

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2013

GCE History (6HI02/A)

Unit 2: British History Depth Studies

Option A: Early Modern British History:  
Crown & Authority

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

### **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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

January 2013

Publications Code US034629

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

*i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*

*ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*

*iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

## **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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-5 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 8-10 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 13-15 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 4: 16-17 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 18-20 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 5-6 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 11-12 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 17-18 marks</b> 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><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> 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>



**AO2b (16 marks)**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-4</b>	<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><b>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 1: 3-4 marks</b> The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>2</b>	<b>5-8</b>	<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><b>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 2: 7-8 marks</b> The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>3</b>	<b>9-12</b>	<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 both 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><b>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 3: 11-12 marks</b> The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>13-16</b>	<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><b>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 15-16 marks</b> 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
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>% weighting</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>25%</b>

### 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
<b>1 (a)</b>	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the view that Wolsey's efforts were half-hearted. Taken at face value, support is found in Source 2, where Francis is reported suggesting Wolsey is able to influence the Pope, yet has not assisted Henry's cause. Source 3 reflects this to an extent, with Catherine's accusation that Wolsey acted in his own interests rather than those of Henry, with Catherine seemingly detailing a range of personal motives Wolsey may have been acting upon. It is likely candidates may look to Source 1 for the strongest evidence to counter the claim, with Wolsey's own letter indicating his efforts have won influential support in the form of Stafileo, detailing the case in canon law for the invalidity of the marriage. Candidates may also connect this to Source 3, with Catherine's reference to the Wolsey's role in ending the marriage, although the extent to which his having 'kindled the fire' can be considered as having acted on Henry's behalf or from his own motives may be debated. Candidates may also suggest that Suffolk's reporting of Wolsey's relations with Rome does not fully deny that he acted in Henry's interest.</p> <p>In exploring the differing views, candidates may highlight the attribution of sources, reflecting on the roles of Suffolk in Source 2, as well as the possible timing and nature of his visit and subsequent reporting back to Henry. Similarly candidates may examine the provenance of Source 1, considering Wolsey's purpose in a letter written significantly earlier in the quest for the annulment. Candidates may also highlight the retrospective nature of Hall's description in Source 3. The chronological relationship between the sources may also be drawn upon for valid discussion of areas of agreement and disagreement. Candidates considering such issues with specific reference to the content of the sources can achieve Level 3. Responses which reach a judgement reasoned through a careful consideration of the evidence can achieve Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the Henry's foreign policy in the years 1518-29. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question. Both Sources 5 and 6 offer evidence regarding the limitations which finances placed upon Henry's foreign policy, with Source 5 suggesting the financial constraints were in part due to a growing fatigue with funding Henry's ventures, whilst source 6 indicating this was more due to an inability to meet the changing demands of the European situation. Source 4 can also be interpreted to some degree as evidence that, whilst Henry is on the face of it willing to support Charles with financial assistance, Henry's purse may be limited. In countering the question, candidates may draw from Source 4 the view that Henry's desire to support Charles by financial means suggests this is not such a limitation. Similarly, candidates may use Source 5 to develop an analysis of the extent to which it was the increasingly unrealistic nature of Henry's ambitions in the shifting European situation from 1521 that were the greater hindrance to achieving these. Source 6 may be related to this, pointing towards Wolsey's efforts to a realistic position for England as the Habsburg-Valois conflict developed, with potential opportunity to examine the extent to which later failure was down to Wolsey's inability to restrain or fulfil Henry's ambitions, weighed against how genuine Charles' commitment to the alliance with England was. Candidates may question the assumption that the policy was indeed a failure, reasoning from the sources that there were genuine successes, even if these were not sustained. Candidates equally may adjudge that meetings such as the Field of the Cloth of Gold were somewhat hollow victories in terms of subsequent developments.</p> <p>Candidates may draw on their own knowledge in relation to the debate, for example highlighting how Wolsey's attempts to raise finance, such as through the forced loans of 1522 and the 1525 – the Amicable Grant – are evidence of an increasing inability to meet the financial demands of a more active foreign policy. Candidates may examine changing diplomatic alignments after the Field of the Cloth of Gold, such as the Treaty of Bruges (1521), Wolsey's efforts to secure peace, with encouragement of the League of Cognac and the increasing alignment with the French after the sack of Rome in 1527, leading to Britain being effectively at war with Charles from 1528 and subsequently abruptly excluded when they made peace in 1529. Thus, candidates may argue a case for the significance of other factors, such as the lack of reliability in chosen allies, the failure of Wolsey in choosing and negotiating these or indeed the difficulty of achieving success in foreign policy in the dynamic context of continental Europe in the period 1518-29. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. 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 extent to which foreign policy was restricted by financial constraints, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>Overall the sources provide evidence for a range of arguments concerning the impact Protestantism had made in England by 1540. Candidates may draw on Source 9 to support the claim, highlighting the Six Articles, the actions of Norfolk or the concerns of reformers such as Cranmer as evidence of the King's preference to limit religious reform in the country at large, potentially exploring from this the extent to which a reaction against the earlier reforms took place in the latter part of the period. Candidates may link this to Tunstall's (or Tunstal's – both spellings should be accepted) letter to Pole (Source 8), highlighting his belief that Henry's aim was not to divert from Catholic doctrine, although the reassuring nature and timing of this letter, dating from 1536, may be explored in assessing the weight of this evidence. Source 7 may also be drawn from, as whilst it largely details changes that were made, it suggests Cromwell's desire for Protestant reform was not matched by Henry in terms of pace or substance. It is likely candidates will rely more on Source 7 as evidence that Protestant reform was effected by 1540, detailing changes to religious practice and the Bible. Candidates may take this opportunity to explore the role of Cromwell, Cranmer and indeed others in the religious reformation, perhaps arguing their zeal did bring about real change, examining the extent to which these were pervasive across England or indeed permanent. However, whilst candidates may explore the issue of faction within this issue, the focus should remain firmly on the extent to which reform took place. Candidates may also draw upon Source 9 to highlight that reforms had taken place, or link arguments to the implications of Source 8, in that any separation brought about as the result of Supremacy inevitably contributed to moving the Church away from Catholicism.</p> <p>In drawing on own knowledge, candidates may highlight the Ten Articles of 1536 as evidence toward the impact of Lutheranism, balancing this against the subsequent Bishops' Book (1537) or the evidence of Source 9 over the Six Articles as to the subsequent limitations of these. Candidates may explore the injunctions of 1536 and 1538, considering the extent to which Cromwell's influence did indeed progress Protestant reform beyond what Henry desired, perhaps examining this in the light of evidence for or against Protestantism having had a broader impact in England, drawing from a diverse range of issues, which might include the dissolution of the monasteries and examples of those who either opposed or actively supported religious change. Candidates may also explore the rise and wane of the influence of a range of individuals such as Anne, Cranmer, Gardiner or Cromwell, and may extend issues to an examination of earlier developments, both in terms of Acts of Parliament before 1536 laying the foundations for the religious reformation, and the extent to which alternative beliefs such as Lollardy and Humanism were influences before the Henrician Reformation was embarked upon, although the focus must be kept firmly on the question to achieve the highest levels. Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by</p>	40

appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the extent to which Protestantism had taken hold, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Evidence can be found in all three of Sources 10, 11 and 12 to support the view that the Parliament of 1614 failed as a result of the actions of the House of Commons. Source 12 indicates the contemporary belief that the parliament fell as a result of a plot, detailing demands which were calculated to provoke a reaction from James; this could be linked to Source 11's evidence that the Commons served demands on James, although that this is stated in a less adversarial tone may be highlighted. Source 10 could also be used as evidence to suggest that critics did exist within Parliament who were likely to disrupt affairs were James not to meet their demands, possibly linking this back to the Venetian Ambassador's observation (Source 11) that (only) part of the Commons was always with James. Candidates may also draw from all three sources for evidence to counter the claim. Source 10 can be used to suggest that James, having forewarning, could have easily removed the threat with relatively minor concessions, although this does not fully deny the role of Parliament. Candidates may link this to Sources 11 and 12 as evidence that James did not act upon this advice. Additionally, Source 11 offers evidence that James' actions were responsible to a degree, indicating that even the Commons were amenable, and that whilst James may have demonstrated a willingness to allow them to assemble, he is clearly asserting his prerogative. Candidates may even consider the extent to which the reference to James' 'patience' (Source 12), is evidence of James' intransigence over what may be seen as reasonable demands. Candidates developing such issue through a cross-reference of the evidence which examines the areas of similarity and agreement are thus likely to reach level 3.</p> <p>Candidates may take a range of approaches in considering the nature and provenance of the evidence, perhaps highlighting the particular chronology of the evidence or examining the roles of individuals concerned, such as exploring how Neville's subsequent non-appointment may suggest his independence or indeed that James was intransigent. Candidates may also explore the extent to which Sources 11 and 12 stem from disinterested or informed viewpoints. Candidates utilising inferential skills or consideration of provenance in relation to issues identified in the content of the sources should achieve Level 3. Responses which are able to reach judgement on the extent of agreement considering the weight of the evidence will be deserving of Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>2 (b) (i)</b>	<p>The question asks candidates to offer an assessment of the nature and degree of the problems faced by Elizabeth in the last years of her reign. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim that court factions were of greatest significance. On the face of it Source 13 appears to provide the strongest evidence to support this claim, highlighting the increasing division between Cecil and Essex and the consequences of this. Whilst Sources 14 and 15 appear to point more towards other factors, stronger responses may explore the interrelationship between problems at court and Elizabeth's age, religious, economic and overseas difficulties. Source 14 highlights in particular the problems stemming from the issue of monopolies, which may be used to open up a wider debate on price inflation, perhaps examining the extent to which this was a consequence of war with Spain and in Ireland. Candidates may use the source to argue that monopolies were a significant problem as Elizabeth was having to make concessions, or equally see her success in dealing with this as evidence of the relative insignificance of this issue. Source 15 can be linked with this, as whilst it deals in the main with problems stemming from the war with Spain and the rebellion in Ireland, this is explicitly linked to financial issues. Thus the sources may be used as strong evidence both for and against the claim in the question.</p> <p>Candidates can use own knowledge to examine a range of problems, such as the problems in Ireland, the costs associated with suppressing the rebellion, potentially linking this with the Spanish war in terms of both moral and military support for the rebels from Elizabeth's enemies. They can also draw on religious conflicts to explain both the war and the Irish rebellion. Elizabeth faced severe difficulties in financing her government which led to some tensions in parliaments, because of inflation and the inadequacies of the system, and that this was exacerbated by the ongoing war and rebellion in Ireland. The inefficiency of the administration, may also be examined, with candidates perhaps noting the deaths of valued advisers such as Walsingham, Hatton and Burghley in examining the extent to which trusted advisers gave way to factional interest in Elizabeth's court in her latter years, with candidates perhaps arguing that the rivalry between Essex and Cecil was to some extent muted whilst the elder Burghley still served. Candidates may draw upon Essex's Rebellion of 1601 as a sign of both faction and Elizabeth's susceptibility due to other issues, although it may be argued that the relative ease with which this was dealt with is evidence to counter this.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. 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 extent to which faction was the greatest problem faced by Elizabeth, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40



Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>2 (b) (ii)</b>	<p>The question asks candidates to offer an assessment of the extent to which James was the main obstacle to intervention in the Thirty Years War. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question. Candidates may well start with Source 16, which at face value shows James I as refusing support for Frederick and the Protestant Union in the early stages of the war. Candidates may well link this to Source 18, which seems to suggest James remained a barrier to intervention throughout the remainder of his years, at least in terms of acting against Spain. This may also be linked to Source 17, as whilst this does detail how James did proffer invasion plans, the limited nature of these could be used to argue a case for his reluctance in the face of pressure to intervene in a manner aimed more against Spain. In countering the claim in the question, candidates may consider the evidence in Source 17 that James was willing to intervene, having both a definite objective and a clear proposal for achieving this. Candidates may also refer to James' overall desire for peace and his motto 'beati pacifici'. Thus it may be argued that rather than James' refusal being at issue; it was Parliament's focus on a broader anti-Spanish conflict that was of concern to the monarch. Candidates may well link this to the debate detailed in Source 18, where Charles and Buckingham's conversion to this approach is outlined. In this respect, candidates may also consider the evidence of Source 16 as only being partially supportive of the stated view, it being in respect to an earlier and thus narrower stage of the Thirty Years War.</p> <p>In terms of integrating the given evidence with own knowledge, candidates may draw from a range of issues. It is likely the financial constraints to intervention might be explored, with Sources 17 and 18 highlighting the disparity between parliament's support for intervention and support for an expedition to the Palatinate as James planned for. Candidates may well link this to the costly failure of Mansfield's expedition, although any development of this should aim to retain a focus on the issue at hand. Candidates may well explore other factors surrounding James' reluctance to intervene, particularly in the early stages, such as his initial hope that Philip would not support Ferdinand, the delicacy of the marriage negotiations, his commitment to diplomacy and the extent to which his Frederick's position in Bohemia countered James' approach to rightful kingship. Candidates may well explore the issue in the question regarding James remaining a barrier, through examining the developing position in England towards the war. James felt increasing pressure, particularly from the Parliament of 1621. The failure of the Spanish match may be examined in precipitating a change in the approach of Charles and Buckingham, whilst candidates may also analyse the extent to which by this point James was effective in resisting the will of his son and the Parliament of 1624.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. 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 assessment of James' role in intervention in the</p>	40

Thirty Years War, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code US034629 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website  
[www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com)

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

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

