



# Examiners' Report

## Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel

In GCE History  
(9HI0/32)

Paper 3: Themes in breadth with  
aspects in depth

Option 32: The Golden Age of  
Spain, 1474-1598

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2022

Publications Code 9HI0\_32\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

The paper on Spain, has a small entry, 33 candidates. However, there was clear evidence that students had engaged with the issues featuring in the specification and developed, in differing degrees, the ability to develop their arguments.

Responses to questions in Section B showed the benefits of the Advance Information that was issued to centres. In many scripts, impressive specific knowledge was deployed to support the general points being made. This certainly facilitated some impressive conclusions.

## **SECTION A**

Q1.

The source proved to be accessible, and many candidates made effective use of the caption, especially in their evaluation.

Both enquiries were competently assessed with specific extracts from the source being used to identify key points and make inferences. The deployment of contextual knowledge was very effective in many papers and led to fully reasoned inferences. These could then be weighed up to produce substantial judgements.

In some papers, the second enquiry was less effectively dealt with, especially in respect of the wish to obtain more information by encouraging denunciations and in the desire to make the process appear to be legitimate and reasonable.

## **SECTION B**

Q2. This question generally promoted the development of focused and balanced responses. The career of Cisneros was well known by most but, in some cases, his work was listed without being linked explicitly to the specific question. The counter arguments were strong in the majority of responses with a range of points, e.g. re the king's Burgundian advisers and his own personality and priorities.

Q3. This question was well done by many candidates. The work and ideas of both Azpilcueta and Mercado was generally well known and understood. These points were then measured against a range of other factors, often with very strong specific illustration, and a substantial judgement was developed.

## **SECTION C**

This section was at least soundly completed in the majority of scripts but in some cases, perhaps due to the Advance Information narrowing coverage across the specification, there was insufficient range which prevented the award of the higher levels for bullet point 2 of the mark scheme.

Q4. Most responses revealed a sound knowledge of both the nominated factor and a range of other points that were vital to Spain in the Mediterranean. However, some responses were stronger on expansion and neglected consideration of 'maintenance'. Some scripts displayed an effective range of knowledge but did not develop the relative significance of the points they had identified. This held back their debate.

Q5. This question promoted many well informed and wide- ranging responses with effective address to the nominated factor which was then weighed against a range of other points across the timeframe. Again, as with Q4, there could have been more consideration of the relative significance of points. A small number of candidates confined their responses to naval factors.