

Examiners' Report
June 2013

GCE History 6HI02 A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2013

Publications Code US036139

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

Examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination. Many were able to structure their work effectively, addressing the specific focus of both the Part A and Part B questions and writing with understanding and insight about the key themes.

At the highest levels of attainment, there was impressive work.

However, it is disappointing to note that there were a minority of candidates seen in this exam series who did not perform as well, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In Part A, many candidates were able to use the language of cross referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross reference. There seemed to be an increase this series in the number of candidates who worked through the sources sequentially; this makes it very hard for candidates to cross reference effectively and move beyond Level 2. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question in this exam series. There is no credit for this in Part A and as such, these candidates waste time that would be better spent developing those aspects of the answer that do gain credit – cross referencing, a consideration of provenance linked to the arguments and judgements.

In Part B, it was again disappointing to note that a minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. In a small number of cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge at all being used. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the Part B questions. There also appeared to be an increase in the number of responses seen this year where candidates used their own knowledge to create the line of argument and made only passing reference to the sources. The best answers made use of both elements, using the sources to shape the argument and own knowledge to develop the points raised. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, even more candidates appeared to comment on provenance in their responses to Part B in this exam series. Such comments are often very generic – the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight (or they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event). In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in Part B. Candidates would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. The usage of 'bias' seems to have increased again this year and brings with it all the variant misspellings – biast and biasicity to name but two.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

Question 1 was significantly more popular than Question 2 with 6785 entries compared to 866.

Question 1 (a)

Overall, this question was completed fairly well, with many candidates selecting evidence well from the sources that supported arguments for and against the statement in the question. Many candidates were able to cross reference the sources and consider the attributes of the sources and so access Level 3. The best responses successfully cross referenced the provenance of the sources and were able to use this as a basis for reaching a supported judgement based on the validity of the evidence. Most candidates were able to identify religious reasons for Cromwell's downfall, and most also identified the alternative reason in the role of the nobility by linking comments in Source 3 with reference to Norfolk in Source 2. Some candidates missed clues in the source, such as 'heresies' in Source 3 together with its reference to Cromwell's treatment of Robert Barnes, which then restricted their ability to use Source 3 to cross reference with Sources 1 and 2 for agreement. Many candidates are able to describe the provenance of the sources but too few really use the sources as evidence and struggle to move beyond claims such as that Sources 1 and 2 were French and therefore 'biased'. There are still a significant number of candidates who work through the sources sequentially or set quotations for agree and disagree side by side rather than developing cross-references. These candidates cannot progress beyond Level 2. Rather unusually, a number of candidates used a significant amount of knowledge to address this question. This is not credited in assessment objective A02a. There were also a number of candidates who did not proof read their responses before the end of the examination and did not pick up on the occasions in which they referred to Cromwell as Wolsey.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a)

~~IC / religious~~
Source 1 presents the argument that Cromwell's downfall came as a result of his religious faith. It mentions that by 1540 Cromwell was 'working against' the 'intentions of the King'. Accordingly Francis I, these intentions were to return England to 'the way of truth' or in other words Catholicism. ^{suppress the old practices} Hence the argument is raised that it was Cromwell's fervent protestantism that led to his downfall. This is supported by source 2, where Francis confirms that Cromwell's fall was a result of accusations made in his previous letter - source 1, thus supporting the argument raised in source 1. Moreover, the idea of Cromwell being a radical reformer, stipulated by source 1 is supported further by source 2 arguing that after the fall of Cromwell, there was greater 'peace & tranquillity'. ~~There is~~ This argument is further strengthened by source 3, an extract from Cromwell's trial which ~~states~~ ^{writes a 'new preaching'} evidences his approval of a source 1 Robert Barne's protestant preaching as reason for his downfall. Therefore, sources 1, 2 & 3 both ~~show~~ ^{contribute} evidence supporting the idea that ~~that~~ Cromwell's religious faith was cause for his downfall.

Having said this, on closer inspection of the sources, the argument that Cromwell fell from power as he

((a) continued) disobeys Henry's orders becomes apparent. In this sense, it wasn't necessarily Cromwell's religious views that caused his downfall, but rather his disobeying of the king + parliament that contributed to his fall. Therefore, in source 1, Francis refers to Cromwell going against 'the intentions of the king'. This may have been in religious matters, but as source 2 suggests, supporting his argument, it was though being 'naughty' that resulted in his fall from power. Moreover, source 3 further supports his claim arguing that the case of Robert Barnes is significant not for evidencing Cromwell's religious beliefs but rather that he acted 'against the king's proclamation' as suggested by Francis in source 1. Source 3's evidence adds weight to his argument as it is from the charges brought against Cromwell. Therefore, as parliament was instrumental in Cromwell's fall, by then referencing the importance of him disobeying the king, it strengthens the case that this was the primary factor for his downfall.

~~On the other hand,~~ On the other hand, both the ideas that Cromwell's ~~fall~~ downfall was a result of religious belief in disobeying the king is weakened by the presence of sources 1 + 2. Source 1 + 2 are from Francis I who had ~~entirely~~ a strong hatred of Cromwell ~~as he opposed the English throne alliance,~~ therefore making the source partial. Moreover, these arguments are further weakened by the mention of Norfolk giving Francis his

((a) continued) the 'nobles' had a 'great disdain for Cromwell'. Therefore sources 1, 2 + 3 all point to causing argument that Cromwell's ~~downfall~~ fall was a result of his various enemies, most notably the nobility.

In conclusion, it was opposition to Cromwell, as source 1 suggests that led to his downfall. Here 'principal officials' which sources 2 + 3 imply included the nobility were instrumental in causing the king's opinion of Cromwell. Moreover, as Plant was the ~~interest~~ interest for his downfall, it further strengthens the argument that opposition to Cromwell resulted in his downfall. However, it must still be noted that his opposition would have encouraged them to consider Cromwell's ~~views~~ ^{views} which would have led Cromwell to disinherit Henry. Here, both these factors can't be discounted as they were part of a broader picture which led to ~~Cromwell's~~ Cromwell's fall. The spark that lit the flame fire though was the opposition to Cromwell's enemies, he had his big his disinherit of Henry + religious views.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. The candidate cross references the sources throughout the answer and draws well considered inferences from the sources to develop the argument. The reasons for Cromwell's downfall are explored in detail; the candidate identifies two alternatives (disobedience to the king and the enmity of the nobility) to the given factor, religious beliefs, and uses the attributes of the sources to weigh the relative significance of the factors. There is a good example of the candidate using contextual understanding of the issue to assess the reliability of Source 1. The conclusion arises out of the judgements that the candidate has made in the body of the answer and is based on a careful weighing of the sources.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This response drew a good number of responses but was not as popular as 1(b)(ii). Some candidates did find both the topic and the source material challenging, but there were also a pleasing number of very competent Level 4 answers where candidates had managed to incorporate a range of own knowledge thoroughly integrated with the sources. The best responses had a good grasp of the conceptual focus of the question and were able to test the representation in the sources on the basis of a sound knowledge. Able candidates were able to deploy knowledge on Henry's acquisition wealth and of power over the church, the potential growth of parliamentary power with the potential and actual threats of rebellion at home and aggression from the Catholic powers of Europe. Such candidates picked up on references in Source 5 to the work of Cranmer and Foxe in claiming that 'the kings of England had no superiors on earth' to enable the use of their knowledge of *collectanea satis copiosa* and the Act in Restraint of Appeals to explore the issue further. Some candidates questioned the claim in Source 4 that Henry had 'public support' by considering the challenge posed to Henry in the Pilgrimage of Grace. Many candidates did find it hard to move beyond the content of the sources and although they were able to score highly in A02b by developing reason and argument, they were less successful in achieving in A01. There are still a significant number of candidates that discuss the provenance of the secondary sources. There are no marks available for the evaluation of source attributes in A02b and candidates should avoid using the sources for this purpose.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

*(b)

Reformation = ^{greedy} ↑ in certainty

Authority ~~increased~~

↓ in papal authority

No ↑ in ecclesial authority.

The Reformation, despite arguments to the contrary, undoubtedly increased Henry's authority. However, during his period, Parliament also saw an increase in its power, which limited the use of Royal supremacy. As a result, Henry's ~~power~~ authority over church & amongst public opinion greatly increased, but what Parliament encroached on Henry's ^{domestic} political power, & over-seas, the reformation ^{Henry's authority} ~~was undermined~~ ^{or unimpaired} if affected Henry's authority very little. Hence overall the reformation ^{at all}

Source 1 introduced the argument that the reformation which included the break with Rome gave Henry more authority' as it increased 'public support'. It argued that this was achieved through Acts that ~~changed~~ 'changed the status of the king'. For example, the Act of Submission of the Clergy gave Henry total control over the legal mechanisms of the church. Further Acts such as the Act of Injunctions of Appeals in 1532, further weakened the legal powers of the church. Therefore, as source 1 states through the reformation, Henry was able to assert the power of the church, and his the 'Church in England' became the 'Church of England'. Thus the reformation greatly increased

((b) continued) Henry's authority ~~of~~ over the church.

This is supported by source 5 which argues that the reformation brought about the end of the 'papal authority' in England. Therefore the ~~very~~ ^{very} evidence of source 1 suggests Henry controlled the authority of the Pope being Supreme head of the English church as the Act of Supremacy declared. In this sense the reformation did increase Henry's authority ^{the sense} as head of the church in England. Source 6 strengthens his argument by citing that ~~the~~ the Supremacy Act intended to assert Henry as 'supreme Head of the church in England'. Despite mention of this not being accepted overseas, the it does nothing to imply the king was not accepted as Head of the church internally. Therefore we can conclude that the reformation greatly increased Henry's domestic authority as he became head of the church in England, asserting all its powers.

Henry said this, source 5 suggests evidence which disagrees with his argument. Later for the reformation leading to an increase in authority, Henry held power as king without it. It states that according to Canon (Archbishop of Canterbury) & Fox (Lambert) protestant authors, Henry had no superiors on Earth. In this sense, even with the ~~only~~ ^{only} of the Pope's authority, the Henry even before was still more powerful & exercised more authority. Obviously, Canon & Fox were on the Pope's side & therefore interested in making the king so therefore it is understandable why they would claim that Henry was a

((b) continued) So a ruler with supreme rule, the argument here cannot be discounted. This is as source 5 concedes with the story that where there was conflict between church state law, 'can held jurisdiction' implying Hey was supreme judge even without the reformation. Therefore ~~So~~ by a secondary source details the case is source 5 that Hey was already powerful, & the reformation did not go to greatly increase his authority as he was already the supreme judge in England.

This being said, the latter part of that statement is contrary to an argument raised by source 6 supported by source 6. In his Murphy writes that as a result of the reformation though which all Acts were passed hence Plant, Plant subsequently was 'on the path to increased influence'. This influence encroached on the Hey's domestic legal authority. Source 6 supports source 4 in saying that Plant ~~is~~ had the authority to appoint & remove a bishop. This ~~text~~ suggests Plant to have supreme legal power in England not Hey. This is further supported by source 4 which says that the bishop's authority is 'subject to the support of Plant'. In his sense therefore, despite source 6 ~~text~~ mentioning limitations to Plant's power, Hey never absorbed legal ~~power~~ authority in England, as after the reformation increased the legal & judicial authority of Plant.

This argument is supported by source 6 being a primary

((b) continued) source, but moreover as it is ~~more~~ More's words who was a condemned man with nothing to win or lose, the argument is strengthened. Moreover, More, former Lord Chancellor would have understood that had right into the great powers of France, ~~that he remained as a~~ ~~final supporter~~ ~~to a large extent~~ sympathetic to Italy. This sympathy he had that he remained engaged in the power. However, ~~he was not~~ ~~added in~~ ~~limited~~ ~~by the idea~~ that More would have refused to accept.

More also referred a factual comment on his high authority which suggests he reformation didn't encourage his high authority in foreign policy. This argument is not refuted by any source, & therefore remains unchallenged. What source ~~is~~ ~~concerned~~ ~~with~~ ~~domestic~~ ~~authority~~, ~~only~~ ~~seems~~ ~~to~~ ~~mark~~ ~~the~~ ~~lack~~ ~~of~~ ~~increase~~ ~~in~~ ~~foreign~~ ~~authority~~.

First of all, by breaking with Rome, Henry alienated England, as felt by Cromwell from the Forces of Charles V both Catholic rulers. In his sense it may be understood his diplomatic activity as when in 1518 with the Treaty of London, Henry was able to secure an alliance with all Catholic rulers, such an opportunity was now impossible. Later England became isolated & they lost the ability to play France against the Imperial Empire as it seemed according to Cromwell that ~~such~~ a Franco-Imperial alliance would isolate England.

((b) continued) Therefore, Henry lost the authority to manipulate Franco-Imperial relations as a result of the reformation.

In conclusion, Henry's authority of the church greatly increased as a result of the reformation, despite source S's argument to the contrary that the authority was always there. It was rather with the repudiating of Clement that Henry gained supreme authority. However, his authority was limited. Henry's authority only increased conditionally, with no increase overseas & even suggestion of decline in diplomatic authority. In addition, the reformation encouraged an increase in parliament's authority which encroached on the legal & judicial authority of Henry. Therefore, whilst the reformation encouraged an increase in royal authority for Henry over the church, it also allowed for an increase in Parliament's authority & therefore, in some regards, the reformation weakened Henry's authority when he overseas & at home, despite source Henry's best line was 'the work of us and ours'.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a secure Level 4 for both assessment objectives. The candidate uses the sources to identify two conflicting representations, the increase in royal authority and the constraints on royal power as a result of the increasing influence of parliament, in the introduction. Throughout the answer, secure knowledge is integrated with the source material. The sources are used to explore and sustain the argument. The conclusion is very strong; the arguments in the sources are debated and a clear judgement is reached.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This was the most popular question in Part b and it was generally tackled well. The sources were analysed well, with many candidates achieving Level 3. The majority of candidates were able to use the sources to identify the conflicting claims by the authors and organised their responses to address these claims. The candidates who really knew Wolsey were able to get their teeth into this question very well, with many including references to all the key areas of Wolsey's domestic policies. It was pleasing to see many candidates being able to recall very precise facts and figures relating to Wolsey's domestic policy, and these were often analysed well in relation to the question. Other candidates were more limited in their knowledge. A significant number of candidates were unaware of the differences between Star Chamber, the Court of Chancery and the Court of Requests, and thus argued that Wolsey encouraged the poor to bring cases before Star Chamber. Some had little knowledge to offer beyond the failure of the Amicable Grant and other candidates focused on foreign policy. A careful reading of the question and the use of a plan could be used effectively to avoid such errors. Some candidates used the sources to drive the analysis and used them effectively to debate the issues and reach a sustained judgement based upon the sources tested by own knowledge. However, a significant number of candidates struggled to reach a sustained conclusion here, with many simply summarising that there were some positives and some negatives in Wolsey's domestic policy.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(b) i It is more apt to say that when looking at the sources, Wolsey was unsuccessful as Henry's chief minister. Although all sources recognise his attempts at being successful, the failures outweigh the successes. Firstly, source 4 and 9 do highlight Wolsey's minor successes as chief minister, focusing particularly on justice. Source 8 comments that the Star Chamber created by Wolsey held vision and originality. In the early 1520's, Wolsey sought to organise the government through creating the Court of Chancery and the Star Chamber, most likely due to his humble and downy part. The Star Chamber was a criminal court, focusing on bringing those to justice by administering the King's justice. One might argue his ability went to the government in the title, as Wolsey often sought to include himself in hearings, hearing one 120 cases a year in the Star Chamber, and 540 in the Court of Chancery. Here, Wolsey sought to solve cases through civil law, a more

sought to solve cases through civil law, a more
juste law, therefore embodying what it meant to
be the king's chief minister. ~~So~~ Similarly, source
9 adds weight to this argument, with Cavendish
commenting that he "never saw justice better administered".
Before Wolsey rose to Lord Chancellor in 1515 much of
the nobility ruled parliament, which meant those

((b) continued) who had the money to win a hearing could
do so. By administering justice, Wolsey made enemies
with the nobility, but showed to Henry that he
was able to uphold the title of King's chief minister
by thoroughly organising government.

However, both sources 4 and 8 show that
in balance, Wolsey was unsuccessful as chief adviser,
due to overwhelming failures in financial
aspects of government. Source 8 comments that "financial
potential was seriously reduced by the venality to
the unbridgeable gulf. Due to Henry's high demands
for foreign policy pursuits, Wolsey was forced to,
as source 7 describes, "rule as king when he
was not king" whilst trying to provide Henry with
money for wars with France, Wolsey ~~also had~~
had to raise money through parliament. In 1522,
he asked parliament for £800,000 as a tax,
however, they declined and only gave him £200,000.
However, by trying to raise money when he could, he
pushed the Expulsion of the Minors in 1519,
in order to reduce expenditure. To some extent
this proved successful, as by 1524, Wolsey had
managed to raise Henry £100,000. However, by ~~to~~ trying
to please Henry in one sense with money, it

ultimately used him to be unsuccessful in his position. Source 7 furthers this point and comments that

((b) continued) Wolsey "ignored legal + constitutional traditions" in England, which contrasts heavily with source 9's comment "I never saw this kingdom in better order." By 1525, Wolsey's Amicable Grant had failed to bring Henry the money he desired for a 2nd war with France, due to other taxes in place at the time which caused riots in the North of the country. This evidence takes weight away from the argument in source 9, as in which comment only focuses on "my judgement". As Cavendish was Wolsey's personal biographer, by writing nearly 30 years after Wolsey's death, and only focusing on his private life rather than personal, his judgement is deemed flawed or unreliable, as it does not necessitate the details of his feelings as the other contemporary sources, 7 and 8. This takes weight away from the argument that Wolsey was successful in domestic policy.

Moreover, despite sources 7 and 8 commenting on some successes regarding the English church, with source 8 7 suggesting "he was only moderately successful", the fact that Wolsey had a developed ruthless personality was the only reason why they were moderately successful. Source 8 describes Wolsey as a "consummate politician", thus immediately refuting attention away from

((b) continued) his involvement with the Church & it's clear to see that whilst Wolsey was aware of the misdeeds taking place in the Church, he chose to ignore them. Since it furthered this point, suggesting Wolsey ~~was~~ ^{had} "self interested judgement", to the extent that he felt faults in the Church could be ignored. Much vice was associated with the Church in 1520's, such as sexual misconduct and absenteeism. Despite one minor success in 1512, with Wolsey passing on act to punish those of crimes of the Church without holy orders, he failed to make any lasting reform. This act did not apply to those clergymen who did hold holy orders, and, moreover, due to Wolsey himself behaving against the procedures of the Church, he had no desire to change anything. He often used his money to benefit his illegitimate child, thus showing no real example to England of the Church. Since it was done & until receipt to this regret, as done & says "Wolsey had no guiding... principles", thus showing how his ruthless self obsessed personality got in the way of creating successes in the Church and his kingdom. He ostracised the nobility due to his policies such as E12th ordinances against them to pursue his own personal vendetta.

((b) continued) against them, and, as source 7 connects to "promote unrest" and reduce their ~~influence~~ influence towards Henry. However, source 9 agrees as it does not comment on Wolsey's personality, and how it affected the realm, therefore showing a dismissal to his possible ruthlessness acknowledged in sources 7+8.

In conclusion, it is clear to see that despite Wolsey's attempts not being successful in domestic policy, his personality, lack of financial gain for the country and focus on his own pursuits ~~do~~ outweigh the successes he created, ~~via all sources 5-8~~ scores 7+8 favouring these points entirely.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response achieved Level 4 for both assessment objectives. The sources are used to identify conflicting opinions about the extent to which Wolsey succeeded as Henry's chief minister and detailed knowledge is used to test these opinions. The argument is sustained throughout the answer leading to a well considered judgement in the conclusion.

Question 2

Question 2 (a)

This question was handled quite well. Many candidates were able to identify evidence to support the claim that Essex was responsible for his own downfall, and to contrast this with alternative inferences drawn from the sources that Elizabeth's indulgence of Essex contributed to his fall or that he was 'misled' by his followers. Some candidates successfully cross referenced the provenance of the sources and were able to use this as a basis for reaching a supported judgement based on the validity of the evidence. In many cases candidates picked evidence supporting Essex's downfall being down to his own actions better than they selected evidence for other factors from the sources. Some picked up that the influence of others was a possible factor from the sources quite well, but others found it difficult to clearly differentiate between the fault of Essex and the fault of the Queen. Most candidates were able to note the provenance, but for many, there was little development beyond simple comments such as 'Source 12 can be trusted because Essex would not lie'. Candidates need to explore the validity of the sources in order to reach a judgement in relation to the question.

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) Essex caused his own downfall:

Plan: Intro - Rebellion in 1601 - failure of Ireland in 1598.

P1 - Essex - in debt, 1594 (source 10), fault in himself (source 11) - "greater error"

- accepts that he has broken law (12)

P2: Caused by Liz too: - "indulged" him (11) - eg. giving money in 10, suggestion in followers (x-ref 12)

Conc. although ~~that~~ he is at fault - led to it by Liz's affectiois (10/11) but he is at fault (all sources).

The Earl of Essex (also known as Robert Devereux) was executed in 1601 as the result of his attempted coup in London earlier in the same year, on the charge of treason, as source 12 shows. He had also dropped in Elizabeth's favour due to a number of other mistakes, such as his handling of the 17,000 strong army he had been sent to lead against the Earl of Tyrone. While all of the sources

suggest that Essex is, at least partly, the cause of his own downfall, all three, and in particular source 11, suggest that Elizabeth is also partially to blame.

(a) continued In Elizabeth's 1594 letter to Essex (written before Essex's mishandling of the situation in Ireland, where he failed to follow orders and then abandoned his army in order to return to court), Elizabeth seems ready to offer Essex help in the clearing of his debts, by saying "accept this 4,000[...].] and my hand shall be ready to help you than any other." As this is written by Elizabeth herself, this source is reliable evidence that the relationship between Essex and the Queen in 1594 was cordial, and thus it can be suggested that this shows that Essex was the main cause of his downfall, as Elizabeth does not seem angry with him at all. However, as this was prior to Essex's trip to Ireland, the Queen does not as yet have any reason to orchestrate Essex's downfall. Sir Nauntou, who was at court in Elizabeth's final years also supports the view that Essex is to blame as he says that Essex is at "greater error", thereby suggesting that he is the one ~~the~~ that caused his downfall. As Nauntou was at court, he would be well able to judge ~~the~~ who's fault it was, and Nauntou is thus reliable, since he is writing after the Queen's death when he has no motivation to be nice about Elizabeth. In addition, in Essex's response (source 12), he accepts the blame, saying "I am willing to die", however Essex may have been trying to butter Elizabeth up by saying ~~the~~ he "never had any trecherous or disloyal intentions", and therefore escape the death penalty, so his acceptance of blame is less reliable

((a) continued) than the other two.

Although Essex seems to accept responsibility, he does state that his motives are good, and both sources 11 and 10 state that Elizabeth "indulged" Essex to some extent, giving him "excessive attention" (source 11), and "£1000" (source 10). In addition to the suggestion that Elizabeth's ^{indulgence} ~~best~~ is the ^{cause} ~~blame~~ for Essex's downfall in both of these, source 11 states that "if there had been more proper conduct in either of these two", meaning that Elizabeth is at least partly at fault. In addition, Nauntan references the "error" of Essex's "followers", whom Essex himself refers to in source 12, thus suggesting that Essex was driven to commit treason by the actions of people who surrounded him.

In conclusion, both sources 10 and 11 lead us to believe that Elizabeth's "indulgence" of Essex (both in financial aid and as a favorite), ~~is~~ is one of the causes of Essex's downfall, and Essex and Nauntan both also suggest that Essex's followers may have had something to do with it. However, given that Essex would be attempting to save his neck at this point, and the fact that he admits to "committed that which has brought me within the power of the law", Essex himself is the cause of his downfall, and the positive

((a) continued) tone of Elizabeth in source 10 agrees with this. Although source 11 ~~is~~ states that the Queen perhaps led Essex to be at fault, all three of these sources do suggest quite strongly that Essex himself was a major cause of his downfall (although Elizabeth's "affectations" may have played a more minor role in leading him to this point).



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. The candidate uses the sources in the introduction to identify an alternative reason (Elizabeth's role) to the given factor that Essex was responsible for his own downfall. The candidate proceeds to examine Essex's own culpability, cross referencing all three sources and considering their attributes to treat the sources as evidence rather than as information. The alternative argument is examined more briefly but secure skills in cross referencing are demonstrated. The conclusion is secure, with the weight of the sources used to reach the judgement.

Question 2 (b) (i)

Many candidates chose this question, although 2(b)(ii) was more popular. It was answered well overall, with candidates being able to integrate the evidence of the sources from their own knowledge. Most candidates were able to distinguish between the conflicting representations in the sources and so debate the failures of Parliament in comparison to James' extravagance and intransigence as a primary cause of the financial problems. Some candidates had an excellent depth and breadth of knowledge and were able to explore the financial problems inherited from Elizabeth, the adequacy of parliamentary subsidies, the issue of monopolies and purveyance, and the failure of the Great Contract as well as considering James' extravagance. However, some candidates were not so well prepared, and relied on snippets of detail alone (such as James having a big family and so needing more money) to prop up analysis. Sources were handled well overall, although to some the final source from Parliament caused a little confusion. Some candidates struggle to reach a judgement, with many candidates summarising that in some ways it was and in some ways it was not the fault of Parliament.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

* (b) Source 13, 14, 15 ~~shows~~ debate whether parliament was responsible for the failure to ~~so~~ solve James' problems of finance. Source 13 and 14 suggest that the lack of trust, and control or strength of Parliament affected James' deteriorating finances. However all 3 sources emphasise the pressure for a new and foreign monarch to spend, and be extravagant.

Source 14 states that "Salisbury's success at increasing customs revenue by £100,000 would have ~~helped~~ would have improved ~~James~~ finance" if James had been willing to substantially reduce his spending.

Indeed, James was extremely generous with ~~be~~ at court and with his favourites. He spent £185,000 on jewels and

((b) continued) his between 1603 and 1612, and once paid for a banquet of one of his favourite's (Haye's for the french Ambassador) worth £2,200. As a result, it would obviously ~~be~~ not Parliament's fault for James' extravagance and poor finances. Source 14 shows how Salisbury's efforts to improve finances could ~~be~~ simply not keep with with James' poor idea of saving and his excessiveness.

Source ~~the~~ 13 supports the idea in source 14 that ~~it was not Parliament~~ James' extravagance hindered economic improvement, ~~what~~ as "what was voted was lowered by the amount never received by the Exchequer". However, Source 13 insinuates that Parliament did not do enough to control James' extravagance,

((b) continued) as there was "great generosity of parliament in voting subsidies in perpetuity". It could be argued that this shows Parliament did not do enough ^{or were not strong enough} to restrict James. Yet it is a fact that they ^{did} ~~tried~~ ^{try} to restrict James. Indeed the two Bibles of Bounty were introduced, one in 1608 (by Cecil), and one in 1619 by Cranfield. Unfortunately, James ignored the restrictions, for example he broke the rules terms and gave Buckingham property worth £20,000. However, ^{perhaps} parliament was too weak to stand up to James after he broke the terms.

~~In addition to this, it~~ It could be argued that Parliament showed "generosity" in their subsidies due to reasons expressed in source 15. The source is from the 1st parliament, and states how James' needs

((b) continued) were simply "beyond those ~~that~~ of his predecessors".

It is a fact that when James became king he was left with a poor financial situation left by Elizabeth. Elizabeth debts of £400,000 were ~~paid off~~ by covered by outstanding debts from France, the Dutch and an uncollected subsidy from 1603. However, she Elizabeth left a backward and conservative financial system, with unpaid officials, ~~and~~ ~~or~~ a monopolies crisis, and inflation and corruption. Hence, ~~the~~ Parliament's "generosity" ~~do~~ did not deteriorate finances, as Tax inflation devalued the subsidies, and James had to also pay £500,000 to end the problems ~~from~~ of Elizabeth in Ireland. Subsequently, it could be argued that

((b) continued) Elizabeth's ^{lack of} ~~back~~ ^{backyardness} ~~caused~~ Parliament and James to struggle with the finance system.

Then, again, source 14 indicates that both Parliament hindered financial progress, due to "the failure of the Great Contract of 1610".

The ~~aim~~ idea was that if James gave up some of the backward revenues of Elizabeth (purveyance, wardship and feudal tenures) Parliament would give him a single sum of £500,000, and a ~~a~~ guaranteed annual subsidy of £200,000.

It was the doubts of Parliament after a break that led to the failure of an innovation that would have given the financial system a ^{needed and} positive overhaul. Parliament was concerned that James would

((b) continued) abuse their privilege and continue to collect feudal tenures and use purveyance. As a result, it could be argued that Parliament's mistrust in their king and stubbornness over their privileges led to the failure of finance under James. However, even though James was concerned whether the annual subsidies of the Great Contract would keep up with inflation, he was prepared to compromise. Consequently, the failure of the Great ~~Contract~~ Contract disillusioned James' perception of Parliament, as he felt his prerogative had been used. Overall, this emphasises how the issue of privilege and prerogative hindered economic success.

((b) continued)

Overall, source 13, 14 and source 15 emphasise how finance was a major problem under James. ~~Source~~ Source 13 ~~su~~ suggests Parliament was ~~due to~~ the cause of this due to their "great generosity". Indeed Parliament failed to be assertive and strong enough to have establish ~~consequences~~ consequences

((b) continued) when James' extravagance (described in source 13 and 14) was "lowered the amount received by the Exchequer".

Source 14 suggests that parliament missed an opportunity to improve finance after "the failure of the Great Contract".

Again, this highlights how they were simply too concerned with privileges to be assertive enough to reform. However, it could be argued James' "extravagance" led to these doubts, hence he is just as much at fault as Parliament.

Although source 15 indicates that there were economic pressures on James when he came to the throne (eg. to pay for Elizabeth's funeral and

((b) continued)

prove himself as a monarch), his excessive generosity to is displayed in source 13 + 14. obviously James caused and parliament were equally at fault. however ~~parliament should have~~



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response achieved Level 4 for A01 and level 3 for A02b. The key issues are identified from the sources and outlined in the introduction. The candidate uses the sources effectively to consider the various alternatives, but the use of developed knowledge is the stronger skill demonstrated in this answer. The conclusion is rather brief and summarises the views in the sources rather than developing a secure judgement.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This question elicited some of the best responses on the paper. Many candidates who attempted this question produced answers which integrated sources with well developed own knowledge. The best answers were able to identify the conflicting representations in the sources and to compare the relative significance in the worsening relations between king and parliament of the role of Charles I to the attitudes and actions of Parliament itself. Many candidates identified the role of Buckingham, particularly in reference to foreign policy, as a separate cause; stronger candidates realised that Buckingham was an example of tensions between Crown and Parliament rather than a separate factor. Responses demonstrated a good understanding of Charles' belief in Divine Right. Stronger candidates also examined the role religion played and considered Laud's promotion and Parliament's fear of Charles ruling as an Absolute Monarch. Some candidates were able to link factors together and used the sources to support and challenge points they made, but sometimes the knowledge was applied too descriptively rather than analytically.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

* (b) ii) Do you agree with the view that, in the years 1625-9, Charles I was responsible for the worsening relationship between crown and Parliament?

Plan: Intro

P1: Charles: "divine right" (16), bad communicator,

P2: Parliament: attacked favourites (B)(18), projected ideas (17), criticised/discussed (16)

P3: Buckingham/FP (18), 17-war with Spain, failures of Cadiz, La Rochelle + Mansfeld etc.

P4: Religion: Arminians (16/17) - Offices of King (ie Church - Montagu/Laud = Bishops etc) (18)

Conc: YES as he appointed Buck, had fierce say on FP/religion but Parliament didn't help.

Over the years 1625-1629, the relations between Charles I and his Parliaments had worsened to the point that, in March 1629 Charles dissolved Parliament and embarked on a long session of prerogative rule without them. This worsening of relations was due to several factors of which Charles and his attitudes and actions were definitely one, as is shown in both sources 16 and 17.

however the issue of Foreign Policy in the hands of the Duke of Buckingham was also a problem, as is shown by source 18. There were also religious disputes between

((b) continued) the King and Parliament, and all of these issues were definitely exacerbated by the Parliament itself, and its' actions.

One of the key reasons for the worsening of monarch-parliamentary relations between 1625-9 was certainly Charles' own behaviour, as is shown in source 16, which states that he was "a poor communicator [...] would allow no argument". Given that Parliament existed to debate points of law, this behaviour is definitely a major contributor to worsening relations, as was Charles' belief in "the divine right of kings [...]" ~~(which)~~ he actually tried to put this into practice". The fact that divine right asserted the monarch's power, and thus slightly overlooked the parliamentary privileges, coupled with Charles' marriage in May 1625 to the French absolutist princess Henrietta Maria, ~~caused~~ also caused ~~tensions to~~ the relationship between King and Parliament to worsen. The fact that Charles' actions undermined the hope outlined in source 17 that ~~Parliament~~ Charles "might ^{be} better able to trust ^{their} (Parliament) good intentions" further worsened the relationship.

In addition to Charles' own behaviour towards Parliaments, another reason for the worsening of relations by 1629 was ~~the~~ Charles' support of Buckingham, despite the many failures of Buckingham in terms of foreign policy.

Declaration

((b) continued) The common's ~~objection~~ of Buckingham in source 18 states that "the greatest [...] are in the Duke's own hands", referring to the many offices that Buckingham held, including Lord Admiral, and later goes on to list the "strange abuses" and infinite neglects that occurred as a result. Given that this was written in 1626, the Cadiz expedition would be fresh in Parliaments' minds, but other disasters like La Rochelle, and the use of ships against "friends of our own religion" (the Huguenot uprising that Buckingham attempted to suppress, but was unable to as his ships mutinied rather than fight fellow protestants) would also worsen the relation between Charles and Parliament, as Buckingham had Charles' full support, and indeed was one of the "small circle of counsellors" to which source 16 refers. The relationship's souring due to foreign policy would also have been especially bitter as some in Parliament "wanted an aggressive foreign policy" (source 17) and would thus have been disappointed with ~~Charles's~~ Charles' continued support of Buckingham despite the failures Buckingham had in terms of foreign policy.

Another issue that ^{damaged Charles and Parliaments' relationship} ~~Parliament~~ was particularly unhappy ~~with~~ between 1625-9 was that of the growing prominence of Arminianism in religion, which Charles supported as "they stressed the divine nature of the

((b) continued) monarch" (source 16). As Charles' ~~executed~~ ^{held the} Anglican clergy in "more consistent favour" according to source 17 the mainly Puritan Parliament ~~was~~ ^{became} ~~also~~ deeply unhappy with Charles' religious stance, as they mention in source 18, when they complain about the treatment of the "offices of the Kingdom", which included posts like the ~~Archbishop~~ of Bishop of London, Bishop of Winchester and ~~the~~ Royal Chaplain, which were all filled by the Anglicans Laud and Montagu between 1625-9. As the issue of religion had been contentious between monarch and Parliament since Henry VIII dissolved the monasteries, the relationship between Charles and Parliament over religion was fraught and became increasingly fractious as Charles' appointments of Anglicans became greater during the 1625-9 period.

However, despite the issues of Charles' beliefs and behaviour, the problem of Buckingham, foreign policy and religious contention, ~~the sources~~ is evidence from the sources (especially in 18) that Parliament itself caused some worsening of relations between 1625-9. Their attempt to impeach Buckingham in 1626, as shown in source 18 was obviously deliberately antagonistic, as Buckingham was so close to Charles, and this indirect criticism of Charles by attacking Buckingham is clearly a way of baiting and unsettling the king who saw actions

((b) continued) like this as "treacherous" (source 16). In addition, source 17 also suggests that Parliament had many "contradictory hopes" for Charles in March 1625, so some members of Parliament would obviously have a worsening relationship with the king as their "contradictory" desires could not^{all} be fulfilled.

To conclude, although it is clear that Parliament's attempt to project hopes onto Charles ~~be~~ and antagonise him by efforts such as source 18 (Impeaching Buckingham), I do agree with the view that the worsening relations between crown and parliament 1625-9 were caused by Charles, as he was ultimately the one who made religious decisions and had the final say on matters involving Buckingham, such as the foreign policy mentioned in sources 18 and 17. Because Charles ~~made~~ is ultimately the decision maker on all the major matters that ~~antagonised~~ worsened relations with Parliament he



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response achieved Level 4 for A01 and Level 3 for A02b. The candidate identifies three possible reasons for the worsening relations between Charles and Parliament in the introduction; Charles' attitude and actions, foreign policy in the hands of Buckingham and religious disputes. The answer is organised around an assessment of the relative significance of these factors. The knowledge developed is detailed and focused on the question. The use of the sources is not quite as strong and the response is driven more by knowledge than sources. The response reaches a clear judgement.

Paper Summary

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

All Questions

- Candidates should proof read their answers at the end of the examination and correct any instances where they have incorrectly labelled a source, used the wrong names or the wrong dates.
- Candidates need to use the terms 'implies' and 'infers' correctly. Candidates should argue that a source implies something and that they, the reader, infer from it.
- Too many candidates are using certain phrases, such as 'using the sources as a set', as a substitute for actually engaging in the task that they are claiming.

Part A

- Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
- Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross referencing. Candidates who work through sources sequentially cannot go beyond Level 2.
- Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. The attributes of the sources should be discussed, not described. This aids the use of provenance as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
- Cross referencing not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance, enables candidates to weight the sources and reach supported judgements.
- There are no marks available for knowledge in Part A. Candidates should avoid arguing from their knowledge since it cannot be credited.

Part B

- Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification, rather than rely heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
- In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not a descriptive or chronological account.
- Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not rewarded in A02b. Many candidates still engage in generalised comments that a particular historian is or is not reliable at the expense of developing argument and analysis tested by specific own knowledge.
- Candidates need to ensure that they are aware of the focus of the question and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer, to avoid straying into irrelevant areas that cannot be rewarded.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE