

Examiners' Report

June 2018

GCSE History 1HI0 27

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 2018

Publications Code 1HI0_27_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Section A – Introduction

The Period Study focusses on an understanding of the unfolding narrative of a time period. In this first GCSE History (9-1) examination, most candidates seemed well-prepared for the question styles in this examination. Most candidates attempted the required three questions, although it would appear that some candidates answered Section B first. Whilst this is perfectly acceptable, it should be noted this has could have implications on timing and unfinished questions, perhaps explaining the number of blank responses for Question (Q) 2.

Q1 will always focus on consequence, requiring candidates to explain two valid consequences, giving equal attention to both. Very few candidates did not attempt Q1, which is deliberately designed to be accessible to the entire ability range. However, some provided more detail than was necessary, leaving less time to address higher-tariff questions.

Q2 is a new style of question that focusses on analytical narrative. Candidates are expected to write an account that not only describes what happened, but also finds connections and makes sense of events, with an analysis of the links between events as they unfolded.

The analytical narrative will always focus on a period containing events or ideas that can be perceived as a sequence; this could cover several years or a much shorter period. Candidates should be clear about the time-span of the question. They must ensure that they cover an acceptable range and what it is the narrative is designed to analyse: in this case, the events of détente during the 1970s.

It was clear that most candidates found the new style of question challenging. It is vital they understand the narrative concept, with the sense of a beginning, development and end, rather than produce three paragraphs that do not link directly. The quality of responses varied, based primarily on the depth of knowledge of the topics addressed.

The stimulus points serve a different purpose from those on other questions: they will be useful reminders to candidates of sign-posts along the narrative and not aspects they need to develop. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge. This should be shown by three discrete points in the narrative being covered,

although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different events. This question appeared to be the answer left blank most frequently, perhaps due to timing.

For Q3, candidates were required to analyse the importance of an event/person/development. The question focussed on what difference the event/person/development made in relation to situations and unfolding developments. For example, in the first choice on this question, candidates were not being asked to comment generally on the importance the development of the atomic bomb, but to consider its importance on relations between the Superpowers in the years 1945-49. It was clear many candidates had been prepared for the importance-style questions. Responses ranged from impressive analysis focussed on the appropriate second-order concept (Assessment Objective (AO) 2), which were supported with accurate, relevant and good knowledge (AO1), to those from candidates that offered simple comment, with limited knowledge for support.

All the Period Study examination questions use a levels of response mark scheme. Progression in AO1 is shown by the candidate's increasing ability to select information precisely and show wide-ranging knowledge and understanding. Progression in AO2 is shown by a candidate's response moving from simple or generalised comments, to analytical explanations that show a line of reasoning, which is coherent, logical and sustained. Centres are reminded that the indicative content in the mark scheme does not imply what must be included in a response, nor does it give any expectation as to how candidates are expected to structure their responses.

Sufficient space is provided in the exam papers for all questions to be answered in full. Although some candidates did write on extra sheets, their responses were not always as successful as those of candidates who produced more concise answers. It is of vital importance that candidates do not continue answers from one question in the space reserved for another and, if they wish to write more than the booklet allows, they should identify this clearly on the paper, and ask for additional sheets.

Section A: Comments on Superpower Relations and the Cold War, 1941-91

Question 1

In Q1, candidates were asked to provide two consequences of the fall of the Berlin Wall. There were 4 marks available for each consequence, which needed to be explained (AO2) and supported with specific information showing good knowledge and understanding (AO1).

Most candidates understood the second-order of concept of consequence. Where responses were not awarded the top mark for either Level 1 or Level 2, it was almost always due to weaker performance for AO1. There were also responses where candidates merely rephrased the same consequence as their second answer, and this could not be credited a second time.

Where generalised comments were made about a consequence, candidates tended to note that people were now able to travel more, there were more opportunities for better homes and jobs, or simply that it led to the end of the Cold War.

AO2 at Level 2 used the features of the period to explain a consequence. Examples included the opening of the Wall leading to a growth of protest in East Germany, demanding significant reforms and, later, for the reunification of Germany. The USSR was now unwilling to continue its control over the Eastern Bloc, and the unification of East and West Germany led a much larger single German nation.

The common types of specific information that were added to these explanations were the fall of the communist government in East Germany, Gorbachev's abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine, and the newly-enlarged Germany becoming a member of NATO, whilst the Warsaw Pact broke up.

SECTION A: Superpower relations and the Cold War, 1941-91

001

8

Answer ALL Questions in this section.

- 1 Explain **two** consequences of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Consequence 1:

One consequence of the fall of the Berlin Wall was the ^{break-up} ~~collapse~~ of the Eastern Bloc. The fall of the Berlin Wall signified the end of communism and other countries followed this pattern. Communist ~~governments~~ parties were beaten in free elections due to more freedom in voting and countries got rid of communism. ^{Also,} ~~the~~ the Eastern Bloc which was such a strong buffer zone for the ~~Soviet~~ Soviet Union that had collapsed.

Consequence 2:

Another consequence of the fall of the Berlin Wall was the end of the Warsaw Pact. The Warsaw Pact was signed by all the Eastern European countries so that if they were attacked, the other countries in the Pact must help to defend them. The Warsaw Pact broke up in 1991 due to the Berlin Wall as these countries did not want to be communist and did not want the Soviet Union in their lives.

Examiner comment:

These are clear examples of Level 2 responses. Both are Level 2 for AO2 by giving a feature of the period to explain a consequence. The first

discusses 'the break-up of the Eastern bloc' and 'the end of communism'. This is supported at AO1 with specific information on 'free elections'.

The second consequence is Level 2 AO2, by commenting on 'the end of the Warsaw Pact' with specific information on its breaking up in 1991. The response shows a sound understanding of the period, and of countries not wishing to be controlled by the Soviet Union, with the comment 'did not want the Soviet Union in their lives'.

Examiner tip:

Q1 is designed to provide an accessible start to the assessment of the Period Study and requires specific information added to two different explanations offered on consequences, for the focus of the set question.

Question 2

This new-style question was approached most appropriately when candidates' responses were structured to demonstrate the beginning, development and end of the Superpowers, following the principles of détente during the 1970s. Those responses using language demonstrating an analysis of links between the various stages of détente, moved into Level 3 of the mark scheme for AO2.

The stimulus material provided candidates with a possible start and end point for a narrative account: Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) 1 in 1972 and Afghanistan, with a given date of 1979. Some candidates lost valuable time by giving details of the background to détente, including the hotline between Washington and Moscow in 1963 and the 1963 Test Ban Treaty. It was felt acceptable, given the timeframe of the 1970s in the question, to credit from Nixon becoming US President in 1969 – with his aim to improve US-Soviet relations – as well as Carter's lead on boycotting the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games. Knowledge on the 'Second Cold War', Reagan, and 'Star Wars' was not credited. Centres should note that the purpose of the stimulus for Q2 of the Period Study may be chosen to demonstrate either the chronological span of the question or key features of the narrative.

At Level 1, most responses had an understanding for AO2 of the basic narrative of détente as a period when relations between the Superpowers started to improve and then from a high-point in the mid-1970s, began to deteriorate towards the end of the decade. The simple narrative was typically added to, with simple knowledge prompted by the stimulus material. This included SALT 1 agreeing to build fewer nuclear weapons, a general statement about better relations developing, and then frequently making a comment about tension growing again with the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan.

Generally, Level 2 responses were able to show a clear sequence of events with the use of more accurate and relevant information. This included the start of the 1970s détente symbolised by arms negotiations, with Nixon and Brezhnev signing SALT 1 in 1972. SALT 1 limited the numbers of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) and Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs). This was generally followed by accurate and relevant information on the Helsinki Agreements and, finally, with relevant information on SALT 2 and how it was not ratified by the USA, following Carter's opposition to the Soviet Union's invasion

of Afghanistan. Although these responses often showed a clear sequence of events, the linkage between them was often quite implicit.

Level 3 responses often made it clear that SALT 1 was a very significant achievement in developing co-operation between the two Superpowers. This led to Nixon visiting Moscow in 1974 and the very symbolic joint US-Soviet Apollo-Soyuz space mission. Responses then explained that to maintain détente, the USA and the USSR, together with other nations, supported the terms of the 1975 Helsinki Agreements, to develop security, cooperation and human rights.

This greater co-operation significantly reduced the threat of direct conflict between the Superpowers. However, the USSR's invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 was condemned by the USA with the Carter Doctrine. It led to the USA refusing to ratify SALT 2, increases in US defence spending and a boycotting of the 1980 Moscow Olympics led by the USA – thereby bringing the period of détente to an end. Some common misunderstandings included the 1975 Helsinki agreements, which were written as nuclear disarmament treaties in themselves. Others confused the 1970s with Reagan and Gorbachev's agreements of the 1980s.

You may use the following in your answer:

- SALT 1 (1972)
- Afghanistan (1979)

You **must** also use information of your own.

In 1972 Salt 1 was ratified by both ~~the~~ the USA and USSR which showed the era of détente and cooperation of the two Superpowers. This led to the Helsinki conference in Finland where both superpowers and nearly all European countries agreed to greater treatment and freedoms of people. This coincided in SALT 2 which was ~~sign~~ signed by both superpowers but never ratified due to the Afghanistan conflict.

This era of ~~cooperation~~ Cooperation caused the Afghanistan conflict as Brezhnev (Then Soviet president) believed that because ~~the~~ Afghanistan was on their border and wouldn't affect the USA (and because of their recent friendliness), the US wouldn't ~~not~~ mind if they invaded. However, then president Jimmy Carter did mind and helped the Mujahadeen* coming up with the Carter ~~do~~ doctrine. ~~That was~~ Finally, this showed the End of Détente and start of frostier relations. The Second Cold War had begun.



* through giving them money, equipment and training to fight off the communists.

Examiner comment:

This response is a clear example of a high Level 2 script with AO2 clearly stronger than AO1. The answer follows a narrative structure, is mostly well-organised, events are linked, and attempts are made at analysis with 'this lead to...', '...but never ratified due to...' 'Finally, this showed the end of detente....', 'The Second Cold War had begun' which all combine to create a clear sense of sequence. AO1 is secure and the candidate, whilst only referencing SALT1, explores SALT2, the Helsinki Conference and the invasion of Afghanistan in more detail – therefore giving aspects beyond the stimulus material. The candidate shows sufficient knowledge and understanding of the events.

Examiner Tip:

Candidates should try to ensure that responses show a clear sequence of events, which is supported with accurate and relevant information.

2

Write a narrative account analysing the key events of détente during the 1970s.

(8) 002 6

You may use the following in your answer:

- SALT 1 (1972)
- Afghanistan (1979)

You **must** also use information of your own.

During the 1970s the world saw peace between East and West. This was called détente.

Détente was first seen in 1972 during the SALT 1 talks. The Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty was a sign of trust and peace between East and West as it saw both sides giving up weapons.

Later on in 1979, ~~saw~~ East and West relations were yet again improving with SALT 2 talks which would further limit weapons which both super-powers had. However, these talks would fall apart with

the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Détente came to an end in 1979 when the USSR invaded Afghanistan. This was seen as an act of aggression by the USA and from this point détente was over, ~~and~~ ~~conflict~~ Tensions would continue to rise through the 1980's.

Examiner Comment:

This script is an example of a low Level 3 answer, where AO2 is awarded a low Level 3 and AO1 is awarded a strong Level 2, thus the overall mark is a low Level 3. The sequencing is strong – 'Detente was first seen in ...', 'Later on in 1979 East and West relations were yet again improving...', 'However, these talks would fall apart with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan', 'Detente came to an end in 1979....'. These phrases lend a strong coherence to the structure of the response. Good knowledge is shown of SALT1, SALT2 and some knowledge is shown of the invasion of Afghanistan.

Examiner Tip:

Candidates should try to ensure that responses show a clear sequence of events, which is supported with accurate and relevant information.

Question 3

This question comprises two 8-mark questions based on the second order concepts of significance and consequence. Candidates who addressed the importance of the factor raised in relation to the stated development, and supported this with good knowledge and understanding, achieved Level 3. Candidates' responses that explained the importance of the factor without relating it to the stated development remained in Level 2.

The first option was on the importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb for relations between the Superpowers in the years 1945-49.

Level 3 responses invariably kept very firmly to the date range in the question and analysed clearly the importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb for significantly increasing tension between the Superpowers.

Explanations included Stalin's suspicions being raised due to Truman deliberately delaying the first meeting of the Potsdam Conference, Stalin becoming more determined for the USSR to develop its own atomic bomb especially after its use by the USA in Japan, and the USA's development of the bomb, making the USSR more determined to tighten its grip on Eastern Europe.

Some candidates made clear that this start of the breakdown in the relationship between the Superpowers was in contrast to what had, until very recently, been the 'Grand Alliance' fighting against Nazi Germany. High-scoring responses explained how the relationship between the Superpowers became more strained with the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, the first Cold-War crisis over Berlin in 1948-49 and the formation of NATO. Very few candidates mentioned Kennan's or Novikov's Telegram, but some used Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' speech to exemplify the growing rift between East and West.

Level 2 responses were mostly good explanations of the USA's development and use of the atomic bomb, together with some initial consequences on the immediate early Cold War but without focussing on its explicit importance for relations between the Superpowers.

Level 1 responses often gave a simple comment on how it made relations difficult between the USA and the USSR and often gave lengthy descriptions on the USA's use of the bomb on Japan. A common mistake at both Levels 1 and 2 was for candidates to give material way beyond the time period in the question, such as information on the impact of the development of the atomic bomb on

events such as the Cuba Missile Crisis, the concept of Mutually Assured Destruction and the building of the Berlin Wall. There was also a number of candidates who believed that the USA and USSR were actually at war with one another. Some candidates were not entirely sure what countries were meant by the term 'superpowers' in the question and wrote with reference to a range of countries, including Germany and Japan.

The second option was on the importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union. Level 3 responses analysed the ways in which the Bay of Pigs incident led to a worsening of relations between the USA and the Soviet Union. Candidates referred to a number of reasons such as the USA's support for Cuban exiles demonstrating its anti-communist stance, Castro declaring himself a communist and consequently Cuba developing closer ties with the Soviet Union. Other references included the humiliated Kennedy now needing to show US strength, challenging Khrushchev's belief in co-existence, whilst for the USA, increasing the commitment to containment.

Some candidates also mentioned that the Bay of Pigs incident led to more strained US-Soviet relations as Khrushchev regarded Cuba as the beginning of the spread of communism into Latin America and a restoration of the balance of power due to US missile bases in Turkey. Candidates showed misunderstanding of the focus of the question by focussing on the setting up of the hotline between Washington and Moscow, as well as détente as an immediate consequence of the Bay of Pigs. They frequently confused chronology. Some regarded the Bay of Pigs as a consequence of the USSR placing nuclear missiles in Cuba. Other candidates confused the Superpower leaders at the time of the incident, with Truman, Reagan, Stalin and Gorbachev mentioned in a number of responses.

The third option was on the importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia. At Level 3, there was a clear understanding of the Brezhnev doctrine itself, as a measure to maintain the USSR's sphere of influence over the Eastern Bloc as a whole, as well as necessary intervention specifically with regards to Czechoslovakia. At this level, the main focus of responses was specifically on the impact of the Brezhnev Doctrine on the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia by the removal of Dubcek and measures taken by Brezhnev to reassert the adherence to communist ideology within Czechoslovakia and ensuring continued firm membership of the Warsaw Pact.

Some candidates at this level included the USSR's involvement in making Husak Czechoslovakia's new leader as a communist hardliner who would abolish many of Dubcek's reforms. These measures were seen as necessary by Brezhnev as events in Czechoslovakia had threatened the USSR's control of Eastern Europe.

Many Level 2 responses had some clear links to the Brezhnev Doctrine but frequently included information on events in Czechoslovakia during the 'Prague Spring.' Some misunderstandings by candidates on this question included the confusion over events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 with Hungary in 1956, and a few responses asserted that the Brezhnev Doctrine was to help foster closer ties between the USSR and the USA.

Indicate your SECOND choice on this page.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

- ☒ The importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb for relations between the superpowers in the years 1945-49.
- ☒ The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.
- ☒ The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia.

The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia was that it allowed entire control and invasion of any country ^{if they} went against communism or tried to reform similarly to Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia which was run by Dubček, was also apart of the Soviet sphere of influence meaning it was a communist country. However, when Dubček took control he wanted freedom and ~~a~~ reforms to make a communist lifestyle better to live. He came up with some reforms in the Prague Spring, meaning the secret police was ended and destroyed so the public didn't have to fear anymore. It also meant less press censorship and voting for elections was allowed. However, when Khrushchev



P 5 7 3 7 4 A 0 9 3 2

they were doing; so when America found out they planned an invasion - the Bay of Pigs. However, Castro knew that America were coming to invade and was waiting for America to arrive on the Bay. When America arrived they were shocked and unprepared - meaning that Castro could capture most of America's troops and hold them captive. This damaged relations as it was the USSR which provided Cuba with around 2000 troops, heightening tensions as the war was almost real. This meant it led to the Cuban missile crisis as Stalin thought Cuba needed more protection so planted a missile base in Cuba starting up the arms race again, intensifying it. Eventually leading to the Cuban missile crisis where the two oppositions were nearly at nuclear war but made them realise that is not what they want so they slowed it down a bit.

Examiner comment:

This is an example of a mid Level 2 response on the importance of the Bay of Pigs for relations between the USA and Soviet Union. AO2 is a secure Level 2, especially in the latter part of the answer, but AO1 is weaker. The candidate shows some confusion between the Bay of Pigs invasion and the Cuban Missile Crisis. The focus is on the Missile Crisis, rather than the invasion.

Examiner tip:

Candidates should focus on the ways in which the specified aspect in the first part of the statement makes a difference to the development given in the second part of the statement.

Indicate your SECOND choice on this page.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

- ☒ The importance of the USA's development of the atomic bomb for relations between the superpowers in the years 1945-49.
- ☒ The importance of the Bay of Pigs incident for relations between the USA and the Soviet Union.
- ☒ The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia.

The importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia was that it allowed entire control and invasion of any country ^{if they} went against communism or tried to reform similarly to Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia which was run by Dubček, was also apart of the Soviet sphere of influence meaning it was a communist country. However, when Dubček took control he wanted freedom and ~~a~~ reforms to make a communist lifestyle better to live. He came up with some reforms in the Prague Spring, meaning the secret police was ended and destroyed so the public didn't have to fear anymore. It also meant less press censorship and voting for elections was allowed. However, when Khrushchev



P 5 7 3 7 4 A 0 9 3 2

Brezhnev found out about these reforms, he invaded Czechoslovakia immediately to ensure the reforms didn't spread to any of the other countries in the sphere of influence, as he didn't want communism to appear weak. Therefore Brezhnev made the Brezhnev ~~the~~ doctrine which entitled him to invade any country under communist influence if they tried to reform. Due to this they arrested Dubček and took him to Moscow and put him on trial and released him but he wanted to be leader of Czechoslovakia again. Brezhnev appointed the role to someone new, this allowed the Soviet Union to now control Czechoslovakia again as they lived in fear of communism and USSR at threat of invasion.

(Total for Question 3 = 16 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 32 MARKS

Examiner comment:

The second part of the answer is a low Level 3 on the importance of the Brezhnev Doctrine for the Soviet Union's control of Czechoslovakia, and where AO2 is more secure than AO1. AO2 is placed at low Level 3 because although the analysis of importance is somewhat limited, there are efforts at explanation. AO1 is securely in Level 2 because accurate and relevant

information show some knowledge and understanding of the Doctrine and its impact on Czechoslovakia.

Examiner tip:

Candidates should focus on the ways in which the specified aspect in the first part of the statement make a difference to the development given in the second part of the statement.

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

- Focus responses within the time period if a date range is given in the set question
- Be clear about the various Superpower leaders that are relevant for key events during the period 1941-91
- Link the events used to support the narrative for the given explanation in Q2

Section B of paper 2 assesses the British Depth Study with candidates required to answer three questions targeted at AO1 and AO2. Candidates receive an examination paper with either the two Medieval Depth Studies or the two Tudor Depth Studies. It is the only time for the Edexcel GCSE History examination where candidates need to ensure that they answer questions on the particular option for which they have been entered.

From this summer's scripts, there were very few candidates who attempted to answer questions from both Depth Studies. However, there was a significant number of candidates who had started answering the questions on the study for which they were not entered, before crossing out their work and moving to the section for which they were entered. There was also a number of candidates who had continued their Depth Study responses in the booklet under the option they had not studied, rather than asking for extra paper. Candidates do need to indicate clearly where their response to an item should be found, if it is different to the specified section of the answer booklet.

Q4(a) and Q5(a) follow an identical format to Q1 on Paper 1. Candidates need to be clear that the feature identified should be a characteristic of the topic and, that having identified a feature, they should add a further detail that will explain the feature or provide context. Some candidates did not seem to understand that two marks are available for each feature – one for identifying the feature and one for additional information about the identified feature; answers that listed four features or disconnected points of separate information were limited to a maximum of two marks. There was also a number of answers that tried to use the same point as two separate features.

Q4(b) and Q5(b) follow an identical format to the 12-mark tariff to Q4 on Paper 1 and Q2 on Paper 3, but with a difference in the second-order concept being assessed. On Paper 1 the 12-mark tariff question focusses on the process of at least 100 years, whereas on Papers 2 and 3 it relates to the causes of an event, development, success, failure and so on, over a shorter period of time within a Depth Study. The stimulus points do not normally include dates and are simply intended to help candidates to associate what they have learned with the question being asked. Use of the stimulus points is not compulsory but it should be noted that the mark schemes do require deployment of material not prompted by the stimulus points to reach the top of Levels 2 and 3 and entry into Level 4.

In Q4(c) and Q5(c) candidates choose between (i) and (ii) and the questions may target any of the second-order concepts (cause, consequence, change, continuity, significance, similarity and difference). This question follows the same principles as Q5 and Q6 on Paper 1 but without a requirement for Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar (SPaG) to be assessed. For Q4(c) and Q5(c) the stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of the two sides of the issue or the chronological range covered in the question. Note that they will not necessarily be presented in chronological order. Note also that the stimulus points will usually relate to aspects of content, rather than directly indicating a factor that should be included. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be both depth and breadth of knowledge, shown by three discrete aspects of the question being covered.

Many answers remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. Candidates who reached Level 4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus on which a judgement should be offered. Similarly, whilst it was pleasing to see how many answers were clearly structured to consider both sides of the issue, sometimes other structures may be more appropriate. Although the question asks how far the candidates agrees, the answer should also take account of the second-order concept being assessed, for example, structuring the answer to look at different aspects of change and continuity or of significance.

One reason that many responses remained in Level 3 was that the judgement tended simply to be a summary of the two sides of the issue and the decision

that the statement was 'somewhat' true. At Level 4, there should be a sense of evaluation, recognising nuances of partial agreement and showing which evidence carries most weight. Answers should also show what criteria are being applied. For example, a judgement on significance could be based on the number of people affected, the length of time that the effects were felt, the groups affected, or how wide-ranging the secondary effects were. Ideally, this will create a sense of argument running throughout the answer and the best answers often had plans, showing that the argument was thought through before beginning to write the actual response.

If extra paper is taken, Candidates should signal clearly that the answer is continued elsewhere. However, in many cases where additional paper had been taken, the marks had already been attained within the space provided, rather than on the extra paper. Candidates should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, candidates taking extra paper often lacked time on the final, high-mark question and therefore disadvantaged themselves. There were also some completely blank answers to the final question, suggesting that time management was a problem for some candidates.

There were no indications that, for Paper 2 as a whole, candidates had found it difficult to answer both sections in the one hour and forty-five minutes allowed.

All examination questions use a levels of response mark scheme. Progression in AO1 is shown by the candidate's increasing ability to select information precisely and show wide-ranging knowledge and understanding. Progression in AO2 is shown by a candidate's response moving from simple or generalised comments to analytical explanations, which show a line of reasoning that is coherent, logical and sustained. Centres are also reminded that the 'Indicative Content' in the mark scheme does not imply what must be included in a response, nor does it give any expectation as to how candidates are expected to structure their responses.

Question 4(a)

Candidates were asked to describe two features of the Eltham Ordinances. Where candidates attempted this question, they were generally able to answer confidently, achieving Level 2 by identifying a motivation for the Ordinances. An example was cutting costs, and an example of how this was achieved was by providing set mealtimes. Other common responses mentioned banning hunting dogs and reducing the number of palace servants. Many candidates were able to associate the Eltham Ordinances as one of Wolsey's policies, although a number of responses confused the Eltham Ordinances with other features of Henrician policy, most commonly the Amicable Grant or the Break with Rome. A high proportion of candidates left the answer blank.

Option B3: Henry VIII and his ministers, 1509–40

If you answer Question 4 put a cross in the box ☒ .

Answer Question 4(a), Question 4(b) and EITHER Question 4(c)(i) OR Question 4(c)(ii).

4 (a) Describe two features of the Eltham Ordinances. (4)

Feature 1

One feature was that the amount of members within court was reduced from 12 to 6 as it ~~was~~ this meant that Wolsey would have less ~~open~~ opposition ~~within~~ within court that would threaten his relationship with Henry.

Feature 2

Another feature was that ~~the~~ Wolsey designed the ~~the~~ Eltham Ordinances ~~to~~ to reduce the amount of royal expenditure and so that this money ~~save~~ could be used elsewhere, such as funding for Henry's wars.

Examiner comment:

The candidate has identified two features of the Eltham Ordinances and provided supporting detail for each one. Therefore, this response achieved 4 marks.

Examiner tip:

The content you need for full marks on this question should easily fit on the lines provided: if you are writing in the blank space underneath, you have probably written too much.

Question 4(b)

Candidates were asked to explain the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace. The majority of candidates were able to expand on the first stimulus point, although significantly fewer were confident in linking enclosure to the Pilgrimage. At Level 2, many responses delivered a detailed explanation of the conditions in the monasteries, with descriptions of monastic vice being a common feature, but often went on to explain how this led to Dissolution without making a link to the Pilgrimage of Grace.

Stronger answers developed from the first stimulus point with specific details of the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* and linked this back to upsetting people in the north of the country. Common additional information offered by candidates included Cromwell's unpopularity, and unrest stimulated by the religious changes connected to the Break with Rome. However, a large number of responses remained in Level 3 due to over-reliance on the first stimulus point, which prevented candidates from demonstrating wide-ranging knowledge.

The best responses were able to synthesise a range of causes into a coherent line of reasoning. A few candidates showed that the reason for the rebellion varied according to location or class, or differentiating between the two waves of revolt.

There was a significant number of responses where candidates wrote about the events or consequences of the Pilgrimage of Grace, rather than focussing on causation, which, while displaying good knowledge of the topic, unfortunately resulted in a loss of marks at AO2. A number of candidates showed chronological confusion by placing the Pilgrimage within the Wolsey era or after the Dissolutions had been completed.

(b) Explain why the Pilgrimage of Grace took place.

You may use the following in your answer:

- inspection of the monasteries
- enclosure

You must also use information of your own.

Wolsey, Anne
A
Charles V
Protestants
Henry VIII
uprising

The Pilgrimage of Grace took place in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire. Henry VIII was very distant from these areas, so he lacked influence over them and he desired that. Henry wanted to gain more influence over these areas as it would heighten his power. Henry ordered ^{Wolsey} ~~himself~~ to go and inspect the monasteries. This ^{was} later became known as the ~~enclosure~~ ^{enclosure} ~~enclosure~~, this included extremely searching the home and backyards of several monks and nuns. They were found to have been living extremely luxurious lives and going against the word of God. Some monks were even accused of raping ^{girls} ~~girls~~. This gave Henry a swift advantage to be able to close down the monasteries with good reason. Many Catholics were absolutely mortified as Henry VIII was trying to essentially force their religion into obscurity (the dark/nothing). This caused major uprisings known as the Pilgrimage of Grace, they weren't very successful, many

Catholics ended up dead.

Henry VIII had now gained enough power and influence over these areas to control them easily (despite their distance). Many ~~pieces~~ ^{pieces} of land were taken by Henry, Wolsey initiated the enclosure. Many agricultural lands had been taken away and the Catholics were absolutely furious. Their land had been God's gift to them and Henry was just dismissing it as though it was nothing. Many Catholics planned to listen the power of Henry, the uprisings grew stronger and this caused Henry to appear weaker. Henry became furious at this and blamed Wolsey. Many other powerful people saw Henry as deceitful, the treaty of London (in the 16th century - around 1525) showed Henry to be a man of peace, but the Pilgrimage of Grace unravelled that idea very quickly.

Examiner comment:

This response shows good development from the stimulus points. Although there are some inaccuracies, the candidate has remained focussed on the conceptual focus of the question. However, since the content of the response is limited to what is prompted by the stimulus, this answer cannot achieve a mark above the middle of Level 3. Therefore, this answer was awarded 8 marks.

Examiner tip: Make sure you include information beyond the stimulus points, or your answer will be capped at 8 marks.

(b) Explain why the Pilgrimage of Grace took place.

The Act of Ten Articles.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- inspection of the monasteries
- enclosure

1536 - dissolution of monasteries
Northerners - influx about
The Ten Articles

You must also use information of your own.

The Pilgrimage of Grace took place due to the dissolution of the lesser monasteries in 1536. This is because it made the Northerners angry and disappointed; the monasteries were played an important part in society; the monasteries took care of the sick and the poor; without the monasteries, these social issues would have increased. Moreover, the Northerners believed that the monks and nuns had an important role to play in society and without the monasteries, they would be put out of work.

Also, the Pilgrimage of Grace took place because of the inspection of the monasteries. Due to Cromwell's visitations, it was revealed that the monasteries broke rules. For example, it was revealed that they had sexual relations and were not celibate; also cases of homosexuality were revealed. It was believed that this was invalid; Cromwell just wanted to get rid of the monasteries to increase Henry's finances; the monasteries

owned a third of the land in England ^{northern} and had an income of £600,000.

Another reason why the Pilgrimage of Grace took place was because of the Ten Articles. Cromwell had changed the Seven Sacraments from 7 to 3. This saw England becoming more Protestant. As a result, the Northerners were strongly against it because they were strong Catholics and the Ten Articles had been seen as a threat; they did not want England to become Protestant.

Examiner comment:

This response demonstrates very specific knowledge and covers a range of points, all loosely connected to the theme of religion. Each one is used to explain the growing dissatisfaction that led to the rebellion. This answer achieved 12 marks.

Examiner tip:

Good answers can be very succinct and to-the-point, using precisely selected evidence to address the conceptual focus of the question.

Question 4(c)

Candidates were asked to write about an aspect of the rule of Henry VIII's ministers – either Wolsey's rise Q4(c)(i) or Cromwell's political reforms Q4(c)(ii). A significant majority of candidates opted to answer Q4(c)(i).

Responses to Q4(c)(i) were variable, with an unfortunate number of responses exemplifying Wolsey's rise using events from later in his premiership, such as the Amicable Grant or his failure to secure a marriage annulment for Henry VIII. It was clear that a lot of candidates had been well-prepared to answer questions on Wolsey's policies and his fall, but that, in some cases, less emphasis had been placed on his rise to power.

Lower-achieving answers often included vague references to Wolsey's background but were rarely able to exemplify Wolsey's organisational skills or make effective use of the stimulus points. A disappointing number of responses assumed that 'expedition to France' referred either to the Field of Cloth of Gold or a fact-finding mission preceding the Treaty of London.

In the mid-range responses, more detailed information was provided about Wolsey's formative years, for example, although the links to his rise to power were usually left implicit. Candidates in this range found it difficult to achieve any sort of argument, with conclusions usually being simplistic and stated.

Candidates who answered the question well paid clear attention to the question focus and did not go beyond 1515. They elaborated on the Battle of Spurs and campaigns with France in Henry's early reign, often combining this with an explanation of how Wolsey's education and work ethic, combined with Henry's lack of interest, in day-to-day governance, enabled Wolsey to impress the king and achieve more power. Many responses at Level 4 also referenced Henry's unwillingness to work with his father's ministers and Wolsey's parallel rise to prominence in the Church.

Although significantly fewer candidates attempted Q4(c)(ii), responses to this question were generally much stronger. Some impressive knowledge of Cromwell's reforms was demonstrated across Levels 3 and 4 answers, including his reforms to regional government in Wales and an explanation of how the legal aspects of the Break with Rome had an impact on the way England was governed. Some candidates had been taught the historiography surrounding this topic, with occasional references to the alleged revolution in Tudor

government of Elton's thesis, in the strongest responses. Though beyond what is necessary for this paper, which focusses specifically on AO1 and AO2, it was extremely pleasing to see that this wider aspect of the topic is being covered.

Most candidates were able to build on the stimulus points and include a variety of points from their own knowledge, which helped to ensure that they scored highly on AO1; thus the limiter at Level 3 was often candidates' inability to assess the extent of the consequence of the changes identified. At Level 4, candidates demonstrated an impressive ability to set criteria for making their judgements. The wider impact of parliamentary changes being more important than the narrower impact of the Privy Council reforms, was a popular view.

At Level 2, candidates were usually able to expand on the stimulus points with a description of each one, or provide evidence of other changes that Cromwell made. A small number of candidates focussed on Cromwell's later work with the Dissolution of the Monasteries or the marriage to Anne of Cleves, neither of which was sufficiently well-linked to changes to government to be creditworthy.

<p>Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box <input type="checkbox"/>. If you change your mind, put a line through the box <input type="checkbox"/> and then indicate your new question with a cross <input type="checkbox"/>.</p>	<p>him are very heavily yet before then.</p>
<p>Chosen question number: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4(c)(i) <input type="checkbox"/> Question 4(c)(ii) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Another reason for Wolsey rise to power was his intelligence. Wolsey was a very smart and well educated man who was very good at his job. He had many friends to help him and show him he was intelligent enough to take on any role. However this is his important then Wolsey ambition and background because this allowed the king and cardinal to display his intelligence to the monarch Henry VIII.</p>
<p>I do not agree with the statement that the main reason Wolsey rose to power was because of his organization. This is because even though Wolsey got into Henry's good books when he showed him that a full well equipped army a year before only a year after his last campaign it wasn't that important. The only thing it did was get in his good books and his organizations had failed at other points so it was not a major reason.</p>	<p>Wolsey also rose to power because of his position in the church and as Royal advisor and member of the royal household. These granted Wolsey a lot of power which he used to influence Henry VIII. Also Henry liked the fact that Wolsey was so well connected to the church and rewarded him by giving him lots of his responsibilities. These responsibilities included things like running things for days like in England while Henry planned campaigns. However this is less important than Wolsey's background because without his humility and humble background Henry would not have started to give Wolsey the more and more power and responsibilities.</p>
<p>The main reason Wolsey rose to power was because of his ambition and his background. Wolsey was born in 1473 to a poor family. His father was a butcher. He went to school and attended Oxford university then went on to enter the church. He eventually became Royal advisor and Henry liked Wolsey. This was because Henry VIII was paranoid about the nobles trying to steal his power and his throne so he trusted Wolsey. Also his ambition meant that he took on all the roles that Henry didn't want plus other roles in the church that made</p>	

The wit, charm and loyalty of Wolsey was also a way in which he rose to power. Wolsey was a very witty and charming person. Characteristics which Henry VIII liked quite a lot. Also he displayed absolute loyalty to Henry carrying out his every wish and sticking by him. These were ~~major reasons why~~ the reasons why he wanted his power because he helped himself to rise positions using his wit and charm and his loyalty gained him many bonus points with the king. However it was less important than his ambition because Wolsey's vaulting ambition led him to try and get those roles to begin with and his humble background reduced the resistance of the king to allowing him to get more power.

So in conclusion I do not agree with the statement that the main reason Wolsey rose to power was because of his organization. This is because I believe that Wolsey's ambition and back ground were the keys to unlocking ~~his~~ his rise to power. Also other reasons like his wit, influence, loyalty etc. were just as important as his organization skills.

Examiner comment:

This response details a range of reasons for Wolsey's rise, including his education, popularity with Henry, and religious connections, as well as developing from the stimulus points.

The content of the answer targets the conceptual focus of the question and there is a conclusion, although the criteria against which the judgement is made are left implicit. Coupled with this, the candidate has not weighed the different causes against one another in the body of the essay, which means this essay lacks strong debate. This response gained 11 marks.

Examiner tip:

Try to express a sense of debate within your essay and, in your conclusion, evaluate the different causes against criteria to make a judgement.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☐ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 4(c)(i) ☒ Question 4(c)(ii) ☐

I do not agree with this statement. I would say that the most important change that Cromwell made to the government was to give it the ability to pass laws.

During shortly after Cromwell's appointment as Henry's chief adviser, Cromwell decided to use the government to attempt to help Henry get his marriage to Catherine cancelled so that he could marry Anne. He did this by allowing the government to vote to pass laws. In particular, it was the Act of Separation that made Henry the head of the church. But allowed the parliament to get through and to marriage to Anne to be allowed. This was the most important reform that Cromwell made to the government because it highly modernised the government and this was the basic foundation of the government in place in Britain in modern society, meaning that it has been able to be modernised constantly development for decades.

Another important change made to the government by Cromwell was the introduction of new sectors to the government's members. A key example of this is the department of the Exchequer. The Exchequer is a section

of the British government that handles money and the country's economy. Examples of this have monitoring loans and interest rates, as well as looking at the loss of ~~the~~ ^{the} Britain's trading with other countries. This was an important change because not only did it increase the government's influence, it also helped to ~~modernise~~ ^{modernise} the government, as many of these segments are still in place today, however this is less important than the introduction of the government's ability to vote to pass laws, as this was the basic foundation that led to the government's gain in influence, which without, the segments would have little benefit.

Another change that Cromwell made to the government was the introduction of the council in 14th century. This was where members of the government were sent to the court in the north of England and made laws, which ~~was~~ ^{was} at the time Britain had little influence over. Their role was to introduce the current laws of England to these areas as well as enforce them, so-called if needed. This ~~was~~ ^{was} caused conflict as ~~the~~ ^{the} British had come out of the blue and started demanding changes to be made to traditions in these areas, many people, however after some time, peace was found and slight compromises were made. This ~~was~~ ^{was} important as it increased England's influence and as well as giving potential ~~to~~ ^{to} members from these areas. However I would say that

It was not as important as the introduction of the government's ability to pass laws, as it did not do as much to modernise the ~~government~~, government, and had smaller future impact.

Finally, the Council made reforms to the Privy Council, making its membership far more exclusive than previously. This reduced its size greatly, and also made it much more efficient at making informed decisions as its members were now carefully selected for actually fulfilling a purpose. This was important as it meant that the House of Lords was more efficient and better as a whole, but not as important as it had a much less significant future impact than the introduction of the government's ability to pass laws, and so was a less important change.

To conclude, the most important change made by Cromwell to the English government was ^{primarily} its ability to pass and change laws in the country, as this heavily ~~influenced~~ influenced future government development in Britain, and whilst there were other significant changes made to the government by Cromwell, this was the most influential one.

Examiner comment:

This response demonstrates a wide range of content relating to the conceptual focus, analysing each one and comparing them with the factor named in the question.

There is a coherent line of argument leading from the introduction to the conclusion, suggesting that the candidate has planned the response before

beginning to write. The judgement is made against criteria – influence on future government developments. This answer received full marks.

Examiner tip: Write a short plan for your essay before you begin writing, to ensure you have a coherent line of argument running throughout.

Question 5(a)

Candidates were asked to describe two features of Elizabeth's religious settlement. Where candidates achieved marks in Level 2, usually they identified a relevant piece of legislation and provided some information about it, for example, associating the Act of Supremacy with Elizabeth's role as supreme governor of the Church. A number of responses that received marks low in Level 2 did so due to a lack of clarity or irrelevant material: Mary, Queen of Scots and Mary I both featured regularly, as did the grievances of the Puritans, serving as a reminder of the importance of staying focussed on the topic.

At Level 1, candidates were able to identify Elizabeth's religion or an aspect of her legislation, for example English Bibles, but did not add further context to this, for example by saying that each parish needed to have one.

Option B4: Early Elizabethan England, 1558-88	
If you answer Question 5 put a cross in the box <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> .	
Answer Question 5(a), Question 5(b) and EITHER Question 5(c)(i) OR Question 5(c)(ii).	
5	(a) Describe two features of Elizabeth's religious settlement (1559). (4)
Feature 1	<p>Elizabeth became the head of the Supreme leader Elizabeth was made the head of the Church under the act of Supremacy. All Church leaders had to swear allegiance to her.</p>
Feature 2	<p>A common book of prayer, written in English had to be placed in every church.</p>

Examiner comment:

Although the candidate begins with an incorrect statement, the rest of Feature 1 identifies a legal aspect of the Religious Settlement and goes on to add a supporting detail. The second feature has confused the Book of Common Prayer with the English Bible but has enough evidence to be awarded a mark. Therefore, this response gained 3 marks.

Examiner tip:

Avoid crossing work out on the short question – instead, see if you can continue adding to it, because you will not lose a mark for a mistake. This will save you time.

Option B4: Early Elizabethan England, 1558-88

If you answer Question 5 put a cross in the box ☒.

Answer Question 5(a), Question 5(b) and EITHER Question 5(c)(i) OR Question 5(c)(ii).

5 (a) Describe **two** features of Elizabeth's religious settlement (1559).

(4)

Feature 1

Elizabeth made an act which made
her governor of the church
the name of this act was
called the act of Supremacy

Feature 2

Elizabeth made both Protestants and Catholics
go to the same Sunday mass.
If Catholics were caught for not going
they would have to pay a
fine.

Examiner comment:

Although the phrasing is clumsy, and the knowledge is a little vague, this response identifies two features of the Religious Settlement and provides each with a piece of supporting knowledge. Therefore, this response gained 4 marks.

Examiner tip:

Be strict with the time you spend on this question: you do not need much information to achieve full marks.

Question 5(b)

Candidates were asked to explain the reasons for increased exploration during the Early Elizabethan period. The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve at least Level 1 on this question, with the weakest answers providing brief comment related to the stimulus points, for example, improved journey outcomes thanks to more accurate maps.

At Level 2, candidates frequently described specific examples of aids or the positive examples set by Drake and, latterly, Raleigh. Many candidates emphasised the impact of rivalry with Spain, although at Level 2 this was often not linked explicitly to increased exploration. Other Level 2 answers maintained a good focus on AO2 but were limited by a lack of precise evidence, discussing luxury goods in vague terms, for example.

At Level 3, responses were able to extrapolate from, for example, the successes of Drake and other traders, to explain that this motivated more Elizabethans to attempt the journey.

At Level 4, responses combined the motivation provided by other people's successful journeys with the enabling factors of better maps and bigger, safer galleons, to provide a coherent and sustained explanation of the reasons for the increase.

There was an over-reliance from some candidates on content that was only obliquely relevant to the topic, for example, increased poverty in the era. Whilst this may have led to more crew members available for the expeditions, it is not a reason why the number of explorative journeys increased.

(b) Explain why there was an increase in exploration in the years 1558-88. (12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- navigational aids
- luxury goods

You must also use information of your own.

~~There~~ One reason why there was an increase in exploration in the years 1558-88 was the use of navigational aids. As the years went on, technology improved - better boats were built and more technical compasses were built ensuring better navigation when sailing the sea. These aids were very useful and therefore increased exploration as it allowed the sailors to know where they were going and therefore where they had been, allowing them to move in new directions and discover new places.

Another reason why there was an increase in exploration in the years 1558-88 was because of luxury goods. This meant because of the discovery of the new world - there was more discoveries in luxuries. This meant more had to be exported and traded between countries, so therefore more ~~navigation~~ exploration as they looked for new places with goods.

The last reason there was an increase in exploration in the years 1558-88 was because of Francis Drake and other privateers. Francis Drake was a privateer close to Elizabeth so often sailed to find new places to steal money and invade ships to get England out of their £300,000 debt. This meant, as they got more in debt, Elizabeth demanded more exploration to pay it back and so Drake did this job for her.

Examiner comment:

This response covers three aspects of content but there are issues in each instance. In the first and second paragraphs, which develop the stimulus points, knowledge is vague, although the link to further exploration is explicit. The last paragraph demonstrates stronger subject knowledge but there is only an implicit link to increased exploration. This answer reached the top of Level 2 – 6 marks.

Examiner tip:

Ensure that the evidence you select to answer the question is related back to the conceptual focus.

(b) Explain why there was an increase in exploration in the years 1558-88.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- navigational aids
- luxury goods

Colonies
treasure

You must also use information of your own.

Navigational aids grew much better in the second half of the 16th century. Nearly that ~~people could~~ explorers could travel much further and have more of an idea where they were. Also, maps of the Americas were made which meant that when the expeditions got there they could have around ^{more} easily. This meant that it was more of an attractive prospect: exploration.

Luxury goods were just being bought to ~~bring~~ England by Spanish merchants in the 1550s. Some people got used to the luxury goods and wanted more. Sugar was one of these things that Elizabethan England loved, it was being consumed more and more. This meant that exploration to the Americas was more profitable and businessmen funded people to go and buy sugar, tobacco, potatoes and tomatoes and sell them in England for a few times the

price. It was a very profitable business plan that made lots of money for people in high places.

England wanted an empire like the Spanish Empire. The idea of colonies was relatively new, and Spain led the way in showing how it was done. There were many advantages to colonisation: cheaper raw materials, luxury goods marketed earlier, more land for the country and more natural resources in the colonies. The queen herself and other businessmen funded explorers to go and to try and get colonies for England. The most famous one of these being Sir Francis Drake. However, he and his team weren't very successful at setting up colonies. The Spanish had beaten them to it and so they were. However, they were good at being pirates. Rumour spread that English ships captured by Drake sank Spanish ships and stole their goods. They even sometimes bought the boat home and were. This meant the richest men were brought back to England, causing people to fund even more exploration. Lots of gold was captured and the queen personally knighted Drake, to the dismay of King Francis II of Spain who was outraged by the piracy.

Examiner comment: In comparison with the 6-mark example, this response covers very similar points but has achieved a mark in Level 4. The knowledge demonstrated is more detailed and links back to the question and is therefore more explicit. Although there is some deviation from the focus on the second page, the final part of the paragraph ties its content back to the question. This answer achieved full marks.

Examiner tip:

Select evidence precisely, to help you explain the causes of the event in the question.

Question 5(c)

Candidates were asked to debate an aspect of Early Elizabethan England history – either the reason for the failure of the Spanish Armada (5(c)(i) or changing attitudes towards the poor Q5(c)(ii). A significant majority of candidates opted to answer Q5(c)(i).

Weaker responses to Q5(c)(i) tended to focus on vague descriptions prompted by the stimulus points, of the impact of bad weather and/or fire ships. A common error at this level was to describe fire ships as ships that fired cannons at the Spanish or destroyed their ships, as opposed to breaking their formation. A significant minority of candidates also misapplied their knowledge of improved galleons, perhaps fresh in their minds from answering 5(b), by explaining that the English had larger ships than the Spanish. Many candidates seemed to think Elizabeth was personally responsible for the tactics used.

In the mid-range, knowledge was usually accurate and more detailed, with Drake's Raid on Cadiz, the weakness of the Spanish leadership and England's tactics to attack Spain's crescent formation the most common range of causes explained.

However, links to the focus of the question were often left implicit, with candidates not analysing how the Raid on Cadiz had a long-term impact on the Armada's ability to succeed, for example. This, coupled with a tendency to continue adding causes, rather than to analyse those already identified, often led to a list-like outcome that lacked coherence or an appreciation of the debate to be had. This was particularly evident in answers where candidates had continued on additional paper: although they knew much about the topic, this was not well-deployed to construct an evaluative analysis.

Answers that achieved highly in Level 3 and in Level 4 were marked on their ability to group causes together and provide a supported judgement that identified key turning points in the event: Spain's inability to secure a deep-water port, coupled with the bad weather, for example.

When considering change in attitudes towards the poor in Early Elizabethan England in their responses to Q 5(c)(ii), weaker answers to the question often included material related to the poor from other sections of the course.

References to a lack of education and the different leisure pursuits of the poor

were common but usually not rewardable above Level 1, due to their lack of connection to the focus of the question.

A small number of candidates developed the Houses of Correction stimulus point by writing about workhouses in Victorian England, displaying a slightly worrying lack of chronological understanding. Candidates that focussed on the different categories of poor, and/or the treatment of vagabonds, tended to achieve slightly higher marks because these were more relevant to the conceptual focus. At Level 2, candidates were able to describe deserving poor and idle poor, the treatment of vagabonds and the work of the Houses of Correction. They were unable to identify or explain how this reflected change or continuity in the reign of Elizabeth.

At Level 3 and above, candidates were able to deploy more specific knowledge in relation to the topic. Common content included the names and dates of the poor legislation that was passed during this time period, although some candidates included references to the later Poor Laws, which were unfortunately not rewardable within the scope of this question. At this level, candidates were more likely to address the concept of change and continuity. Some answers deployed evidence about the lack of change in educational opportunities successfully, here, to exemplify continuity of attitudes. The changing treatment of vagabonds was also widely used.

The best answers were able to identify the nuances in the change of attitudes. For example, they explained that there was little change in the attitudes of the public towards the poor, but that government legislation reflected a softening of approach from the ruling class. Criteria against which judgements were made also sometimes considered change at different times during the period, linking increased poverty with changing attitudes.



I agree that the effect of Naval tactics was the reason for British victory over the Spanish Armada.

For example Fire Ships were used by Britain on the Spanish Armada. They set a ship on fire and drove it straight into the Spanish

ships causing them to catch on fire and kill the people on board and destroy a ship. They did this several times and causing lots of Spanish ships to catch on fire. At this tactic used by Britain caught the Spanish off guard and caused the loss of many Spanish ships.

However Britain had some luck with bad weather conditions causing many

Spanish ships to crash into the side of cliffs and sink.

on the way to Britain the Spanish ships got into a sticky situation when a horrendous storm caused many of the ships to crash and cause the amount of ships in the fleet to decrease by a great number.

Naval tactics used by the British helped them to defeat the Spanish Armada but Sir Francis Drake had an important role before they set sail two years prior to when the Spanish Armada set sail. Drake set fire to the Spanish cord junks and set alight ships which caused the Spanish to rebuild everything which prolonged the already planned attack and allowing the British to prepare for the attack.

On the other hand Britain were victorious over the Spanish Armada due to poor planning from the Spanish which lead them into crashing and giving time for the British.

time to prepare for the attack.

finally Britain were victorious against the Spanish Armada due to the British bravery as the British were outnumbered but they were brave and with cunning tactics they fought the already dispersed Spanish fleet and were victorious.

In conclusion Britain beat the Spanish due to a bit of luck, great tactics and absolute desert from the Spanish who were prepared.

Examiner comment:

This response develops from the stimulus points and the candidate adds several points of their own. In many cases, this evidence is descriptive, focussing on the events of the Armada, rather than analysing the reasons for its failure. The conclusion is stated and unsupported. However, in the paragraph on the Raid on Cadiz, the candidate makes a link back to the conceptual focus and therefore this answer reaches the bottom of Level 3 – 7 marks.

Examiner tip:

Remember to relate your evidence to the conceptual focus of the question regularly throughout your answer, to ensure you are writing an answer to the question, rather than a narrative of the topic.

Chosen question number: Question 5(c)(i) Question 5(c)(ii)

I disagree because Elizabeth felt that the poor had been neglected by society. She ~~had~~ ^{had} put the poor law into action which taxed people and the money was given to the poor. This changed many people's attitudes towards the poor ^{some} and wealthy people decided to donate to charities as well as pay the tax. This was an improvement because before many people in society didn't care or take social responsibility for the poor so it was a huge step. The poor law lasted for 200 years.

Another reason why ~~that~~ ^I don't agree with the statement is ~~because~~ ^{because} ~~society was starting~~ ^{most poor} to recognize that ~~more poor~~ ^{most poor} people were "deserving poor" because they had tried and tried looking for job opportunities but never found any. They were called the deserving poor because they weren't beggars on the street but there was still stigma around beggars as they were seen as lazy and some weren't even poor, but frauds.

On the other hand, I ~~do~~ ^{also} agree that there was little change because vagabonds still weren't given the same attention as the deserving poor. Vagabonds would steal instead of looking for jobs and many people in Elizabethan England didn't approve of it so, if vagabonds were caught they would get whipped publicly and sent to jail.

I ~~agree that~~ agree with the statement also because the House of Correction was a place where the sick and deserving poor would stay while looking for a job. This was extremely helpful in supporting the poor community as they were able to give them a place to stay and encouraged them to find work. This also helped reduce poverty in Elizabethan England.

Overall there was a huge change in attitudes towards the poor due to Elizabeth taking action and ~~also~~ ^{encouraging} society ~~to take~~ ^{to take} social responsibility over the poor.

Examiner comment:

In this response, the candidate has presented a balanced answer using varied evidence. This could be more precise, for example by naming the legislation described. Although the candidate has recognised the debate, there is a lack of coherence in the response, which might have been avoided by planning the order of the paragraphs before beginning the essay. The judgement has some support but the criteria are left largely implicit. This answer achieved Level 3 – 11 marks.

Examiner tip:

Improve the sense of debate in your essay by writing a short plan before beginning and, in your conclusion, evaluate the different causes against the criteria to make a judgement.

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>

