supportive. However, in contrast it can be argued that religious changes were not welcome between 1547 and 1566, particularly in the reigns of Edward and Mary like iconoclasm, the first prayer book and the resistance towards the Catholic reformation. Overall, the ~~former~~ ^{former} argument, that religious change was ~~not~~ welcomed by those in Tudor society appears to be ~~stronger~~ ^{stronger} as lots of the change was ~~not~~ welcomed.

It can be argued that in the year 1547 to 1566, the members of Tudor society ~~did~~ welcomed religious change. One example being Somerset's first notable change, the repeal of the Act of Six Articles, produced by Henry VIII in ~~1539~~ 1539. At the time when this Act was enforced, it did experience some resistance especially from reformists. Towards the end of Henry's reign reformists like Somerset, Catherine Parr and Lord Denny were ~~at the~~ rising in power and influence in court, and this continued in 1547 on the accession of Edward VI. When Somerset decided to repeal the Act of Six Articles in 1547,

allowing further religious reformation to take place there was little to have resistance from council, court and the public. This is likely to be down to the fact that protestantism was the king's personal preference and people were not fond of going against the king and down to

(Section A continued) the rise in power that the reformist protestants had in ~~the~~ the 1540's. Overall, the fact that a radical change like this received little opposition supports that religious change was welcomed by the Tudor state in 1547 to 1566.

Another point for the argument that religious change was welcomed by Tudor society in 1547-1566 is ~~that~~ how Mary I, who was a known Catholic was so well supported for her place on the throne. Mary was brought up Catholic, she was the daughter of a Spanish, Catholic princess and it was ~~to~~ thoroughly known in court as Edward and his advisors spent a long time trying to change Mary to Protestant. The fact that a Catholic, like Mary who was bound to impose a large amount of Catholic restoration, was welcomed as Queen shows that religious change was welcomed too. She also received little resistance for some of her ~~even~~ more radical changes like the restoration of Papal supremacy with the Second Statute of Repeal 1555. Overall, it can be argued that religious change was welcomed ~~in 1553~~ by the Tudor ~~state~~ ^{society} using the fact a Catholic was so welcomed in 1553 as Queen.

Similarly, the fact that a known protestant like Elizabeth Tudor was rallied for and support to ascend to the throne shows religious change was welcomed by Tudor society in 1547-1566. Elizabeth



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response to question 2 was given a high level 3 mark. It shows an understanding of the question and attempts to link material to the question in order to analyse the reaction of society to religious change. However, this is not always convincing or made fully relevant.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses had a confident grasp of the extent to which 1643 marked a turning point in the English Civil War, and offered good range and depth of issues pertaining to both sides. At the higher levels, a range of relevant developments were considered (e.g. financial measures, reforms to parliamentary forces both by 1643 and later, the building of alliances, leadership, actual battles and the impact of these on the relative position and strength of both sides) and a judgement was reached. Weaker candidates tended to produce (1) answers which were to some degree 'off the peg' responses to why parliament won, with varying degrees of focus on the precise demands of the question (2) answers with confused chronological understanding or (3) answers which were limited in depth of detail or range.

It is widely debated as to what the main reason was for parliament winning the civil war. It can be seen that parliament were the architects of their own success. This essay will argue that Parliament did ~~they~~ lay the basis for their success, despite any of the early Royalist victories. This includes their ability to build armies and to form alliances. However, the Royalists failure to capitalise on success will also be assessed in relation to p Parliament's success.

Parliament laid the basis of success by building armies. For example, following the failure of the militia ordinance at the battle of Edgehill in 1642, parliament introduced the impressment ordinance in ~~Victoria~~^{August} 1643. This meant that parliament would have a bigger and more organised army, which laid the foundations to later success. For example in 1644 the self denying ordinance was introduced which meant Parliament gave up their control of the army. This ~~army was~~ the then meant that in 1645, the New Model army could be set up which consisted of 22,000 men and was led by Cromwell and Fairfax who was an experienced soldier who had been at the head of the Yorkshire cavalry since 1642. This organisation of the army laid the basis of ultimate success, and Parliament were able to be victorious in the battle of Marston Moor in 1644, and at Naseby in 1645 which was the battle that saw

(Section A continued) them win the civil war.

Parliament had the funds to support their military due to ordinance set up in 1643. For example in February Parliament set up the assessment ordinance which meant that county committees would check that tax was being collected, and the money was being properly spent. They also set up the ~~order~~ compulsory loan ordinance in May 1643 which meant that men who had estates generating over £10 a year had to give 1/5 of their revenue to the cause. This organised system in 1643 laid the foundations to parliament's success.

Parliament's alliances helped lay the foundations to their success in 1643. Parliament were able to make an alliance with Scotland in 1643 called the Solemn League and Covenant. In this agreement, Scotland gave Parliament 22,000 soldiers. This alliance proved its value later on when the Scottish army, led by Alexander Leslie, in 1644 marched into England and met with the Royalist commander Prince Rupert. The Scottish army pushed Prince Rupert down to York where he was defeated at Marston Moor. This shows that the foundations laid in 1643 gave Parliament ultimate success.

It can be seen that it was actually the Royalist's failure to capitalise on early victories which laid the foundation to Parliament's success. For example, at the battle of Marston in 1642 the Royalists edged a narrow victory. So at this point London was weakly guarded, and an attack on London would have very likely caused a Royalist victory. However, Charles didn't listen to Prince Rupert and instead attacked



This Level 4 answer, which offers a clearly structured analytical approach, examines the argument relating to the Civil War, and in the main has a good grasp on the specific demands of the question. Here, the candidate builds an argument in support of the contention in the question in relation to Parliament's organisation of the army, the financing of the war and the building of alliances. There are minor errors, but by and large these do not detract from the overall quality of the response.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses analysed (with decent range and depth) the reasons why settled government was difficult to achieve in the years 1649–53. High scoring candidates tended to focus on relevant causal factors such as the role of Cromwell and the army, the failure of Rump to reform, legitimacy issues, disagreement over republican influences, religious radicalism and the failure of the Nominated Assembly. There were some responses displaying both excellent knowledge, and an ability to deploy this to explore the interplay of a range of factors to analyse the difficult circumstance of the given years. Weaker responses tended to (1) offer little development on reasons for the lack of settled government, tending to narrate on the execution of Charles I or on the actions of Cromwell and the Nominated Parliament (2) drift from the time frame by analysing, or indeed describing, events from the start of the Civil War through to the Restoration or (3) conflate a range of issues without clear focus, at times relying on material from the controversy in question 8.

Chosen question number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Take away of the
great

~~Personal Arbitration = Earl of Newcastle vs. Cromwell & Royalists~~

~~• Gross vs Hastings: T. Morrell 'Any man who claims to supersede the laws and uphold the constitution will be widely supported.'~~

~~• C. Hill in the 17th Century said 'my country' he meant 'my county.'~~

~~Religion = Presbyterian, Puritan etc. Parl = Reform~~

~~• L. Stone 'Far more decisive than any socio-economic factor is that of religion.' T. Morrell 'Of those who took sides 90% of Catholics became Royalists and 72% of Puritans became republicans.'~~

When

~~• Charles' Belief in Royal Prerogative, refusal of HOP
'Amateur piece of compromise' Failed to be consistent.~~

~~• Rump Council 'Freeing Act' Public debt = £1 mil.~~

Following Parliament's victory in 1642, the Rump Parliament was established, comprising of those MPs who partook in the King's execution. In the following years, a settled government seemed impossible to reach.

The Rump faced both internal and external issues from the beginning. The external issue faced was that the Irish rebellion of 1647 was not avenged and that

(Section A continued) control had not been retaken of Ireland, making the government appear weak. This led to Cromwell's campaign of Ireland, with Cromwell desiring to crush all rebellion and appeal to the Anglo-Irish gentry. Cromwell's campaign was extremely successful, with him leaving in 1650 having crushed all resistance. Therefore, whilst Ireland initially posed a threat, it was dealt with and therefore not a cause for the failure to achieve a settled government. The Rump faced many internal issues, with Members all struggling for power. Despite the removal of the Privy Council and the exclusion of many MPs or a Royalist party was still present, simply leading to 22 members being excluded from Parliament. A key requirement of the Rump Parliament was that all men swear allegiance to it, or be barred from all public office, causing much protest within Parliament. Whilst internal problems caused a less efficient government, they ~~was~~ didn't occur on a large enough scale to be the cause of failure to achieve a

settled government.

General Monk's rebellion was arguably the most prominent cause ~~of~~ of the failure to achieve a settled government. Monk had not witnessed exiles from Scotland and believed England was on the verge of Anarchy, leading to him sending letters to key figures, stating a general and free election be held, or he would March South. English

(Section A continued) troops were placed at Newcastle as a ~~precautionary~~ precautionary measure but despite this, due to English troops unwilling to defend an unelected government, Monk was able to march on London. Monk arrived to great support, partly due to his ability to distribute ~~propaganda~~ propaganda whilst blocking parliament's. Monk published the many petitions he had received for a free government, and demanded that the Rump set a dissolution date. This was following Monk's meeting with the excluded members of Parliament, including 11 Royalists. Parliament refused to set a dissolution date, acquiring a royal garrison to defend themselves. Monk marched on Parliament, with the Royal garrison simply scattering, and dissolved the Rump. The soon

The form of government following Monk's rebellion was described as a military dictatorship

Following Parliament's victory, the country went from a military dictatorship, to an unelected parliament

and then an unsettled government. Despite ~~Howard~~
Mowbray desiring a free, elected Parliament, his
rebellion simply led to that an unsettled government.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response displays some relevant knowledge, and attempts analysis. However, it lacks a clear focus on the demands of the question, straying from the given period and the analytical demands of the question.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were firmly focused on the extent to which the Pilgrimage of Grace posed a genuine threat to Henry's authority. This was linked to the issues raised in the sources. Higher scoring candidates also offered some balance in examining the debate and were likely to recognise the interaction of issues, e.g. in terms of size, diversity, cohesion, aims and leadership. Many perceptive answers found indirect evidence of the perceived seriousness of the Pilgrimage in Henry's response – initially, and after the Bigod rebellion. A common line of argument pursued by higher level responses was to contrast the potential threat with the actual threat to Henry's authority – with the very best providing a range of evaluation in depth across many different local factors as well as politics at court. Low scoring responses tended to (1) generalise about the threat without offering specific development and/or (2) simply describe the evidence presented in the extracts, or not integrate information from the sources with their own knowledge.

How far do you agree with the view that the Pilgrimage of Grace posed a ~~serious~~ genuine ~~the~~ threat to Henry VIII's ~~hold on the throne?~~ the authority of Henry VIII

Agree disagree

③ Penetration of Royal...
① List of demands...
② 2 lords - opposing policies...

① beyond concession
Teach...
③ not really a rebellion...
② as though it was an army...

In 1536 ~~the~~ the Pilgrimage of Grace posed a serious ~~the~~ threat to Henry VIII's authority. The pilgrims demanded a renunciation of Royal Supremacy. They had a list of demands and had 2 lords

opposing his policy's. However it looked like an army came to ~~oppose~~ ^{depose} Henry, it was ~~not~~ described as "not really a rebellion".

(Section B continued) Also, the demands that the rebels had drawn up were "beyond the reach of possible concession". I believe that it was a ~~serious~~ genuine threat to ~~Henry's~~ Henry's authority.

In source 1 it is stated that "The rebel's grievances were consolidated into a list of demands." From my own knowledge I know that most of these ~~the~~ demands were related to religion, but there were some which displayed agricultural grievances as well. So these demands were a clear and organised list of what they wanted to undermine Henry's authority over.

Source 3 states that demands "were" beyond the reach of possible concession". This implies that the ~~the~~ pilgrims' attempt at threatening the king's authority was in ~~fact~~ source 1's demands were futile. From my own knowledge I know that these ~~the~~ demands were never acted upon so did prove to ~~be~~ be

subtle. So here maybe it didn't threaten the king's authority as much as the rebels would have liked.

(Section B continued) Source #2 says "The two nobles... Lord Darcy and Lord Hussey... had good reason for opposing Henry's policies." From my own knowledge I know that these reasons ~~was~~ were religious grievances. This was good for the Pilgrims as it meant they had more leading noble support that could eventually threaten Henry's authority.

Source 1 states "A rebel force, organised as though it was an army". This however looks as if it was meant to depose Henry as opposed to threaten his authority. So maybe these 2 new nobles were there to organise the army for better leadership. From my own knowledge I know that there were 36000 rebels. This force was so large there wasn't a royal force that could stop them. I believe that it is more likely that the 2 nobles and the army were there, ~~for~~ not to depose the king but to threaten his authority instead.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response to question 5 was given level 3 for both assessment objectives. It has an understanding of the issues and does recognise the different views within the given sources. However, it lacked depth, with limited analytical development and debate.

Question 6

Question 6 again attracted a relatively small number of candidates, producing a high proportion of quality responses. Stronger responses identified and developed arguments for and against the proposition from the sources, with informed discussion of a range of areas such as religion, marriage, succession, Mary and free speech featuring regularly, with reference to episodes in specific parliaments.

Higher scoring candidates explored and weighed issues, with confident consideration of the given views. Weaker responses were likely to (1) include little or no own knowledge in support of their argument (2) misunderstand key issues, such as the Privy Council (3) attempt to apply learnt historiographical views (e.g. Neale) with limited analysis relevant to the question.

developments in Parliament inc. difficult.

Committees (5) (Bell etc.)

Member Puritan education (4)(5)(6)

Councillors (5)(6)

Elizabeth's Parliaments have been considered the source of many issues - notably infringements of the Royal Prerogative over religion, as well as marriage. Source 5 discusses how the increasing bureaucracy and use of committees weakened Elizabeth's influences, all three sources reference a "strong Puritan" dissident voice, whilst sources 5 and 6 consider the influence of the Privy Council within the Commons.

In Source 5, Calkes refers to "greater organisation" within Parliament, notably the "increasing use of committees". Where Calkes implies that Elizabeth and the Speaker sacrifice power by allowing these committees, it was actually the Speaker Robert Bell who proposed that motions should be examined in committee prior to being raised. In actuality, the second session of this Parliament (1576) was one of the least fraught yet, despite Wentworth's concerns over censorship. Moreover, despite the fact that the Speaker's power began to "wane", it remained strong enough to dismiss Cape's Bill and Book in

(Section B continued) 1587 on grounds of the Queen's 1572 embargo on religious debate in Parliament. As ~~although this was a "Puritanist" stance~~ Gilkes acknowledges, "the Crown's control of patronage remained substantially the same" - hence, the development of parliamentary committees did not inhibit many of the manners in which Elizabeth could control the debate, and through "prevarication" and judicious use of the veto, Elizabeth remained in control, despite the more insular nature of these developing committees.

A more worrying concern was the emergence of "better educated" more "radical" Puritans within the Commons. As Cook remarks, their "ambitious" natures and "strong Protestant convictions" led to a vocal puritan minority who were unsatisfied with Elizabeth's moderate religious settlement and the potentiality of Mary Queen of Scots ascending the throne. This "strong Puritan minority" is said by Gilkes to have been learning "the art of successful opposition", echoing Neale's thesis of an organised 'Puritan Choir'. Cook suggests that Elizabeth "dared not veto" in the face of such opposition, however this does not necessarily indicate powerlessness; ^{though she "dared not veto"} in 1563, Elizabeth was able to circumvent harsh penalties for refusing the Oath of Supremacy by simply ordering the bishops not to offer it twice, whilst in 1572 she avoided the passing of the Mary Queen of Scots exclusion bill, proroguing parliament and conveniently losing it. Indeed, Elizabeth was not alone in opposing the "radical" views of these Puritans, of those referred to by Cook, notably Wentworth and Cope were punished by the Commons themselves. For allowing royal spiritual authority, with Wentworth barred from Parliament and Even Strickland, though he was released upon Wentworth's protestations, was subsequently arrested, and Cope's proposals set aside and ignored. ^{punished by the Commons.} As such, the impact of and power of the Puritans in the court should not be exaggerated.

Indeed, Haigh in source 6 entirely refutes Neale's presentation of the "Puritan opposition" and indicates instead that they were instead "agents of the Council". Gilkes also considers the importance of the Council in controlling the "machinery of Parliamentary management". Indeed, we see Councillors regularly in positions of power and sometimes subverting Elizabeth's will, for example when Cecil attempted to force Elizabeth to name a successor in the preamble to the 1565 Subsidy Bill. Their ability to "[plan] business in advance" and "manage proceedings" indicates that they had the potential to overpower the wishes of the Queen. Indeed, their ability to nominate MPs suggests an ability to "heavily influence" proceedings in the Commons, ~~and~~ and ~~prominent~~ Puritans such as Walsingham are likely to have used this to their advantage. However, this does not indicate ~~a desire to override the Queen's will~~ an objective opposition to the Queen herself. Indeed, in 1571, Parliament was carefully steered away from the discussion of marriage after the sensitive incident of the Northern Rebellion, ^{Plot} whilst the Act for the Preservation of the Queen's Person was their chief concern. Despite this, religious tension was consistent throughout Elizabeth's Parliaments and it is evident that (especially in 1584 after the appointment of Archbishop Whitgift) that the Council played an influential role in the mitigation of Puritan persecution, ~~making use of~~ and attempted to allow non-conformity amongst Puritans, ~~as suggested~~ based upon John Field's Admonition to Parliament, submitted in 1572. As such, it is clear that the Council (whose power had already augmented across the reigns of two female monarchs) had a disproportionate quantity of power in Parliament.

(Section B continued) Overall, ~~however~~ these ~~the~~ developments complicated the power dynamics of Elizabeth's Parliaments, however it would be an exaggeration to claim that Elizabeth was unable to control them. Indeed, she maintained a very tight control over the legislation passed by Parliament, using myriad

techniques to subvert the intentions of the "Puritan minority that challenged her, and compromising only on issues that suited her. On the other hand, Haigh's opinion of the Council as "leaders of an opposition are concerning - it was Walsingham's manufacture of the Babington Plot in 1586 that forced Elizabeth to execute Mary Queen of Scots, an action that Elizabeth had been concertedly avoiding for over a decade. ~~These~~ Nevertheless, despite the "strong Protestant convictions" of individuals like Wentworth, Elizabeth was able to respond by ~~emphasizing~~ softening and sidetracking their legislation, or outright arresting them as with Wentworth in the final session of this period. Much as "the art of successful opposition" developed, so did Elizabeth's ability to combat it, navigating issues of parliamentary privilege and the commonweal. Ultimately, we must remember that the most conflict ridden Parliament was that of 1563-66, and that despite the actions of the "radical" members, "Norton, Wentworth, Cope, Strickland" and the vocal minority, the Parliaments were increasingly well managed as Elizabeth's reign progressed.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response has a clear and confident focus on both the question and the views taken on this in the given extracts. It examines these drawing on evidence from the sources and own knowledge, offering reasoned evaluation of the strengths of their arguments. Such a response is typical of a level 5 for both assessment objectives.

Question 7

On Question 7, stronger responses appreciated that the claim could not in itself address the complexities of side-taking, and set about unpacking and evaluating the argument with reference to material in the sources and from their own contextual knowledge. The highest scoring responses tended to confidently examine the meaning of social class in relation to the debate, and explore the divergence in claims made by sources, e.g. 7 and 9. One issue that tended to distinguish higher scoring responses from less successful ones was their ability to bring in knowledge of other issues, e.g. stronger responses used opportunities in Source 8 to develop a discussion of the significance of religion in side-taking, as well as using source 9 to develop discussions of localism or the interrelationship between different motivations for side-taking. In contrast, less successful responses sometimes attempted to cover such issues, but with limited connection to the given question or debate in the sources.

Other issues that limited less successful responses were (1) taking evidence from the Personal Rule, with little focus on actual side-taking in 1642 (2) a review of historiography, without giving much attention to the sources (3) limited contextual knowledge.

Class = Aristocrats support = Royalist because Charles = poor.
Trade Union of the Great = Newcastle £90K Worcester £20K
J. Morrill 'The middlesex men comprised a large proportion
of the Parliamentarian support.'

Constitutional = Charles defended ^{meaning} 'Feared Parliament = Puritan dictatorship
Presented Charles as the protector of the rule of law, public order,
the established Church and the constitutional balance.'
To rebel against the King was unthinkable' C. Hill
8 = 'When the Monarch requested armed support, it was a matter of
honour and duty to comply'

Economic = Trade Union of the Great' Newcastle £90K Worcester = 20
Source 7 quote.
Lower Class supported Parl ~~Constitution~~ 9 Quote

When civil war began in 1642, citizens were forced to
choose between the Parliamentarians and the Royalists, with

a variation of factors determining this. Whilst many chose to remain neutral, it is of great historiographical debate as to what factors determined the side one took in 1642.

(Section B continued) Marx historians believe it was social class that determined the side taken, traditionalist historians argue it was constitutional issues and Revisionists, economic issues.

Social class was a key motive for side taking in 1642, as argued by Source 7. Many aristocrats supported the Royalists, due to their power being awarded by Charles, they were aware that a Parliamentary victory would result in a loss of power. This is supported in Source 7 'desire to preserve their power... that motivated many supporters of the King.' Whilst this does reinforce the argument that the upper class supported the King, the language of the source could argue otherwise to the contrary. The source originates that this ~~desire~~ was the motivation for their actions, but that it was not the cause for their initial support, due to the ~~wording~~ wording 'motivated many supporters' instead of 'motivated many to support'. The lower and middle class supported Parliament due to their belief that a parliamentary government would be more fair towards them. The lower class may also be motivated to support Parliament due to Charles' actions during Personal rule, such as the annual tax of Ship Money. This is supported in Source 7 'Parliament drew much support from the middle ranks

of society or directly stating that the Parliamentarians enjoyed support from the middle class, possibly due to their belief of better treatment under a parliamentary rule.

(Section B continued) This is further supported by John Morrill, stating 'The middle such men comprised a large proportion of ~~parliamentary~~ parliamentary support.' At Whilst Charles' actions during personal rule may have persuaded the lower and middle class to support a parliament, they may have decided support from the Gentry, due to the treatment of Burton, Bastwick and Pyre.' Whilst they would suggest that social class determined ones side, Barry Coward claims in Source 7 'no evidence that the way MPs decided in 1642 depended in any way on social status'. This obviously disputes the argument that social class determined the side taken in 1642. On the contrary, they ~~only~~ only state that MPs were unmotivated by social class, without discussing the majority of the population.

Constitutional issues were the prominent cause of the side taken in 1642, as argued in Source 8. Charles appeared as the defender of the English constitution, and many feared a parliamentary revival led to a Puritan dictatorship. This is supported in Source 8 'Parliamentarians, by contrast, were portrayed as innovators whose demands directly threatened the fundamental law and balance of the constitution'. This source indicates the extent to which the people feared a parliamentary victory, stating they 'threatened' the constitution.

Pym's constant attacks upon Charles, & such as the Treason Act of 1641 and the nineteen propositions were both unjust, and represented to the people a direct challenge

(Section B continued) to Tradition and the constitution. Tradition and the constitution both focus focus on the royal prerogative, and the King's hereditary birthright, and they also motivated people to take sides in 1642. Source 8 states 'in a crisis, when the monarch requested armed support, it was a matter of honour and duty to comply'. This indicates that much of the Royalist support stemmed from the traditional loyalty to the constitution. This is further supported by Christopher Hill 'to rebel against the King in the Seventeenth century was unthinkable' ~~indicating~~ indicating that many viewed the parliamentarians simply as rebels.

Thus in conclusion, traditional loyalty to the constitution was the decisive issue in side-taking in 1642. Theoretically, ~~economic~~ ^{class} issues would have caused one to take a side, but ~~there is~~ there is little evidence for this, simply a correlation. Traditional loyalty and constitutional beliefs were the decisive issue in side-taking, as supported in Source 8. Whilst this may be true, ~~Barry~~ Barry Barrow Conrad stating 'nor did people remain constant in their loyalties' indicates it may have been other issues that determined the side side taken in 1642.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is broadly analytical, attempting to examine issues. The response has a focus on the question and overall offers some analysis. However, some parts of the answer lack development, with points that are stated or explanations without analysis. The views of the sources are recognised, although these are often used to support points without developed discussion. Responses such as this are likely to receive level 3 for both assessment objectives.

Question 8

On Question 8, stronger responses had a good understanding of the controversy and assessed the source arguments (Cromwell's desire for broad acceptance, his contradictions, commitment to godly reform and failure to manage parliament, fundamental differences on issues such as religious liberty and the role of the army). Some high scoring candidates offered impressively detailed knowledge but this is not a definite requirement. More importantly, own knowledge was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources, with a clear focus on the extent to which Cromwell sought broad acceptance and was not to blame. Weaker responses tended to offer (1) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach regarding the responsibility of Cromwell and other factors behind the limited success of the Protectorate (3) a generalised narrative account of the period.

Q - W, S = P, L = Ref.

A

h's = no blame should be blamed

- Protectorate failed
- blame DC?
- genuine desire (10)
- but (11) & (12) = unpopular policy
→ BA - not abandonment
∴ blame

(10) - broader basis
- checks (frictions)
- acceptance of pol. union
- HP & A = more powers of (10)

(11) & (13) → army hated
→ but would not abandon

ANTI (11) → disallowed
(11) → Powers of 104
Godly Ref. (11) & (12) → rel. tol
(12) → godly ref. main aim

Provisional govt:
→ HP & A crown, otherhouse
→ exclude, appoint, approve
→ shed origins
→ reduce army

wanted h's
but would abandon radical ideas
→ army, godly ref.

willing to reduce size of army & rel. tol.

EVAL

CONC - (10)
- limited extent
- while did have genuine desire - relied on radical aims
- would not abandon Godly Ref. & closed (11) → (12)
- main reason = Army
- ∴ entirely to blame all sources

Genuinely sought
∴ no blame

(Section B continued) Oliver Cromwell's protectorate (1653-54) had only a limited success. One might assume the blame of this would therefore fall largely on his shoulders. However, Woolrych emphasises in Source 10, Cromwell's genuine desire for acceptance from the political nation - in Cromwell's words 'healing and settling'. However, both Smith and Coward highlight Cromwell's unpopular policies in Sources 11 and 12. Thus it can be argued Cromwell was not to blame. However both Smith and Coward emphasise Cromwell's unpopular policies in Sources 11 and 12. Because Cromwell ~~showed~~ did not abandon these it can ~~be~~ in fact be argued he was to blame for the Protectorate's limited success as it prevented working effectively with the political nation.

Nonetheless, Source 10 shows Cromwell's genuine desire to 'heal and settle'. Woolrych states Cromwell wanted to 'broaden [the Protectorate's] basis [of support]' by imposing 'constitutional checks' and gaining the 'acceptance by as much as possible of the political nation'. Such checks took the form of giving powers to Parliament

(Section B continued) in the Instrument of Government in December 1653. The most significant ~~example~~ 'check' on his power was that Cromwell would have to call Parliament at ~~least~~ least once every three years for at least five months. This would appease the political nation as it prevented Cromwell ruling arbitrarily. Cromwell also tried to gain the 'acceptance ... of the political nation' by making his government as traditional as possible. Good examples of this can be found in the second protectorate constitution the Humble Petition and Advice, proposed in March 1657. An upper house (called the 'Other House') was to be created by veto legislation from the Commons. This was very reminiscent of the old House of Lords. Moreover the Humble Petition advocated Cromwell taking the Crown - which was familiar and reassuring both to the common folk and the political nation. That Cromwell was willing to at least consider such measures shows his desire for appeasing the political nation and thus blame can arguably be put elsewhere for the limited success of the Protectorate.

Cromwell's genuine desire to 'heal and

(Section B continued) 'settle' can also be seen by his acceptance of reduced power in the Humble Petition and Advice. First, as Woolrych says it was 'devvised by... Parliament' compared to the Army devised Instrument of Government. Moreover, under the new constitution Cromwell could no longer appoint members to the Council of State, no longer exclude MP's and only Parliament could approve new taxes. That Cromwell accepted the terms again shows his genuine desire to please the political nation. Furthermore, Cromwell reduced his unpopular policies of religious toleration and the size of the army in the Humble Petition. He also listened to Parliament's grievances and abandoned the scheme of the Major Generals in January 1657. All of this shows Cromwell genuinely trying to gain the acceptance of the political nation - at the expense of his own power - and this can arguably not be blamed for the limited success of the Protectorate.

However, Cromwell maintained unpopular policies throughout his rule, such as religious toleration ~~and~~ that Godly can worship outside the state Church - and the Army, ~~showing~~ ^{arguably}

(Section B continued) means so blame must be placed on him. Even if he reduced their scale he would never remove them entirely. For example both Smith and Coward make reference to ~~Cromwell~~ the hatred of the Army and yet Cromwell never abandoned it. This was because as Smith says 'his own power ultimately depended [on it]'. Moreover, Cromwell felt he needed the army to achieve his aim of enforcing a Godly Reformation upon England and encouraging religious toleration. This despite ^{the political risks} ~~it~~ being against the Army, Cromwell never abandoned for relatively selfish reasons. Thus he can be blamed for the Protectorate's limited success.

Another unpopular policy of Cromwell's, which Coward emphasises, was his desire for 'religious liberty' ~~and~~ or religious toleration. The political feared allowing ~~that~~ religious toleration would lead to increased religious radicalism (fears ~~had~~ heightened by the ~~the~~ Biddle and Nayler cases of September 1654 and October 1656 - involving blasphemous radicals, as Parliament perceived) and the collapse of the social

(Section B continued) hierarchy. Yet despite outlining the grievances repeatedly in Parliament, Cromwell never abandoned the scheme; yet again an example of Cromwell preventing an effective Protectorate.

Another reason Cromwell can be blamed for the limited success of the Protectorate is described by Smith, namely his 'inadequate techniques of managing Parliament'. Due to his aforementioned unpopular policies and his vast powers, in the Instrument of Government in particular (such as his power to exclude MP's), Cromwell regularly ~~to~~ faced hostility from Parliament. But instead of trying to work with he would dissolve them (an issue raised in all three sources). This caused ineffective government and is a good example of why Cromwell can be blamed for the limited success of the Protectorate.

Thus, ~~in~~ in conclusion, only to a limited extent can Cromwell's desire for acceptance from political nation absolve him of the blame for the limited success of the Protectorate. For whilst it is true that Cromwell did genuinely desire to gain

(Section B continued) the 'acceptance... of the political nation', as seen in by Woolrych in Source 10, Cromwell's refusal to abandon his unpopular and radical policy prevented a successful Protectorate. The ~~main~~ most unpopular of Cromwell's policies was the Army (an issue raised in all the sources), hated for its reputation for radicalism ^{and} the high taxes ^{needed} to finance it, ~~and~~ The Army coupled with Cromwell's other unpopular schemes and policies (such as religious toleration and the Major Generals) and his refusal to take the Crown in the Humble Petition and Advice (something which have pleased the political and provided settlement) are key reasons for conflict between Cromwell and Parliament and thus the ineffective government of the Protectorate. That Cromwell did not abandon them places ^{most of the} ~~all the~~ blame ~~at his~~ for its limited success on his door and his desire for 'healing and settling' does not absolve him of this.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response to question 8 was given level 5 for both assessment objectives. It offered a strong assessment of the debate over Cromwell and the success of the Protectorate, making thorough use of the three sources and own knowledge. These last three pages demonstrate this; the candidate offers a balanced evaluation, which weighs issues, with reasoned judgements which are firmly linked to a detailed analysis of the evidence the sources give.

Paper Summary

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

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 which were 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 to their 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 to offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases though, candidates often struggled to extend issues with their 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, the process of carefully studying the sources to ascertain how they relate to the statement in the question, prior to writing the main analysis, allows candidates to clarify and structure their 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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.