

Mark Scheme June 2009

GCE

GCE History 6HI02 (8264)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: **0844 576 0034**

Summer 2009

Publications Code US021428

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2009

Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	GCE History Marking Guidance	4
	6HI02 Generic Level Descriptors	5
A	Early Modern British History: Crown and Authority	12
B	British Political History in the 19 th Century	18
C	Conflict and Change in 19 th and 20 th Century Britain	24
D	The British Empire Challenged	30
E	Britain in the Later 20 th Century: Responding to Change	36

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4, would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	6-10	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify their similarities and/or differences in relation to the question posed. There may be one developed comparison, but most comparisons will be undeveloped or unsupported with material from the sources. Sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information. The source provenance may be noted, without application of its implications to the source content.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	11-15	<p>Comprehends the sources and focuses the cross-referencing on the task set. Responses will offer detailed comparisons, similarities/differences, agreements/disagreements that are supported by evidence drawn from the sources.</p> <p>Sources are used as evidence with some consideration of their attributes, such as the nature, origins, purpose or audience, with some consideration of how this can affect the weight given to the evidence. In addressing 'how far' there is a clear attempt to use the sources in combination, but this may be imbalanced in terms of the issues addressed or in terms of the use of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

4	16-20	<p>Reaches a judgement in relation to the issue posed by the question supported by careful examination of the evidence of the sources. The sources are cross-referenced and the elements of challenge and corroboration are analysed. The issues raised by the process of comparison are used to address the specific enquiry. The attributes of the source are taken into account in order to establish what weight the content they will bear in relation to the specific enquiry. In addressing 'how far' the sources are used in combination.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 18-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>
---	-------	---

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant, factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far or to be explicitly linked to material taken from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
---	------	---

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

3	13-18	<p>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material, which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. There will be some integration of contextual knowledge with material drawn from sources, although this may not be sustained throughout the response. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>

A02b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects material relevant to the representation contained in the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<p>Comprehends the sources and selects from them in order to identify points which support or differ from the representation contained in the question. When supporting the decision made in relation to the question the sources will be used in the form of a summary of their information.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<p>The sources are analysed and points of challenge and/or support for the representation contained in the question are developed from the provided material. In addressing the specific enquiry, there is clear awareness that a representation is under discussion and there is evidence of reasoning from the evidence of the sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	13-16	<p>Reaches and sustains a conclusion based on the discriminating use of the evidence. Discussion of the claim in the question proceeds from the issues raised by the process of analysing the representation in the sources. There is developed reasoning and weighing of the evidence in order to create a judgement in relation to the stated claim.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed.</p>

NB: generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

A1 Henry VIII: Authority, Nation and Religion, 1509-40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>Taken at face value the sources offer conflicting evidence. Source 1 supports the claim in the question, but the other sources challenge it. Aske is explicit in defending the abbeys and claims that they used their wealth to help the people, as well as providing spiritual support and care. Joan Brytten's bequests are voluntary, and she directly contradicts Fish over the payment of tithes. Candidates who make these points will be demonstrating the ability to match and cross-reference at a simple level. However, there is also evidence to support Fish's claims in Source 3, since she is leaving money to the Church and her bequests provide clear examples of the methods by which the Church grew rich through people's faith. Therefore the sources both agree and disagree, allowing candidates to address 'how far', and developed responses of this kind can reach L2. There may also be a superficial reconciliation of the evidence using simple statements about different times and places. However, using inference and awareness of provenance the sources offer a more complex picture of 'how far'. Candidates may refer to the career of Simon Fish, as indicated in the provenance of Source 1, to question his reliability, and may point out that the reference to the king and his laws indicates an underlying purpose. The reference to how much land the Church had acquired may also indicate an underlying purpose. The content, form and language of the pamphlet make it clear that this is a deliberate attack on the clergy. They may also consider, however, that there would be no point in making claims that did not have some substance, or they would simply be rejected. Aske's view may be considered genuine, since he was about to die for it, but those same deep convictions can cause his opinion to be slanted towards the Church. Candidates can also consider the influence of geography and local conditions, and may point out that he is referring to the regular orders rather than the parish priests and friars. While this still relates to the view in the question, it may limit the weight that can be attached to his evidence. Candidates are likely to have knowledge of the Pilgrimage and of Aske's role in it, because it was the most serious example of resistance to changes and especially to the dissolution of the monasteries, both explicitly addressed in bullet point 4 and its clarification. Even without detailed knowledge the attribution should allow them to understand Aske's views. Source 3, however, refers to parish life and in London. The will of Joan Brytten can be interpreted in different ways. On the one hand her bequests are clearly voluntary, and indicate her faith in the Church and the clergy, challenging both parts of the statement in the question, and the evidence is strengthened by the fact that her beliefs have survived the early changes of the Reformation. On the other hand it can be argued that such faith was exactly the factor that allowed the Church and at least some of the clergy to exploit their flock, as Source 1 claims. Candidates are unlikely to develop all the possibilities fully in the time available. At level three they will both support and challenge the stated claim, using evidence from different sources interpreted in context. At level 4 they will use the sources, interpreted in context as a set, to evaluate the extent to which the claim can be sustained. The best responses may well reconcile the conflict by pointing out the range and complexity of religious life in different parts of the country, allowing for the validity of all three sources.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The sources offer two key factors in explanation of Henry's failure - the action taken by Katherine herself (as foreseen in 1527 by Wolsey) and the power and military success that placed Charles in control of the Pope. These factors are clearly linked, but the wording of the question as 'main' factor allows them to be evaluated as conflicting. In addition Source 4 hints at other factors - the weakness of Henry's case, the challenge to papal authority and Henry's behaviour towards Katherine all suggest that Henry himself was a problem. Candidates can develop arguments both for and against the importance of these factors by reference to a range of own knowledge. This can include events in Europe, the extent of Charles's power, and English foreign policy, including Henry's failure to win a secure alliance with Charles in the years before 1527, as well as Katherine's determination to fight Henry's plans and the extent to which his approach and actions provoked her. For example, his attitude towards Mary and the role of Anne Boleyn played a part. Good responses may well demonstrate awareness of Katherine's role in seeking support from Charles and using her Spanish contacts to counter Wolsey's diplomacy and Henry's claims. Responses can also reach high levels by explaining the interaction of the factors rather than treating them as conflicting, and arguing that no single factor was crucial.</p> <p>Candidates can also challenge the view by reference to other factors not indicated by the sources. These can include mistakes made by Wolsey, the role of factional politics in England (including the emergence of an Aragonese faction and the part played by the Imperial ambassador), the actions of individuals like Bishop Fisher, popular attitudes in England, and the wider situation in Europe, including the nature and impact of English foreign policy. To reach high levels these will be offered as alternative arguments, and therefore candidates must address the factors indicated in the sources to some extent. They are unlikely, however, to cover all factors in depth and detail in the time allowed. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources and/or sources and own knowledge, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination and interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of different interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop a judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The question is focused on the impact of the Reformation, primarily on contemporaries, although candidates who have sufficient knowledge of the long-term effects may choose to address them in addition to the immediate impact. Source 8 emphasises change, particularly 'political' change. Taken at face value the sources can be used to support the statement in the question, and they can be cross-referenced since Source 7 provides a clear example of the extension of royal power and the role of parliaments, as described in Source 8. The argument can be developed by reference to parliamentary legislation enacted in the 1530s and the ways in which royal power was extended as a result. Candidates can also highlight the developing role of parliament and make reference to the potentially revolutionary consequences if they wish. Developed responses of this kind can reach L2. The statement can be challenged, however, by developed inferences and references to provenance as well as other contextual knowledge. Source 7 offers conflicting evidence, since the content of the Act emphasised continuity of belief, while the King's assertion of supremacy over the Church involved a change of great religious magnitude. The royal supremacy had major religious implications, and these can be explained using own knowledge of religious beliefs and attitudes. Candidates can also point out that the Act of Six Articles was not passed until 1539, and had been preceded by major religious changes such as the translation of the Bible into English, and the dissolution of monastic orders. These changes were not all reversed, and the appointment of reformers such as Cranmer into positions of influence encouraged Protestant ideas, and survived the fall of Cromwell in 1540. Moreover, as an Act of Parliament Source 7 represents official attitudes rather than the full range of contemporary beliefs.</p> <p>It is also possible to argue that not all of the political implications and changes that became apparent in the 1530s were a result of events during the period. The attack on franchises and the extension of royal power had been taking place since 1509, and before. Major extensions of royal control in the north, and in Ireland and Wales, during the 1530s were triggered by local resistance as much as official policy, and this was often motivated by religious belief as well as regional loyalties. At the same time, the religious changes of the 1530s vastly increased the king's political status. Arguments of this kind allow students to demonstrate how conflicting arguments can be reconciled into an overall judgement that integrates religious and political elements. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources and/or sources and own knowledge, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to reach a judgement. The best responses may draw on an understanding of religion and politics in this period to argue that the two cannot be separated and make judgement of significance on this basis.</p>	40

A2 Crown, Parliament and Authority in England, 1588-1629

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Taken at face value the sources are clearly in conflict. Sources 9 and 10 suggest that Charles was assertive, seeking to arrest the ringleaders in parliament and being unwilling to give up a worthy cause. Source 11 gives a more mixed account, but emphasises his 'compassionate' nature, reserve and lack of confidence. However as a believer in 'justice' he might well seek to punish wrongdoers, as in Source 9, and Charles himself declares in Source 10 that he could not defend a bad cause, agreeing with Clarendon's view that he had a strong sense of right and wrong. Candidates can therefore cross-reference and develop a L2 response by considering the sources at face value, but can move beyond that by considering the implications of source 11. Clarendon does not merely describe Charles's character, but relates it to 'assessing' him as a king. Believing in justice and in right and wrong, and 'devoted in religion' (S11) Charles could be expected to govern with a sense of duty and morality, which is supported by his attitude to good and bad causes in Source 10. However, his reserve and sense of order might make him appear distant and possibly harsh, as in Source 9. The apparent conflict between his lack of confidence and hesitation in Source 11, and his decisive, perhaps assertive, attitude in Source 9 (which was clearly his own view rather than advice from councillors) can be addressed in two ways. If candidates consider provenance they may note that Sources 9 and 10 relate to Charles as the heir to the throne, while Clarendon in Source 11 has much longer experience of the king. With maturity, Charles may have become less quick to make judgements, or it may be that as a royalist Clarendon tries to excuse his mistakes. The final sentence of Source 11 suggests that he attributes a great deal to bad advice, and candidates may relate this to a lack of confidence and a tendency to rely on the judgement of others. Alternatively candidates may be aware that a lack of confidence can lead to assertiveness and a determination not to be challenged, which has also been suggested as a reason for Charles's tendency towards authoritarian decisions. This would also be supported by inferences that Sources 9 and 10 suggest a rigidity of thinking and a black/white view of events. Candidates can therefore show that, depending on interpretation, the sources both agree and disagree on the character of Charles (L3/4) and that the conflicts can also be reconciled (L4).</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The main focus of the question is the causes of tension between James and his parliaments in the early years of his reign. The phrasing of the question is intended to exclude the problems that arose as a result of the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, because the issues and key personnel involved in the 1620s were significantly different and would create an unduly demanding range to be addressed in the time available. Sources 12 and 13 indicate a key reason for problems, which was the financial weakness of the crown and the ways in which James and his advisers sought to raise extra money. Source 12 demonstrates the claim that James did inherit financial problems, and candidates can develop this point by reference to the last years of Elizabeth. Source 13 indicates that the greater problem was the way in which James and his advisers tried to deal with the situation, by increasing ordinary revenue such as customs duties that did not depend on parliamentary grants. This highlights the contentious issue of impositions and the king's prerogative powers, which caused problems in both 1610 and 1614. Source 12 can also support this argument, since it establishes the link between royal finances and the powers exercised in practice by parliaments. Used together they indicate the extent of the problems that James inherited from Elizabeth, which were political as well as financial. This can be used to extend the statement by explaining the full impact of financial problems. Candidates can develop the argument further using own knowledge to explain the debates over the Great Contract and the role of feudal dues, the Court of Wards and the sale of knightships. Alternatively the point could be used to challenge the statement by emphasising James's political rhetoric and the attitudes that he demonstrated in mishandling parliaments and their sensitivities over royal prerogatives and the Divine Right of Kings.</p> <p>However, Source 14 challenges the statement more directly by explaining the nature of royal expenditure, James's extravagance and the corruption of the Court. Thus the argument can be developed to suggest that it was not only Elizabeth's legacy but James's behaviour that caused both financial weakness and parliamentary resentment. This can be supported by wider knowledge of James's relations with favourites, the aggravation of existing anti-Scottish feeling and quarrels over the proposed Union of the two kingdoms, the growing corruption of the Court after the death of Cecil and the scandals surrounding Robert Carr and the Howards. Further extension of the argument can be supported by reference to James's foreign policy, links with Gondomar and relations with Spain, religious tensions and the growing gulf between an often puritan Country and the various influences at Court. It is unlikely that candidates will be able to consider all factors in depth in the time available, and they should not be expected to do so at any level. The sources offer alternatives that will depend to some extent on how they are interpreted. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to cross-reference the sources, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting representations, and integrate a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and address the reasons for tension between James I and his parliaments.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources indicate the role played by Buckingham in the decision to go to war in 1624, and refer explicitly to some aspects for which he was directly responsible. Taken together they demonstrate his influence at Court, in parliament (where he orchestrated the impeachment of Cranfield) and in the conduct of both diplomacy and the war. Hence they can be used to support the statement and create a case against him that can be developed using own knowledge. Candidates can refer to Buckingham's wider unpopularity, the envy and hostility created by his rise and control of patronage, the nature of his relationships with James and Charles, his occasional vindictiveness, the disastrous diplomacy that took England to war against both Spain and France, as well as his poor leadership and administration of the military campaigns. James's remarks in Source 15 also highlight the dangers of encouraging parliamentary involvement in foreign policy, that he had resisted so strongly until overborne by his son and favourite. However, the sources can also be interpreted to question how far the responsibility lay with Buckingham. The provenance of Source 15 makes it clear that Buckingham was acting in partnership with Charles, and the apparent absolving of Charles from responsibility in Source 17 can be challenged by the conventions of the time - no parliament could openly blame a king. Source 16 is explicit about Charles's broken promises, his failure to inform MPs and his refusal to explain his actions. Wider knowledge can extend these arguments to show that ultimate responsibility lay with the king, and that Charles not only played a significant part in formulating the policies but defended his favourite in 1625-29 to the extent of dissolving parliaments, losing subsidies and embarking on other means of raising money such as forced loans and the 'illegal' collection of tunnage and poundage. It can therefore be argued that the fault lay with Charles, and there is certainly evidence to support the argument that it was Charles's authoritarian response to parliaments in 1626-7 that was directly responsible for his problems. In addition, reference can be made to other aspects of his rule, such as the promotion of Arminians, to challenge the statement in the question. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting interpretations, and integrate a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement.</p>	40

B1 Britain, 1830-85: Representation and Reform

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>Taken at face value Sources 1 and 2 clearly conflict with Peel's claims in Source 3. Both emphasise the limited nature of the proposed reforms and emphasise that the intention is to strengthen the existing system by getting rid of 'blemishes' and adding new voters of the most respectable and reliable kind. Palmerston asserts that the changes will add to its authority, while Peel believes that they will destroy respect and reverence for it. However, candidates may also point out that Peel's concern is not with the detail of the Bill, but with the likelihood of further change, and this can be used to suggest that the evidence is not entirely conflicting. Developed responses of this kind can reach L2. Further consideration and the use of inference as well as provenance offer a more complex picture. All three speeches are taken from political debates in which Palmerston and Russell are trying to persuade the Commons to accept the Bill, and Peel is explaining why he will continue to oppose it. Sources 1 and 2 are therefore likely to emphasise the limits of the proposed changes, and the extent to which reform will increase the commitment and respect with which parliamentary government was viewed across the country. In contrast, Peel is concerned to highlight its dangers. Therefore none of the sources are entirely reliable about the extent of changes. However, the concern to maintain the system and the alliance of the propertied classes behind it, which can be inferred from both Sources 1 and 2, does challenge the assumptions made by Peel in source 3. Source 2 also suggests that a failure to change will destroy what Peel seeks to preserve. Interpreted in context his references to respect and reverence can be related to the aristocratic dominance of the system and the extent to which the middle classes will support this, strengthening Palmerston's argument in Source 2, and agreeing with that of Russell in Source 1. It can therefore be argued that the sources, taken as a set, imply broad agreement on the political aims of the three men, while demonstrating a conflict over tactics. Alternatively, Peel's comments may be taken to refer to respect and reverence for the constitution itself, indicating a conservative fear that any structural change will undermine it and set a dangerous precedent, and implying a more deep-seated conflict of attitudes.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>There is evidence in the sources to support and challenge the claim. Taken at face value Source 4 claims that the destruction of patronage was the greatest change, while Source 5 emphasises the growth of party organisation and Source 6 focuses on the reduction in the powers of the Crown and the Lords. Candidates can develop these points using wider knowledge, and may well cross-reference Sources 4 and 6 to support the claim that the reduction of patronage reduced the control exercised by the Crown and the Lords, as a major effect of the Bill. Source 6 argues that there were only limited effects on the electorate and on MPs, and offers further support by showing that other issues were not addressed. Candidates can use their wider knowledge to demonstrate that the Reform Act did not lead to a comprehensive range of social or political reforms in the period specified. This can support the claim in the question. However, if the sources are interpreted in context a more complex argument emerges. The removal of patronage as a form of electoral control was a major stimulus to party development. This is shown in Source 5, in the Tory response to election defeats and the need to appeal to the electorate on the basis of principles and policies. It is also foreshadowed in Source 4, where the government is seeking to justify its record to the public. However, it can be argued that a more important effect was the reduction in the power of the Crown (and Lords) over the Commons, demonstrated in Sources 5 and 6, where William is no longer able to ignore or manipulate the majority required to keep Peel in office. Wider knowledge can be used both to develop both arguments, to support and challenge the claim in the question. Candidates can refer to the impact of elections, the emergence of the Carlton and Reform Clubs, and of party agents to support the claim, and to the diminishing influence of the crown and Lords to 1850 in order to challenge it. They may also point out the limits of party discipline and control, for example in the continuing significance of personal relationships and groups such as the Peelites, the fluidity of political alliances and the impact of events such as Peel's Repeal of the Corn Laws. The best responses may well reconcile the apparent conflict by arguing that party organisation was increasingly necessary to manage a more powerful and independent Commons, if governments were to maintain themselves in office. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well be able to show how the different effects interacted, to assess the overall impact of the Act.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question. Source 7 suggests that Gladstone supported reform as a matter of principle and in justice to the working classes. Source 8 claims that Disraeli sought political advantage in 1867 and avoided parliamentary reform thereafter because of party divisions, while Source 9 shows the Lords rejecting reform in the counties because it would diminish their control. These arguments can be developed by reference to the measures passed - the Reform Act of 1867, the Ballot Act, Corrupt Practices Act, 1884 Franchise Act and 1885 redistribution of seats - all but the first passed by Liberal administrations. Party advantage gained from the passage of the measures can also be linked to extra-parliamentary campaigns and the outcome of elections showing the nature of support for reform of various kinds. However, further consideration of the sources can develop more complex arguments and evaluations. Source 7 and Source 8 suggest that Gladstone believed further reform to be necessary, but Source 8 also indicates that there were party gains for the Liberals, both in terms of popular support and internal party unity, as well as for the Tories. These points can be developed by reference to Tory support among the urban middle, and sometimes working, classes, and the growth of Liberal support in the counties during and after the introduction of reforms. It can therefore be shown that both parties benefited from appropriate reforms, to strengthen the claim in the question. Similarly the reference in Source 9 to a re-distribution of seats can be developed by drawing out the implications of the changes. Although the power of the Lords in the counties was reduced, they ensured that the Tories benefited from their increased success in the suburbs and the smaller boroughs. However, if Sources 8 and 9 are cross-referenced it is clear that considerations of principle were also relevant. In addition, Source 8 highlights the reforms that followed the 1867 Act to deal with problems of corruption, which can be seen as an alternative factor, challenging the claim about party advantage. Candidates can therefore both support and challenge the claim in the question, and the best may well reconcile the conflict by explaining the interaction of different factors. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement.</p>	40

B2 Poverty, Public Health and the Growth of Government in Britain, 1830-75

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Taken at face value the sources both support and challenge the claim in the question. Source 10 is explicit in criticising central interference, whereas Sources 11 and 12 both suggest other reasons for opposition - the activities of 'Oastler' and the desperate conditions that prevailed in Nottingham. Source 12 also criticises aspects of the law, such as the separation of parents and children, as reasons for resistance to indoor relief. Developed responses that utilise this evidence can reach L2. However, inference and awareness of provenance and context can offer more complex explanations. Source 10 relates to a particular individual who had been criticised, which weakens its evidence as proof of local resentment. Source 11 gives no evidence of local resentment, but is written by a representative of the Poor Law Board, who may be unaware, or chooses to minimise it. The reference to organisation 'as required' and the claim that problems are caused by outside interference cannot be taken at face value. However, Source 12 implies a considerable gap between the attitude of local authorities and that of the Poor Law officials, which may indicate local resentment, but since it is shared by a military commander from outside the district, it also indicates other motives. Cross-referenced in context Sources 11 and 12 suggest that popular reaction, desperate conditions and the nature of the Law itself all offered powerful causes of opposition, and that the reaction of many local authorities reflected this. This allows candidates to achieve L3 and L4, and the best responses at higher levels may well evaluate and integrate the evidence into an overall judgement, suggesting that local resentment reflected the realities of trying to implement the law.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The sources offer evidence to show the part played in improvements by key individuals - Chadwick, Simon, and Pasteur are all named. This can be developed by wider knowledge to show what these individuals achieved, and to introduce others such as Bazalgette. Good responses will show explicitly that these individuals made a contribution that was not widely replicated, to support the statement and focus on individual achievement. Candidates may also challenge the argument by reference to Sources 13 and 15, to show the mistakes made by Chadwick and to evaluate their significance. For example, it can be argued that although he misunderstood the cause of disease, his recommendations still addressed the problems, and that his manner and methods may have been a greater weakness in generating opposition. Responses of this kind will be moving into inference from the sources, and can achieve L3. However, the sources also indicate a number of other important factors, such as political changes and cholera (S15). These can be supported by wider knowledge to develop an alternative argument, that other factors played a more important role in bringing improvements than individuals. Good responses of this kind can also use inference to draw out the implications of Source 14, and argue the need for government intervention to provide new powers to compel co-operation. Wider knowledge can be used to develop the point that public health depended on resources and commitments that could not be provided by individuals, or even by the wider campaigns that individuals succeeded in stimulating. Those who use this to challenge the significance of individuals can reach L3 and if both arguments are sustained, move into L4. However, the best responses will be able to build up an integrated response showing how particular individuals offered new ideas, built up support and created both possibilities and pressure for change, while being aided by key events such as the cholera epidemics, and wider situations such as the scale of problems and the changing political environment, to bring about the necessary government intervention. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>Taken at face value Sources 16 and 17 are in conflict, and can be used to demonstrate changing attitudes to the poor. Source 16 emphasises the moral weakness of the poor and accuses them of seeking to avoid the natural consequences of their failings by relying on handouts to sustain their families. Source 17 suggests a much more sympathetic attitude, that the problems faced by the poor are 'unacceptable' and not necessarily their own fault. Candidates can therefore challenge the statement and develop the argument by explaining the principles and purposes of the 1834 Act and its main provisions to show the level of hostility implied to the poor themselves in its provisions. Wider knowledge of how the Act was implemented and reactions to the attempts to oppose it from different quarters in the 1830s can develop the contrast with the attitude shown by Mayhew by 1850. Knowledge of the circulation and popularity of his work can counter potential arguments that he only represented one voice. Support for the claim that attitudes were changing can also be found in Source 18, as Briggs claims that the principle of less eligibility was 'whittled down'. This can be developed by reference to improving conditions in many workhouses and the measures taken in the second half of the century to provide medical care, education for children and in some cases joint accommodation for married couples. However, the sources also provide evidence of continuity. Source 18 points out that the attitude shown in Source 16 was directed primarily at 'the able-bodied adult male' and this can be supported by cross-referencing the references to 'his' favour, 'his' wife and children and 'his' laziness, extravagance and vice. This can be developed by reference to the intentions of the Commissioners, the difficulties created by lack of resources and the later improvements, to show that sympathy for the vulnerable had always existed. Similarly, the reference in Source 18 to the 'stigma' of the workhouse allows the argument that prejudice and moralising against the poor did not disappear because of the work of people like Mayhew, and developed by reference to the harsh application of the poor law in later years, the constant re-issue of warnings against outdoor relief for the able-bodied, and the continuing lack of resources in many areas. To balance this, candidates can point out the willingness of the Commissioners to accept the suffering of the innocent families of paupers as 'the law of nature' and the greater sympathy shown by Mayhew for the able-bodied as well as those who were 'incapacitated' do show some change of approach. Hence the statement can be both challenged and supported to reach levels 3 and 4 if the sources are interpreted in context. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well be able to evaluate the extent of change and offer an integrated judgement based on varying attitudes and the impact of experience.</p>	40

C1 The Experience of Warfare in Britain: Crimea, Boer and the First World War, 1854-1929

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>Responses may well start with the content of Source 3 which, on the surface, represents a considerable challenge to both Sources 1 and 2. Candidates should, however, take into account the provenance of the source, and be aware that not only is a veteran of the fighting unlikely to privilege wider strategic objectives over the horrors of personal experience but also recognise that memories can sometimes be distorted through the lens of history. They may also take into account the fact that Shaw is describing one day only, which many would argue was hardly representative of the war as a whole. Similarly, Haig's Despatch should not simply be dismissed as a self-serving whitewash but rather appropriately contextualised to help assess the validity of his claims. The content of Source 1 could also be cross-referenced with Source 2 to reinforce the claim that the German Army had been considerably weakened by the campaign. Higher level candidates will address 'how far' and appreciate that the views expressed in both Sources 2 and 3 are, to an extent, qualified. Thus, Carrington notes that the victory wasn't 'decisive' while Shaw admits, in the first sentence of the second paragraph, that some gains did accrue from the fighting. Candidates may, therefore, argue that the sources do not directly contradict each other but merely differ in their evaluation of costs and benefits. At Level 4 candidates will be able to use both the content and the nature of the sources to reach a reasoned judgement.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to focus on the nature of war reporting during the Boer War and the impact of censorship in the field. Candidates may well start with Source 5 which provides a firm platform for presenting the case in favour of the contention. The source emphasises the lessons which had been learnt since the Crimean War and the more knowledgeable will be aware that the 'formal restriction' mentioned in the source refer to the introduction of press censors in South Africa in 1899 and the policy of strict press accreditation. Although the source makes reference to some critical reports the astute candidate will note that these were not based on information received from field correspondents. Source 4 supports Source 5 in so much as it suggests there was very little critical war reportage and highlights the role of Stanley as Chief Military Censor. However, rather than stress the effectiveness of military censorship Stanley, albeit unsurprisingly, instead cites the conventional attitudes of most correspondents as being the main cause of press docility, with the majority preferring, and being naturally inclined towards, collaboration over confrontation. Source 6 provides an alternative explanation for the uncritical stance of the majority of the popular press by emphasising the jingoistic attitudes held by the bulk of the readership of the new dailies. Candidates may use this source as a starting point for a wider discussion on the compliant approach of the mass circulation dailies towards the war, noting the insatiable appetite for war news among the domestic readership and the shift in focus away from investigative reporting and towards personalised accounts. Thus, it was left to the amateur, Emily Hobhouse, to uncover the horrors of British concentration camps. Alternatively, candidates may point out that the intense competition among the new press to maintain readership led to its war correspondents being put under growing pressure to provide a succession of scoops which often involved the relaying of 'bad news' - the arrest of the <i>Daily Mail's</i> correspondent for reporting the shooting of British POWs being one such example. Whatever stance is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature of, and constraints placed upon, press reporting during the war, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The question is focused on the impact of the war on women's role and status in society. Source 8 can be used as a platform for presenting the traditional view that the war provided women with a variety of new opportunities in employment ('men's work') as can the opening sentence of Source 9. This can be countered by Source 7 and the latter part of Source 9. Source 7 highlights the temporary nature of the changes resultant from the war and Source 9 stresses the limited scope of the changes across class boundaries. Candidates should use their own knowledge to show a developed understanding of the extent of change. For example, an appreciation may be shown of the increased earning capacity of women in war-related industries, which is implicit in reference to the flight from domestic service in Source 9, although the more knowledgeable may wish to note the negative press that this attracted. Alternatively, candidates may point towards a change in attitudes, both in public perceptions and women's self-worth. Thus, the fall in the number of women in employment after the war referred to in Source 7 can, in part, be explained by women's reluctance to return to what had traditionally been thought of as female occupations. Although all 3 sources deal with the impact of the 1st World War, the candidates can be rewarded for material which goes from the Crimea and Boer Wars. However, this should not be expected nor seen as a requirement of high level responses. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature and extent of the change in women's role and status as a result of the war, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

C2 Britain, c1860-1930: The Changing Position of Women and the Suffrage Question

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Candidates may well start with Source 10 which specifically states that Davison's actions were 'not likely to increase the popularity of any cause'. However, although the overall tone of the source is condemnatory, a closer reading does reveal the extent to which the incident and its aftermath attracted public attention. This latter point can be cross-referenced with Source 11 in which Pankhurst focuses on the increased interest in the women's movement in the wake of Davison's death. However, the more perceptive will take into account the provenance of the source and will be aware that, as a former advocate of militant action, Pankhurst may well want to paint as positive a picture as possible. Indeed, her insistence, more than 40 years after the event, that both 'horse and jockey were unhurt', is an indication of just how shocked pre-war society was by such extreme methods. Source 12 further supports the contention in the question. Although falling short of all out support for the women's movement, candidates should take note of the sympathetic tone of the piece, with those performing at higher levels able to recognise that a reassessment of Davison's actions and career had taken place in the light of her death. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement in respect of the question. Whatever judgement is reached should be backed by appropriate evidence with the better candidates appreciating the gulf that can exist between immediate reaction and considered reflection.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is on the impact changes in schooling in the second half of the nineteenth century had on the lives of women in Britain. Candidates may well start with Source 14, which presents a strong case in favour of the contention. Thus, the transition from home to school based education and the inference that, by sending some students on to Higher Education, there was a greater emphasis on academic standards can be viewed as significant steps forward in providing girls with new role models and improving the opportunities available to them. The more knowledgeable will be able to place these advances in the wider context of educational reform for middle and upper-class girls, with the establishment of new day high schools, such as The North London Collegiate School, of boarding schools, such as Cheltenham Ladies' College and Roedean, and, under the Endowed Schools Act, of grammar schools, such as Manchester High, all providing a considerable improvement in both educational opportunities and future employment prospects. However, candidates should also note the qualifying remarks in the first paragraph of the source and be able to cross-reference these with the points raised in Source 15. The emphasis here is on conformity with both sources implying that any advances in education provision for middle and upper-class girls were not to be made at the expense of traditional cultural stereotypes. Source 13 can be used to counter the contention in the question by broadening the scope of the analysis to include the experiences of working-class girls. Here the buttressing of traditional roles through the gendering of the school curriculum is made all too apparent. The more knowledgeable will be aware that little changed after the 1870 Education Act with, if anything, gender differentiation in day schools becoming even more pronounced. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature and extent of any improvement in the role and opportunities of women as a result of new educational provision, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The focus of the question is on the progress made by the suffrage movement by the end of the nineteenth century. The argument against the contention in the question is neatly summarised by Source 16 and candidates may well use this as a starting-point to provide an overview of the growth and development of the women's movement in the second half of the nineteenth century culminating in the establishment of the NUWSS in 1897. Source 17 can be used to reinforce the claims made in Source 16 by highlighting the growing influence of women in local politics, although more astute candidates may nuance this by pointing out that, in the eyes of many contemporaries, administration of School and Poor Law boards was firmly rooted in the specifically gendered domestic field. Source 18 clearly presents the opposing view, although it should also be noted that Strachey does concede that 'the societies steadily expanded', a point which can be cross-referenced with Source 16. Candidates may further temper Strachey's assertions by reference to the provenance of the source; as a key activist during the militant stage of the suffrage struggle, Strachey may well wish to privilege this period over any earlier advances. From their own knowledge, candidates should be able to extend the arguments for and against the contention by, for example, contrasting the significance of developments in education, family life and party politics in the later nineteenth century with the failure to gain legislative reform in the same period. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the progress and limitations of the women's movement in the second half of the nineteenth century, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

D1 Britain and Ireland, 1867-1922

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>The sources contain evidence both to support and challenge the claim in the question. Taken at face value Sources 2 and 3 outline conflicting religious values and Source 3 claims explicitly that the only solution to 'the Irish national problem' is that one side absorbs the other or they 'develop independently' i.e. partition. Source 1, however, shows a nationalist desire for an independent republic covering the whole of Ireland, without any religious establishment. The evidence is therefore conflicting, but may be reconciled by suggesting that different nationalist groups had different views and that this continued through to 1921 and after. Developed responses of this kind can reach L2. However, if the sources are interpreted in context, more complex arguments can be developed. Using Sources 2 and 3 candidates can develop a strong argument in support of the claim. Source 2 asserts the determination of Ulster Protestants to defend their religious institutions, and Saunderson gives religion priority over everything else. The provenance of the source suggests that attitudes in Ulster were becoming increasingly entrenched, since Saunderson had previously been a critic of the Orange Order, and the power of Ulster to obstruct a settlement can be inferred from the links with the English parliament. Therefore religion constitutes a serious obstacle. Cross-referenced with Source 3, Source 2 suggests more, since the attitude and demands that non-Catholics must accept 'a Catholic atmosphere' in Ireland would only alienate Protestant opinion. If Source 3 is cross-referenced with Source 1, it suggests that Irish nationalism has become more influenced by religion, more assertive and less inspired by idealistic universal principles, although candidates may challenge this by questioning how representative Source 3 may be. Nevertheless, both sources highlight religious divisions and their capacity to preclude a peaceful settlement. Both suggest an element of intolerance that is likely to create conflict rather than a solution. However, the sources can also be used to challenge the claim. Source 1 aims at a secular, united Ireland based on universal principles, and candidates may have contextual awareness that these ideas had not disappeared. Sources 1 and 3 also suggest that a greater underlying obstacle to settlement lies in an 'alien' i.e. English presence, and Source 3 clearly links this to the 'non-Catholic' element. It can therefore be argued that without English support the non-Catholics could be 'absorbed', and this is reinforced in Source 2. Alternatively, candidates may argue that Source 3 goes beyond religion and emphasises the importance of ethnic and cultural influence, inferring from 'a Catholic atmosphere' that religious labels were used to describe a clash of cultures, not merely belief. Responses that both support and challenge the claims on the basis of evidence cross-referenced and interpreted in context can reach L3, while those develop the arguments fully can achieve L4. The best responses may well show that religious loyalties, cultural differences and English influence worked together to create difficulties in the way of a settlement.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The sources offer evidence both for and against the statement. Dillon's claim that Home Rule would have been established if war had not broken out is supported by Churchill's suggestion that 'something should be done' for Ulster, suggesting that he believed a compromise was possible. Since he was a member of the Cabinet, this is an authoritative view. His opinion that the Conservatives were mainly concerned to humiliate the government also suggests that a compromise could have been reached given time. This argument can be developed by reference to events both before and after 1914. Despite the Lords' delaying powers Home Rule did become law in 1914 and the government did show itself willing to make concessions to Ulster. Although the Conference with the Conservatives broke down in 1914 and there was still uncertainty as to whether the government could make a sufficiently long term commitment to Ulster, there is evidence that the Irish Party had privately shown a willingness to negotiate. In addition the response in both Ulster and other parts of Ireland to the outbreak of war showed that there was still a great deal of goodwill towards the government, suggesting that with firm leadership an agreement could be enforced. However, the implication of Source 6 is that the situation was getting more difficult. The reliability of Source 4 can be challenged. Churchill is simply expressing an opinion, and both he and Dillon had every reason to wish to believe that Home Rule could be successfully implemented. Wider knowledge of the situation can be used to amplify the points in Source 6 and suggest that the Conservative party, led by Bonar Law who was himself an Ulster Presbyterian, would continue to encourage extremism in Ulster, and the Curragh Mutiny had already raised doubts as to whether the government could rely on the Army. The activities of the UVF and the Irish Volunteers increased the tension and resentment in both north and south, while the existence of more extreme nationalists made it more difficult for the Irish party to contemplate any form of permanent partition. Hence the case can be made, that in 1914 Ireland was on the brink of civil war, and that the First World War was in fact 'mercifully... for Ireland' a welcome distraction from an insoluble problem. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources include evidence that can be used both to support and challenge the statement. Lloyd George's manifesto promise guaranteed that Ulster would not be abandoned, and contextual knowledge makes it clear that this would mean partition of some kind. This can be developed using knowledge of relations between the British government and the Irish Home Rulers, who privately accepted that partition, at least temporarily, was unavoidable. Reference to attitudes in Ulster, in Source 8 and from own knowledge, can be used to show how unlikely it was that any alternative would be accepted there, leaving only the Irish nationalists in both north and south to challenge the idea. The general acceptance of it can be further reinforced by its inclusion in the 1920 Act, and by Michael Collins' admission that the nationalists had agreed that the north should not be coerced. This was stated publicly by the man who had negotiated the treaty, which allowed for partition. However, the statement can be challenged as too sweeping. Neither of Sources 7 and 8 covers the full range of attitudes in Ireland, and it was clear that many nationalists did not accept partition in 1918. The Sinn Fein declarations of the time refer to the Irish nation as a single entity, and while they do not specifically exclude partition, the tone of the declarations suggests that it was not accepted. Source 8 also refers explicitly to partition as one of the points to which Sinn Fein objected. The evidence of Source 9 can be challenged as dating from 1921, after three years of 'troubles' and it is also clear that Collins' is still faced by objections and his argument against coercion is based on the need to encourage goodwill in the hope of voluntary re-unification. It can therefore be argued that the nationalists never accepted partition as a permanent fact. This argument can be supported by reference to events in both Ulster and the south, the nature of the troubles, the role of the IRA and the internal war in the south in 1921-22. It can also be shown that some nationalists, including De Valera, only ever made concessions on the issue as part of negotiations and in circumstances where it was unlikely to come to fruition. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well reconcile the conflict, for example by arguing that partition was accepted by the majority, but on different terms and with different interpretations as to what it meant, or only gradually and not by 1918.</p>	40

D2 Britain and the Nationalist Challenge in India, 1900-47

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Taken at face value there is an obvious conflict between Sources 11 and 12 and the judgement made in Source 10. General Dyer explains the difficulties of the situation and presents a reasoned view of why he felt that he had to act. The address from the ladies of the Punjab supports this and goes further in suggesting that Dyer averted rebellion and an attack on their 'honour and lives'. This is in direct conflict with the view of the Hunter Committee, who did not consider any 'conspiracy' to have been proven, and directly condemned Dyer's behaviour as unreasonable. Responses that offer developed arguments of this kind can reach L2. However, if the evidence is analysed more fully and inferences made, there is some support for Source 10. Dyer's own report refers to 2 or 300 dead and admits to having fired 1620 rounds of ammunition, which can be seen as an excessive amount for a limited action intended to disperse a 'mob'. The use of the term, in itself, gives some indication of his attitude towards those present. This is compounded by the address from the 'ladies of the Punjab' whose language, and therefore perhaps their assumptions, has echoes of the Mutiny and fears for their 'honour and lives'. This is supported in Source 10, although the view is not accepted. If the sources are viewed in context it can be seen that Sources 11 and 12 emanate from people based in India, whereas the Hunter Committee came out from Britain and were perhaps more objective in their view of the situation. It can therefore be suggested that the evidence within the sources is not entirely in conflict, although contemporary interpretations of it clearly were.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The sources provide evidence both to support and challenge the statement in the question. Taken at face value all three sources emphasise the success of Gandhi's non-violent campaigning, his ability to generate support, and his militant influence in seeking independence. They can therefore be cross-referenced to support the view that his leadership made an important contribution to the achievement of independence. This can be developed by reference to wider knowledge of his non-violent campaigns in 1920-22 and in later campaigns, for example against the salt tax. Candidates can also refer to his participation in the Round Table conferences, his pact with Irwin and role in seeking to defend different communities to challenge the statement. However, using inference and contextual awareness, the statement can also be supported. Source 13 points to the difficulties experienced in sustaining non-violence and it can be inferred that while the campaigns of the 1920s and 30s did put pressure on the British, they were never sufficient to bring about the withdrawal of the British directly. This can be supported by wider knowledge. Similarly, Source 14 hints at divisions within Congress and the extent to which both moderates and radicals in the Congress party regarded Gandhi's aims as impractical. Wider knowledge of how Congress co-operated with the British, and of support for dominion status, in the years between the wars can be used to develop the argument that more progress was made by working towards gradual reform than by Gandhi's campaigns. The strongest evidence to support the statement is offered in Source 15, which can be interpreted as a reference to the endemic and increasing divisions among the different Indian communities, which became the greatest obstacle to independence. Candidates can point to Gandhi's attempts to protect minorities such as the Untouchables and to his efforts to co-operate with the Muslim League to challenge the implications of the source, but they can also develop the inference by reference to his claims that he could speak for 95% of Indians, his resistance to a federal solution or the provision of special status to many of the minorities, as well as his refusal to accept that Britain had a role to play in these areas. In addition, wider knowledge can be used to suggest other factors that played a key role in the achievement of independence, such as Britain's changed priorities in the aftermath of the Second World War. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well be able to utilise source 15 to reconcile the conflicts by arguing that Gandhi played a vital role in developing support for independence, but was much less effective in finding a 'workable form of government' to accommodate India's internal divisions.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources provide evidence both to support and challenge the statement in the question. Source 16 makes the claim, which is supported by Source 17. This evidence can be amplified by reference to wider knowledge of the events leading to both independence and partition, in particular the attitude of Mountbatten and the extent to which the British were losing control, as indicated in Source 18 by the references to growing violence in the Punjab. However, there is also evidence of other factors leading to violence and brutality, in particular the hostility between Congress and the Muslim League, the threat of civil war and the distrust on both sides, described in Sources 17 and 18. It can therefore be suggested that the fault did not lie with the British, but with the internal rivalries between the Indian communities, which made a peaceful settlement impossible. This argument can be developed by reference to wider knowledge and an explanation of the growing hostility between Hindu and Muslim after the collapse of the Round Table conferences, the impact of the Second World War, the failure of the Cabinet Mission and the activities of extremists on all sides. However, if the evidence is interpreted in context the sources suggest a combination of factors as the cause of violence. Source 16 implies that British reluctance to grant independence had helped to intensify rivalries, and this is supported by evidence in Source 18 that they were not always impartial. However, explanation of the references to Montagu, Irwin and Hoare, using contextual knowledge, can show how British attempts to deal with Indian demands for greater political control had been undermined by problems between the Indian communities, suggesting that responsibility for the situation in 1947 had been built up by errors and misjudgements on all sides. In that context Britain's hastiness and desire to 'leave before the sub-continent went down in flames' can be seen as understandable, perhaps justifiable, while still contributing to the extent of violence and brutality that accompanied the partition. Candidates can therefore argue that the problems arose from a complex interaction of factors, built up over time. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting interpretations, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well explain the interaction of British and Indian actions, to show how different factors combined and to evaluate the importance of Britain's hasty preparations for partition.</p>	40

E1 British Political History, 1945-90: Consensus and Conflict

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>Candidates may well start with the content of Source 1 which appears to present a clear challenge to the contention in the question. Although candidates should take into account the provenance of the source and the need for Labour to highlight the shortcomings of Conservative rule in an election year, many of the criticisms made can be supported by cross-referencing with the issues raised in the cartoon in Source 2. The case for the opposing view is summed up succinctly in Macmillan's famous Bedford address in Source 3, although it may also be highlighted that the challenge presented by Sources 1 and 2 is, to an extent, buttressed by the concerns raised in the last two lines of the speech, with the assertions on the benefits of the consumer boom being balanced by the clearly articulated fear that the good times may not last. Here the difference in dates may be noted with those operating at higher levels suggesting that Macmillan's concern in Source 3 had been realised by the time Sources 1 and 2 were produced. At the higher levels candidates should also be aware that the hyperbolic claims regarding the standard of living for the majority in Source 3 and the Labour Opposition's highlighting of those groups outside the margins of economic prosperity in Source 1, far from being mutually exclusive are simply the result of political rivals forefronting different socio-economic groups for electoral gain.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is on the impact on Britain and the lives of the British people of the post-war Labour Government's reform programme. Both Sources 4 and 6 can be used in support of the contention in the question. Source 6 points to the extensive legislative programme enacted in the immediate post-war years, while Source 4 briefly summarises the beneficial effects the reforms had on the lives of ordinary people (some may recognise the language of the Beveridge Report that underpins the speech). Candidates should be aware that Watson, as a supporter of Labour, is likely to paint a rosy picture and the more knowledgeable will be alert to the significance of the date and note that the speech was given before the financial difficulties of Attlee's last year in power took hold. Source 5 can be used to present the counter-argument, and candidates may note the reference to political differences between the leaders of the Labour Party which were to have repercussions in the government's final year. The opening sentence of Source 5 leads candidates into some of the historiographical debates that surround the evaluation of the government's performance under Attlee. Thus, the 'critics of the Labour Party' would challenge the claim made in Source 4 that Britain in 1950 was a 'land of opportunity' and instead point to the lack of strategic planning and restricted control in the nationalised industries (Hard Left) as well as the general problems of under-investment and deep-rooted inefficiencies (Right). Although candidates need not directly link the criticisms to a political standpoint they should, nonetheless, be aware of the overall direction of the arguments and counter-arguments. Thus, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by an appropriately balanced use of source material and own knowledge combined with a clear understanding that, in part, a judgement depends on assessing the relative importance of the consequences of the various strands of the reform programme.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The question asks candidates to focus on the achievements of the first two Labour Governments under Harold Wilson. Therefore, candidates who include material relating to Wilson's time in power between 1974 and 1976 should not be rewarded (though nor should they be penalised). Source 7 provides a strong case in favour of the contention with the failure to resolve the problems of a 'stop-go' economy being forefronted. Many of the points raised in Source 7 can be cross-referenced with the cartoon from the <i>Daily Telegraph</i> in Source 9, though the more astute candidate will balance any observations by some reference to the provenance of the source. In combination, the sources touch on a number of key areas and can be used as a basis to develop such issues as the abandonment of trade union reform, the decision to devalue sterling and the continued failure to gain entry to the EEC. Source 8 presents the counter-argument and can be used as a starting point for the defence of the Labour Governments. In particular, candidates may not only want to elaborate on and extend the references to the advances in social legislation but also highlight some of the gains that accrued from Roy Jenkins' time as Chancellor. Whatever line of argument is taken, candidates should look to arrive at a judgement with the better responses containing some attempt to prioritise the relative importance of the administration's successes and failures. Achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of the sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the extent and limitations of Labour's achievements, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

E2 Mass Media, Popular Culture and Social Change in Britain since 1945

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Candidates may well start with Source 12 which, in part, supports the contention in the question by highlighting the role played by the <i>Observer</i> in bringing the Belgrano affair to the public's attention and maintaining pressure on the Government. This view is supported by the evidence of Source 11, a newspaper cartoon pointing to the existence of a government cover-up, and the reference in Source 10 to the part played by newspaper journalists in uncovering the Watergate Scandal. However, all three sources can be used to present the counter view. Thus, Dalyell in Source 10 and the <i>Evening Standard</i> in Source 11 are explicitly and implicitly forefronting the role of Ponting in leaking documents, while Ponting in Source 12 is emphasising his legal team's manipulation of the press. However, more perceptive candidates will take account of the provenance of the sources and will recognise that Dalyell would wish to protect Ponting as much as possible in advance of his trial by stressing the importance of his self-sacrificial leaking of documents. Similarly, the rather breathless prose of Source 12, and the fact that this is Ponting's version of events in the immediate aftermath of his trial, may lead some candidates to treat the extract with a certain amount of caution. Thus, in arriving at a judgement the very best responses will balance the roles of the press and Ponting by close reference not only to the content of the sources but also to their provenance and context.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The focus of the question is on the treatment of ethnic minorities on television and the impact this has had on race relations generally. Candidates will most likely access Source 15 as a starting point for the argument in favour of the contention in the question, although some may note that, as an American academic writing in the 1970s, Cottle may be particularly highly attuned to the existence of racial tensions within society. Furthermore, the assertion in Source 15 that television deliberately avoided the issue of race relations is, at least in part, contradicted by Source 14 where examples of the realistic depiction of ethnic minorities in sitcoms and soap operas of the 1970s are presented. However, the more knowledgeable candidate will be able to site this wave of shows in the context of the 'Blacksploitation' films of the early seventies and recognise that this was, as the extract states, only a short-lived trend. Source 14 can also be used as a platform for further contextual knowledge with the retreat into 'stereotypical' and 'unrepresentative' caricatures of non-whites being the result of pressure on television companies to increase their viewing audiences and the public's desire for reassurance in the turbulent years of the late 1970s and early 1980s. An alternative perspective is presented in Source 13 where the interviewee, although making no reference to the representation of non-whites on the TV screen, is nonetheless noting that the medium made a positive contribution to race relations by familiarising ethnic communities with the mores of wider society and thus facilitating integration. The more perceptive candidate will be able to contrast the popularity of the soap referred to in this source with the limited appeal of the shows mentioned in Source 14 when arriving at an assessment of the contribution TV has made to better race relations. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the debates surrounding the nature and impact of the representation of ethnic minorities on television, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question asks candidates to focus on the impact of the internet on work patterns and social interaction. Many candidates will start with Source 17 which firmly supports the contention in the question by noting that work related internet use negatively impacts on a range of social activities. This view can be supported by the bar chart in Source 18 which is stressing the isolating potential of internet use and, thus, the negative impact it would have on traditional patterns of leisure activity. More perceptive candidates will be aware that such concern was nothing new and that similar doubts had been expressed in the past about the deleterious effects of television on sociability and family life, although Source 18 is clearly negatively contrasting TV and internet use by emphasising the active nature of the former with the passivity of the latter. Source 16 presents the diametrically opposite view with the internet's role as a facilitator for social interaction being stressed. More knowledgeable candidates should be able to support this stance by charting some of the developments in online facilities with the growth of email, webpages, Facebook and MySpace all serving to encourage sociability. Thus, the conflict with the view expressed in Source 17 can be explained by reference to the dates, with Source 17 focusing on an early survey when the internet was the exception rather than the norm and hence the opportunities for its use to be incorporated into the routine practices of everyday life, and consequently to augment social contact and additional leisure pursuits, were severely restricted. Candidates may also argue that Source 18 merely shows a shift rather than a decline in patterns of leisure. Achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of the sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the developments and changing patterns of use of the internet, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US021428 Summer 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH