

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

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

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



### 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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2014

Publications Code US039075

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

Centres and candidates are to be congratulated for their performance this examination series, as examiners reported that the majority of candidates understood the essential requirements of the Unit 2 examination with the different focus of the two parts of the question. There was a wide range of responses seen across the mark range.

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

However, it is again disappointing to note that there was a significant minority of candidates seen in this exam series who performed poorly, both in terms of their skills set and their knowledge base.

In part (a), many candidates understand the language of cross referencing, but did not actually engage fully in the processes of cross referencing, merely asserting agreement or disagreement between sources without explaining its basis. There seemed to be an increase this series in this kind of approach, making it very hard for candidates to move beyond level 2 even where they clearly understand the issues raised by the sources. Also in this series, there appeared to be a number of candidates who were using their own knowledge to develop points raised in the content of the sources in this question. There is no credit for this in part (a) and 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 significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always fully understood. In some cases, there was no evidence of any own knowledge being used at all. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have some range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part (b) questions. Some candidates appeared to view both parts of the examination as relating solely to the use of sources. The best answers used the sources to shape the argument and raise issues which were supported and developed with the use of detailed and specific own knowledge. Despite comments in many previous examiners' reports regarding the focus of AO2b, this issue continues to pose a challenge for many candidates. A significant number of candidates commented to a greater or lesser extent on provenance in their responses to part (b) in this exam series. Such comments are frequently 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 and significant names correctly, especially when those words and names form part of the question or the sources. Where candidates have a few minutes left at the end of the exam, they would be well advised to check their work. There were a number of candidates who used the word 'infer' extensively, without actually understanding its meaning. There also appeared to be an increase in scripts where the handwriting of candidates proved difficult to read in this exam series.

## Question 1

Question 1 was significantly more popular than question 2.

### Question 1a

There were many good answers to this question by candidates who identified the conflicting motivations of religious concerns and the need to enforce the Royal Supremacy. The candidates drew insightful inferences about the hidden agenda behind the visitations and were able to use the provenance of the sources to explore the validity of the claims. Many candidates had been well taught to focus on the skill of cross referencing, and the best candidates also cross referenced the attributes of the sources to enable themselves to reach a judgement firmly rooted in the validity of the evidence. However, there were more weak answers that settled in level 2 than in previous series. A significant number of candidates did not understand the phrase 'lay behind' and were confused as to whether the visitations had already taken place or not. Other candidates believed that the visitations had caused the religious concerns. Many candidates did not read the provenance carefully and mistakenly believed that source 1 was written by Thomas Cromwell. This did have a negative impact on the analysis. Many candidates are unable to access level 4 because they list the strengths and weaknesses of sources but do not consider their overall validity and the weight of the evidence as a set.

((a) continued) ~~The set~~  
The sources can be used in combination to argue that enforcing the idea of the Royal Supremacy was ~~the~~ reason ~~for~~ Cromwell's visitations as opposed to a large extent the reason for Cromwell's visitations as opposed to ~~general~~ genuine concern for the state of the Catholic Church.

Source 1 implicitly implies ~~the~~ the idea of the Royal Supremacy being the reason behind visitations to dioceses. Layton refers to ~~the~~ the visitations of lesser visited dioceses as a way 'to beat the King's authority'. This implies the visits were a way to enforce the idea of the Royal Supremacy and convert those in the 'North' where it is more Catholic to ~~more~~ Protestant ideas such as the idea of placing the King above the Pope. ~~Layton also~~ ~~That~~ It becomes evident the visitations are more to do with converting people to the idea of the Royal Supremacy rather than the corruption in the Catholic Church. Sources 3 and also agree with this ~~to~~

added to differing extents. Edward Lee remarks on the new practice of declaring the 'title of Supreme Head' in reference to the King whilst in source 3 it ~~refers to~~ Lee further refers to the condemnation of ~~of certain~~ ~~practices~~ to rather 'die than to yield to your royal title'. Sources 3 and 2 show the ~~affirmation~~ <sup>rejection</sup>

(a) continued) ~~of~~ Cromwell's ~~actions~~ visitations. Thus sources 3 and 2 can be used in combination with source 1 to show the visitations were largely ~~concerned~~ concerned with asserting Royal Supremacy than the state of religion. This is because it shows the condemnation of the Royal Supremacy as a result of these visitations and thus suggests this idea was ~~being~~ more promoted than the state of religion. However there could be cases of over emphasis in these sources. Source 3 could be emphasised as ~~Lee~~ Lee claims he 'persuaded them to change their opinions', this suggests ~~Lee~~ Lee could be overemphasising the severity of the condemnation of the Royal Supremacy or they might not have been one at all. ~~As~~ ~~whilst~~ source 2 ~~is~~ ~~ambiguous~~. Thus it becomes strongly ambiguous as to what the cause of these visitations were.

Contrastingly, source 1 can be used to argue that the state of religion ~~is~~ ~~was~~ was the cause of ~~the~~ Cromwell's visitations. ~~For~~ Layton claims there is a need to show the King 'intends reformation and correction of religion', which is indicative that the aim of this trip was ~~to~~ stamp out

clerical abuses and corruption in Catholicism, source 2 does ~~appear~~ support this idea in source 1, with Lee claiming that he has noticed

((a) continued) preens to preach 'the ~~since~~ ~~the~~ ~~word~~ ~~of~~ ~~God~~' under King's orders. This suggests ~~that~~ that the King ~~didn't want~~ primary reason of these visitations was to reform Catholicism and for it not to get lost in the 'waning fantasies and ceremonies' that Layton refers to in source 1. However source 1 is highly unreliable as Layton was under orders to smear the ~~state~~ state of Catholicism through his report *Valor Ecclesiasticus* ~~in~~ in 1536 ~~by~~ Cromwell commissioned by Cromwell. ~~Thus~~ Thus when Layton speaks ill of the Catholic Church in the source it is exaggerated as he needed to try dismantle the Catholic Church in order to enforce Henry's idea of Royal Supremacy. Thus it can be ~~argued~~ used as evidence to argue the idea of Royal Supremacy was the main reason behind these visitations as opposed to Cromwell's concern for religion.

Overall the sources can be used in combination to argue that ~~that~~ Royal Supremacy ~~asserting~~ asserting Royal Supremacy was the main reason for these visits as opposed to genuine concerns for religion. Source 2 claims there was an 'intention for reformation', however this perspective is offered because there was a hidden agenda to use the state of the 'not perfect' churches in source 2 in order to assert the Royal Supremacy.



This is a level 4 response. The opening paragraph demonstrates the candidate's intention to use the sources as a set to address the question and this is maintained throughout the answer. The candidate identifies the conflicting views in the sources and begins by addressing the role of the Royal Supremacy in the motivation for the visitations and then contrasts this with the religious concerns. The candidate develops cross references and inferences throughout the response. The sources are used effectively as evidence. On page 6, the candidate draws out the ambiguity in source 3 and the exaggerated nature of source 1. The judgement is succinct and demonstrates the candidate's ability to reach a judgement based on the validity of the sources. The candidate concludes the response with an excellent point about a hidden agenda in the visitations.

### Question 1bi

This question was significantly more popular than bii. Candidates were generally well prepared for this answer, having a good knowledge of early foreign policy and were able to use it to test the representations made in the sources. Many candidates were able to access level 4, especially for A01 for the application of their knowledge integrated with the sources. Fewer responses reached level 4 for A02b. Candidates would find it easier to access level 4 if they ensured that they used the sources in reaching their judgement. Responses in level 3 were often descriptive and thus lacking the analytical focus on success or failure. There were also a minority of candidates who did not pay attention to the time frame set in the question and who provided sometimes extensive knowledge of events between 1521 and 1529 which could not be rewarded. Candidates do need to be very clear about question focus to achieve the highest levels; some candidates steered the analysis into a consideration of whether Henry or Wolsey was directing foreign policy, and while there were implicit links to the question, the mis-focus limited the responses to level 3. There were still many candidates who made formulaic comments about the provenance of secondary sources. These comments do not receive any credit and it is important that candidates do not waste their time on such statements.

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

For	Against
• sources	• source 4,
•	• source 5,
• Field of the Cloth of Gold,	• Battle of Flodden
• source 6,	•

Henry was largely unsuccessful in his foreign policy in the years 1509 - 1520. If one examines what a success how a 'successful' foreign policy can be defined in two ways. From Henry's perspective being a Renaissance King by declaring war, and ~~the~~ successful invasion of countries and asserting power and wealth internationally would be what he considers ~~as~~ a successful foreign policy. Meanwhile others may agree that ~~as~~ being on friendly terms with neighbouring countries whilst fighting within

your means would be a successful foreign policy. Henry VIII failed both interpretations through his adventurous campaigns of France from 1511-1515 and his superficial 'successes' of the Treaty of London and the Field of the Cloth of Gold.

((b) continued) Source 4 implicitly displays Henry's failure to fulfill his Renaissance Kingship and ~~Henry~~ Henry failing to fight within his means.

Randell claims Henry I was tricked by his 'father-in-law' during the division of Aquitaine as a result his army 'rotted with insufficient supplies'. This displays Henry's foreign policy was unsuccessful in two ways one in that it showed he didn't have any power as he was ~~left~~ looking deserted by Ferdinand of Aragon whilst he and his Spanish troops used Henry's army to disarm the French so they could invade Paris. Furthermore it exemplifies failure as Henry couldn't fund to keep his troops well equipped because he was ~~working~~ beyond his means, thus Henry's ~~was not successful~~ foreign policy was not successful as he doesn't have the resources to fund his campaigns in France.

This ~~conveys~~ idea of Henry not having the resources to fund his French campaign is supported in Source 5 where Thomson talks of the limited successes of the capture of 'Therouanne and Tournai'.

However the cost of garrisoning those towns cost around £900,000 whilst the annual income of the King was £100,000. This

shows the foreign policy was unsuccessful as Henry simply did not have the wealth to

((b) continued) fund it.

~~But further evidence~~

On the other hand there were some successes to Henry's foreign policy however they were ~~not~~ largely superficial successes. Source 6 refers to the Treaty of London which aimed to make a possible 'marriage alliance' in addition of 'Margaret to be regent in Scotland'. This shows there was steps to making ~~alliances~~ <sup>allies</sup> with the Holy Roman Empire, the most powerful region of Europe ~~and~~ through the engagement of Mary I and Charles V. In addition through his sister Margaret he could quell the risk of invasion from France. This shows it is a successful foreign policy in two ways Henry VIII is now surrounding himself with powerful allies and secondly he is still exerting his Renaissance Kingship through the Treaty of London. The treaty put London at the centre of ~~international~~ international relations, thus putting Henry and England in the spotlight in order to exert his power and wealth. This rule of making allies as opposed to war is order to create a more successful foreign policy ~~is~~ ~~supported~~ supported in Source 5 where Henry 'came to terms with France', thus he stopped

((b) continued) putting England's finances at risk by withdrawing his Renaissance Kingship, thus it can be also viewed as successful from ~~some~~ <sup>1763's</sup> ~~some~~ modernist perspectives but not from Henry's perspective.

### Source 5 ~~5~~

Henry had a high point of successful foreign policy through the Field of the Cloth of Gold in 1520. Henry got to both exert his Renaissance Kingship through flaunting his wealth in France to Francis I and Charles V. In addition to ~~making alliances~~ <sup>maneuvering</sup> around the possibilities of making alliances with Francis I and Charles. ~~However~~ <sup>At face</sup> value it could be interpreted as a success 'however much like the capture of Therouanne and Tournai' in ~~source 5~~ <sup>source 5</sup> it was superficial. The Field of the Cloth of Gold much like the French campaign in ~~source 1~~ <sup>source 1</sup> 'achieved absolutely nothing'. ~~At the Field of~~ The Field of Cloth of Gold was essentially a huge party which further put Henry's crown in which his predecessor Henry VII left him a secure financial legacy was largely squandered. Much like the relative success of Therouanne and Tournai in which ~~Henry~~ the financial cost outweighed the small amount of prestige.

((b) continued) ~~it brought Henry~~. Thus it can be argued that even when Henry did have some success with foreign policy ~~it either exerted his power it could never fulfil his aim~~ it was superfluous and the financial costs outweighed the benefits.

Overall ~~so~~ all the sources in combination can be used to argue that ~~the~~ Henry's foreign policy was not successful. All the sources, in particular source 5 do show that there was success, however they couldn't fulfil all the criteria that makes a foreign policy 'successful'. Source 6 ~~only~~ ~~subtly~~ comes the closest through ~~the~~ the Treaty of London exerting power and making allies. However sources 4 and 5 largely contradict Henry asserting his power instead ~~disparaging~~ ~~the~~ offering a perspective that he was being undermined and his adventures were too costly for England's meagre resources, thus not successful.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a secure level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The introduction, whilst lacking reference to the sources, does demonstrate higher level thinking by defining the nature of success and by highlighting an opinion that Henry failed on both personal and historical terms. The first section of the answer is focused on Henry's failures, using detailed own knowledge to test the views in sources 4 and 5 and reaching a judgement that Henry's wealth was too limited to allow him to pursue a successful foreign policy. The candidate then proceeds to consider the aspects of the foreign policy that could be considered to be a success, using source 6 to consider the success of the Treaty of London. The response sustains the integration of sources and knowledge to engage in the argument and reach judgements. The conclusion is reached by using the sources in combination. Overall, this response is analytical with explicit focus maintained on the question and reasoning developed from the sources which is used to underpin the analysis.

## QUESTION 1bii

This was less popular than bi, but many of the best responses were produced by candidates answering this question. The best responses were able to offer in depth knowledge of Cromwell's use of Parliament as well as showing depth of knowledge on the role of Cranmer, Anne Boleyn and the issue of the pregnancy/male heir. Such candidates were able to make good use of the sources, both for identifying the different factors and for developing a comparative analysis as to the key figure in driving the Break with Rome. Candidates made use of their knowledge to test the opinions in the sources and to engage in debate. These candidates were able to access level 4 for both assessment objectives. Some candidates struggled to explore the role of Cromwell beyond the source material. These candidates were more comfortable and detailed in their comparison of the importance of Anne Boleyn's pregnancy and her role within the Reformation than that of Cromwell and Cranmer. Some responses did not distinguish between the Break with Rome and the Reformation, and provided accounts of varying depth on the religious reforms from 1535 which did not address this question.

•(b) ii.) S7 implies that Thomas Cromwell was the driving force in the Break with Rome as he was the one who made Henry's ideas 'practicable', he was the one who actually implemented the policies leading to 'The Break with Rome'. S8 suggests that Thomas Cromwell was the 'driving force' and that Henry was just a 'supported'. He was the 'organiser' of the major attack on the Church. S9 doesn't even reference Cromwell at all it focuses entirely on the appointment of Cranmer giving the reason for it as 'the divorce', thus showing the divorce was a key driver not Cromwell.

S7 presents Cromwell as the man behind the scenes carefully orchestrating policies in order to see Henry's ideas come to life. 'He took the ideas and made them practicable'. By him passing the Act of Appeals not only did it allow Cranmer to make decisions on the King's Great Matter but also prevented Catherine of Aragon from being able to question any decision made, she could no longer 'appeal' to Rome, the case would have to be heard at English courts and thus the outcome of an annulment was obvious. S7 though does remind us that the original ideas were Henry's, if he did not desire an annulment there would be no need for Cromwell to actually make them into practice which led to the Break with Rome. This suggests that while Cromwell might be the driving force to creating the outcome of the Break with Rome he did need the reasons why which Henry supplied. Consequently S7

implies that both Henry's reasons for obtaining the divorce were the foundations that Cromwell could then use to drive the Acts leading eventually to the Break with Rome.

S8 lessens the value that Henry played in the eventual 'Break'. He sees Henry as merely 'a supporter' of the 'well organised' attack on the Church. Cromwell being the same reformist evangelist he was would probably have rather gone straight to the Break with Rome than have to implement all the other policies to put 'stranger people' on Rome. This implies that as Henry desired the annulment probably through the Pope and Rome that it was actually the refusal of the Pope to grant the annulment that drove Henry to have to break with Rome. The same also <sup>offers</sup> the reason of Anne Boleyn's pregnancy in December of 1532. Catherine of Aragon in the late 1520s was 42 years old and consequently she was unlikely to bear any more children, this was worry for Henry as he did not have a male heir to continue his Tudor dynasty with. He had Mary but she would tend to be difficult in the succession of a female to the crown.

When Anne fell pregnant, Henry had the male heir (or so he thought) and subsequently he needed the divorce to come as quickly as possible, in order to secure the validity of his newborn 'son'. Once she fell pregnant by early 1533 many Acts had been put in place thus allowing Cromwell to validate the legitimacy of Anne and Henry's secret marriage and consequently the legitimacy of Anne's newborn baby. The pregnancy of Anne meant Henry had to obtain the divorce any way he could, thus the Break with Rome. Cromwell had nothing to do with his factor!

S9 was a letter written by the Imperial Ambassador, due to his religious faith and background he was a firm supporter of Catherine of

((b) continued) Aragon and heavily against the 'where' Anne Boleyn. Thus he would probably want to present her in the worst <sup>light</sup> ~~the~~ this blame her and the 'marriage' for the reasons behind the Break with Rome. As much as Chapuys may be attempting to put on Anne and the marriage to present her as being the problem, it does not mention any other factors that contributed to the Break. Henry would have only been able to promote Cromwell to Archbishop with the Act of Act in conditional restraint of Annates which was organised by Cromwell. He needed Cromwell to allow him to have this new marriage. Thus reducing the reliability of his source as Chapuys only hinted in on one source which repeated his opinions on the Great Matter, that the marriage and Anne were the problem.

S8 on the other hand gives a more complete view, Murphy mentions both Cromwell's influences on and up to the Break with Rome and the King's influences leading to such an event. He even adds a new point not considered by the other 2 sources, the pregnancy of Anne Boleyn. However due to when S9 was written only less than a month after Anne fell pregnant, it is unlikely Chapuys knows of the pregnancy but the 'hard to refer to' implies that Henry does know and that's why the Break had to happen so quickly.

S7 mentions the contributions of both Cromwell and Henry, Henry with the ideas and Cromwell with the actual implementation, but this source does not have a completeness issue because in every its weight when answering this question, it explains how a number of combination of factors led to the eventual Break with Rome.

Overall just as S7 and S8 point, Cromwell was one of the driving forces in the Break with Rome, he was the 'organiser' and was the one that put Henry's ideas into action and made them 'practicable'.

~~Without the 'Act of Appeals and Act of Annates' Henry would not be able to appoint Cromer and additionally his divorce would not have been valid along with the title.~~

Without Cromwell's 'Act of Annates' as mentioned in S2, Henry would not have been able to appoint Cromer and without his Cromwell's 'Act of Appeals' he would not have been able to annul Henry's first marriage and legitimise his second. However Cromwell would only have been able to put these Acts in place if Henry actually denied the annulment and patriarchy at such 'haste'. This 'haste' needed for a quick solution to the matter was due to the pregnancy of Anne Boleyn. Cromwell provided a force, Henry provided the reason and Anne's pregnancy provided the haste for a solution.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The position of the sources is outlined in the introduction and the candidate identifies Henry as an alternative driving force to Thomas Cromwell. The candidate begins by examining the role of Cromwell, arguing from source 7 and testing with knowledge. The candidate makes a good point, stating that Cromwell needed the reasons supplied by Henry and draws out the implications from source 7 about the different roles played by Cromwell and Henry. The candidate uses source 8 to develop the significance of Anne's pregnancy and develops this in some detail from own knowledge. The way in which the candidate refers back to the given factor when making judgements about the significance of other individuals in the break with Rome is a strength in this response. This is demonstrated in the judgements drawn from the evidence in source 9 about the role of Cranmer. Overall this is a focused response. The knowledge offered on Cromwell is a little light but it is argued convincingly from the sources whilst the knowledge offered on Anne's pregnancy and the annulment is in some depth.

## Question 2

### QUESTION 2a

There were some excellent responses to this question. Candidates used the sources highly effectively to establish a two sided argument. Cross referencing was detailed and developed by inferences, and the provenance of the sources was used to bring the response to a judgement by considering the weight of the evidence. Some of the best responses were able to draw out the evidence of differing popularity among the varied social and religious groupings. Other excellent response drew out arguments from the date of source 12. Most candidates, however, as also demonstrated in answers to 1a, do not extend their analysis to look at the weight of the evidence and as such they are limited to level 3. Weaker candidates used the sources individually, picking out and commenting on the surface features of the sources without developing the cross references required for level 3.

(a) How far do the sources suggest that Elizabeth had the support of her people in the last years of her reign

Source 10 strongly suggest that Elizabeth had the support of her people in the last years of her reign. This is strongly contradicted by source 11 and 12 which show nobility being unsatisfied with Elizabeth (source 11), and this is backed up by source 12 which show how Elizabeth's people may become increasingly agitated at her greed for subsidies when the poor cannot afford to pay such a tax. However, source 12 also slightly agrees with source 10 because it shows discontent could spread but it has not yet, so thus far ~~per~~ one can infer people still support Elizabeth.

Source 10 strongly indicates that people fully support Elizabeth in the last years of her reign, 'your most devoted subjects and servants', and shows no indication otherwise. Source 12 partially agrees with source 10 because it states 'we shall breed discontent in the people'; this suggests at this ~~per~~ moment in time there is not discontent in the people, therefore ~~one~~ could infer that even in the last years of her reign, people are still loyal to and support

((a) continued) Elizabeth.

However, source 12 could also be seen to contradict source 10 as it suggests that soon there will be discontent within her people, meaning in her years to come (the last years of her reign?) Elizabeth will not fully have the support of her people. They may see her as greedy because she is requesting triple subsidies to be paid over three years, when she knows there is vast poverty across her land, 'the poor man's rent is such that they are not able to afford it'.

The idea that Elizabeth may not fully have the support of her people in her later years suggested by source 12 is backed up by source 11. This states that the nobility nor the poor are impressed with Elizabeth, 'her Majesty is not generous and is slow to relieve their impoverishment'. This statement directly correlates with the negative points from source 12.

However, source 11 may not be the most reliable and therefore valuable of the sources because it is written by a Catholic sympathiser who is therefore ~~mostly~~ most likely biased against Elizabeth for her balanced religious settlement, and he is trying to gain improved treatment for <sup>from James</sup> ~~Charles~~ when he becomes King so he is buttering up James, who most likely doesn't like Elizabeth because she killed his mother, by attacking Elizabeth, and by showing all she has done wrong by losing the support of her people it shows James that he should gain the support of his people e.g. by introducing laws with Catholic tendencies. This therefore makes source 11 less

((a) continued) ~~is~~ reliable and then perhaps less useful than sources 10 and 12.

Although, the question dictates Elizabeth's popularity at the

end of her reign whereas source 12 is written 10 years before she died so one could suggest it is not exactly the last years of her rule in 1593, and therefore the situation from 1593 to Elizabeth's last years may have changed therefore making source 12 less useful than source 10.

In conclusion, source 10 and partially source 12 suggest Elizabeth did have the support of her people in the last years of her reign. However, source 11 and partially source 12 suggests that Elizabeth did not fully have the support of her people in the last years of her reign. Sources 11 and 12 are less reliable than source 10, therefore suggesting that Elizabeth did have the support of her people towards the end of her reign.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a level 4 response. The position of the sources is clearly outlined in the introduction in some detail. The candidate focuses on the skill of cross referencing throughout the response. There is an insightful inference from source 12 made at the bottom of the first page of the response regarding Elizabeth's popularity in 1593 and the extent to which it might change later. The candidate considers the provenance of sources 11 and 12 and uses their weight to reach a judgement. The candidate does not consider the provenance of sources 10 and this is a weakness in the answer, but level 4 skills are demonstrated and the response fully deserves to be placed in level 4.

### Question 2bi

This question was marginally less popular than bii. Overall, it was effectively answered with good integration of knowledge and sources. Candidates had been very well prepared for this question and the level of own knowledge was impressive, ranging across factors to offer well organised arguments. Candidates used the sources to identify James' handing of parliament over the Union, financial problems, the treatment of favourites, and questions over divine right. Detailed own knowledge and sources were fully integrated and judgement reached. In common with all the part b questions though, some answers did tend to drift into narratives or a source-by-source approach. Students do need a greater awareness of the requirement for focused, analytical writing. Some responses to bi showed that there is still a tendency for some candidates to just extract information from the sources. Many candidates accessed level 3 but needed further development of conclusions and stronger argument to achieve level 4. A minority of candidates lost focus and brought in issues of foreign policy, whilst some of the weaker responses focused almost entirely on James' extravagance and his financial problems and thus produced an unbalanced response.

\* (b) i) Do you agree <sup>with the view</sup> that James' handling of domestic issues was effective in the years to 1618?

Yes: ~~the Union~~ Parliament support, Religion, paternalism  
No: economy, Basilion over parliament

King James I arrived in England in 1603 following the death of his predecessor Elizabeth. In the years to 1618, he tackled a number of domestic issues, such as controlling Parliament, religion, ~~state~~ and the economy, all of which were handled with varying degrees of success. ~~however it must ultimately be seen that I:~~ As a set, Sources 13, 14 and 15 ultimately support the view that James was unsuccessful in his handling of these issues.

James I could be considered successful in his handling of the creation of a stable Union, as shown in Source 10. Source 10

states that James "at the time of the debates of the Union, ... showed remarkable patience". This can be corroborated by the fact that although James ~~viewed~~ <sup>viewed</sup> the creation of a Union between his two countries as an ultimate goal, he took limited action ~~as~~ when great resistance was shown, for example, the Five Articles of Perth, ~~the Act~~ which set out unified practices of religion <sup>in England and Scotland</sup>, such as private communion, and kneeling prayer, was only passed in 1618, 13 years after his royal declaration in 1603 declaring himself King of Great Britain. By showing restraint in his ~~to~~ actions, James was held in "an especially favourable light". ~~In addition to this, James' ability to combat~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~nationalism~~ ~~that~~ ~~had~~ ~~governed~~ ~~Elizabethan~~ ~~policy~~ ~~led~~ ~~to~~

Moreover, James' dealings with religion led to a great amount of support as he ~~dealt~~ dealt with rising concerns over Catholicism in the years to 1618, as shown in some 10. Again, James' "patience" with politicians and the people can be seen justly in his dealings with the Military Petition, which was delivered to James in 1603 as he travelled south to London, a petition for the banning of religious songs.

and other associated actions, & signed by 1000 members of the clergy James' decision to hold the Hampton Court Conference in January 1604 in response and allow debate about the issues, as well as coming to decisions such as the creation of the King James Bible (published 1611) corroborates some 13's suggestion that James was "decisive". Further legislation such as the Declaration of Sports in 1618 further persuaded the Puritanical ~~and~~ House of Commons and ensured uniformity of religion throughout the country by listing acceptable pursuits for the Sabbath Day, and ultimately show that James was successful in his dealings with the domestic issue of religion.

However, there were also ~~many~~ many other domestic issues that James had less success with, such as grain and the economy, as shown in sources 14 and 15. Source 14 states that James' "inability to curb his extravagance, or support reforms" led to great issues, which is also demonstrated in source 15 which is a negative response from Parliament to James' desire of his "right to levy impositions". This can be ~~corroborated~~ corroborated by the fact that James' ~~over~~ extravagant aid led to a number

a domestic issues - James spent £185,000 on jewels alone in 1603-1612, which is more than the ~~amount~~ given total amount given in subsidies in the Parliament of 1610. Source 14 also mentions ~~the~~ James' failure to "control the pension list" and indeed in 1611,  $\frac{1}{6}$  of household spending was on pensions for the Villiers family. ~~Although James promised his fourth treasurer Cransfield that he "would not make every day Christmas", essentially~~ By 1606, James was £816,000 in debt, despite only having £350,000 debt left by Elizabeth in 1603, and this was a great domestic issue that he failed to solve by 1618.

Moreover, James' aversion to gradual reform was a great issue, as evidenced in sources 12 and 13. ~~Source 12 states that~~ Both sources state the "corrupt" nature of the gradual system in James' reign, and James' ~~inability~~ inability to reform led to a severe lack of success in parliament.

This can be corroborated by the failure of the 1610 contract, where Parliament granted James an annual stipend of £200,000 a year in return for the loss of ~~some~~ rights such as purveyance, which failed

is ~~it~~ mainly due to James' anger at the idea of losing power. This can be further demonstrated in source 15, where James forbade Parliament from discussing "your Majesty's right of imposing duties".

Ultimately, James' casual spending and reluctance to institute financial reform led to a lack of success in the domestic issue of the economy.

James' strong belief in his own divine right to rule led to a number of domestic issues, such as dissolution of parliaments and a strong disconnect between James and his people, as shown in sources 14 and 15.

Source 14 states that "James' rule ~~sp~~ opened up a split" and source 15 ~~is based~~ comes ~~as~~ as a result of James' anger at the infringement of his royal prerogative.

~~James ~~the~~ wrote two~~ This can be corroborated by the fact that James wrote two tracts on his own divine right to rule, Basilicon Doron and The True Lawes of Free Monarchies. These beliefs led to ineffective handling of domestic issues, particularly within parliament, as James was unwilling to listen to the views of 'lesser' subjects, on issues such as James' "imposing duties" as shown in source 15, as he viewed it as an infringement of

his royal prerogative. James' repeated assertions that certain domestic issues were not to be discussed led to great divisions in the years to 1618 as James disconnected with parliament and his ~~people~~ people.

~~Another area ~~was~~ where James was ineffective~~  
In addition to this, James' inability to control ~~the~~ apparent favouritism was a great domestic issue, as shown in source 14.

This can be evidenced by the fact that James favoured a number of courtiers far beyond others, as shown in source 14, where it states that James "alienated a significant proportion of the country" by overt favouritism of a <sup>select</sup> few, such as George Villiers, Buckingham. James showered Buckingham with gifts and titles, and promoted many members of his family, such as his brother in law, to significant positions within court, further alienating other members of the gentry. Although there were no ~~any~~ major uprisings in the years to 1618, James' favouritism led to growing discontent in the gentry, and ultimately to a growing lack of support. James' failure to address this favouritism in the years to 1618 meant that James was ultimately ~~unsuccessful~~ unsuccessful in his dealings with court.

Moreover, although James had limited go-mentioned success with placating ~~the~~ Parliament in with regards to the Union, no Union was created until long after 1618, so James was therefore somewhat unsuccessful in the domestic issue of the Union.

It must be therefore concluded that despite limited success in the area of religion, James was ultimately ineffective in <sup>handling</sup> dealing with domestic issues, as shown in particular by sources 14 and 15. The issues of the economy, divine right, the court and, to some extent, the Union, were respectively dealt with, and so James' policies were therefore unsuccessful in these areas.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The candidate provides a brief overview and a judgement in the introduction. The candidate uses source 13 (erroneously labelled source 10) and integrates it with own knowledge, examining James' success in the debates on the union and in religious issues and reaches a judgement on these aspects of the domestic policy. The candidate then considers James' failures using sources 14 and 15 to develop sound reasoning. One strength in this answer is the range of issues the candidate examines. In considering James' failures, there is reference to financial problems, the relationship with Parliament and James' belief in divine right as well as the problems caused by the king's favourites. Overall this is an excellent response with sustained focus on the question maintained throughout.

## Question 2bii

This answer was slightly more popular than 2bi and there were some good answers. Many candidates seemed to have a detailed knowledge of disagreements over foreign policy and were able to compare the extent of the breakdown in the reign of James and Charles. These candidates were also able to draw effectively on the sources and their own knowledge of other factors like Charles's personality, Buckingham and finance to produce strong arguments. The best answers were able to link factors together and used the sources to support and challenge points they made. The main weakness was that knowledge was sometimes applied too descriptively rather than analytically. Weaker responses were also more likely to have focused only on the breakdown of the relationship in the reign of Charles, having not considered the time frame carefully.

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

(ii)  
\*(b) In the years 1621-29, the relation between Parliament and the Crown continued to deteriorate. This was partly due to their disagreement over foreign policies, as S.16 strongly suggests and is also pointed out by S.17. On the other hand, S.16, 17 and 18 all suggest other factors that led to the breakdown of relationship. Overall, though ~~it~~ the disagreement of over foreign policies was a key factor of partly responsible for this ~~be~~ breakdown, it is arguably religion that had ultimately led to this disagreement.

Firstly, foreign policies seemed to be the focus of dispute between the Crown and Parliament. S.16 most strongly supports this argument, pointing out that since James 'would not support an expedition to the Palatinate' and 'would not undertake any other form of military operation', this caused 'growing tension'. Yet in contrast, ~~S.12~~ though S.17 points out that there were 'years of peace abroad' (which the MPs appeared to dislike), the 'Parliaments of 1621 and 1624' were 'so much happier than those of 1626 and 1628'. From our knowledge of James' foreign policies, ~~it~~ it may be explained

why his policies caused dispute within Parliament. James was arguably a peace-maker, especially (b) continued) as he promoted the ~~see~~ reversion of hatred between Britain and Spain. The Treaty of London (1604) ~~is~~ offered to reopened trade between the two countries. He even ~~attempt~~ attempted to negotiate a Spanish match for his son Charles. This created dispute due to the fact that many MPs in the Commons were anti-Catholic and pro-Protestant. What's more, James refused to help his son-in-law Frederick, out during the Thirty Years War and get him back his kingdom (the Palatinate). This signalled to the MPs that the King was not going to fight for their ~~own~~ belief and religion. However, ~~the~~ the contrasting view that S.12 provides contradicts to the fact that after 1626, the Commons should be appeased by the ~~own~~ participation in the war against Spain, yet but in fact was more disappointed. This ~~has~~ has to do with the 'foreign disasters' (S.17) which during the war under Charles, foreign policies were ~~also not well~~ ~~impe~~ did not gain the effect the MPs wanted. This was largely due to the failing expedition carried out by Charles. Ironically, therefore, though Parliament should be happier ~~with~~ under Charles' foreign policies, ~~they~~ it was further more disappointed. Nevertheless, though they differed under James' and Charles' reign, foreign policies remained a focus of the dispute between the Kings and Parliament.

agreements may be seen also as a major factor for disagreement, particularly more over in Charles' reign.

S. 16 already suggests that the 'puritan outlook on foreign affairs' was in fact, <sup>a</sup> religious disagreement between ~~the Crown~~ <sup>James</sup> and Parliament.

This disagreement aggravated ~~it~~ under Charles, as S. 17 suggests that 'different religious moods prevailed before and after 1625', which the 'introduction of Arminianism' brought 'tensions'.

S. 18 further resonates this fear of Arminianism, as 'Whoever shall seem to extend or introduce popery or Arminianism, shall be taken as an enemy to this kingdom'. This source is ~~strong~~ strong in its weighting, since it was a direct protestation from the Commons on ~~the~~ religious issue, and the ~~per~~ harsh tone of this ~~at~~ source ('enemy of the kingdom') further hammers their ~~dis~~ discontent with Charles' religious policies.

Indeed, <sup>the puritanism</sup> ~~these sources~~ S. 16 points out matches up with our knowledge that James was lenient with Catholics.

Upon his succession in 1604, he reduced recusant fines, appeasing the English Catholics. Repressive laws against them was also relieved <sup>for a</sup> short period of time when James was negotiating for the Spanish marriage and later the French match. This directly

((b) continued) contradicted with the more ~~anti-Spanish~~ <sup>Thus this gave rise to the conflict over foreign policies as well</sup> ~~and anti-Catholic~~ <sup>voices in Parliament.</sup> On the

other hand, however, James was particularly careful in not promoting Arminianism. He sent delegates in 1618 to the Synod of Dort ~~to~~ to support the anti-Arminianism.

stand. He was careful throughout his reign not to promote Arminians such as Montagu and Laud. In stark contrast, the religious dispute with Parliament became more acute under Charles. Firstly, his marriage to the Catholic French princess brought discontent during his first Parliament. Secondly, his promotions of Laud to Bishop of London (1628) and Montague to Bishop of Chichester (1628) brought considerable fear of pro-Arminianism ~~in~~ regarding the Crown's religious tendency. It is unsurprising therefore, to see that the MPs protested so violently in 1629 (S.18). ~~The focus of religious issues in fact, religious issues under James also thus, religious disagreement was a particularly important factor of the breakdown of relationship, <sup>during</sup> ~~part~~ Charles reign in particular.~~

((b) continued) Despite foreign and religious disagreements, the dispute over finance was also acute. S.16 points out that there was a need for the 'Subsidy Act' to 'create a compromise' over 'own policies'. This is echoed in S.18, as during Charles' reign 'whoever shall advise the changing of the subsidies of tonnage and poundage not being granted by Parliament, shall be considered... an enemy to this kingdom'. The desperate need of the Subsidy Act in S.16 can be matched up with the fact that James was desperately short of cash, partly due to the war but moreover due to his excessive spending. His court was overly lavish, with quite suppress wasting food and monetary

rewards given out ~~was~~ carelessly ( £68,000 was handed out ~~in~~ (1603-07). James faced an ~~unlapped~~ ~~behind~~ insufficient and inefficient financial system too, which ~~led~~ <sup>made</sup> it hard to collect enough tax. Thus by 1620, his debt had accumulated to £900,000. No wonder did Parliament attached several side acts to the Subsidy Act, including James' ~~first~~ a reluctant agreement to the Monopolies Act (cancelling many of the monopolies given). This financial crisis made it even harder for Charles. Given that he had a war to finance, the ~~two~~ two subsidies Parliament gave in 1625 ~~was~~ <sup>he retreated to collect forced loan in 1627, leading to</sup> ~~was simply not enough.~~ And the restriction on tonnage and poundage (S. 18) eventually, led to ~~his~~ <sup>the</sup> end of ~~his~~ <sup>the</sup> toleration ~~or~~ with Parliament in 1629. Still, ~~the~~ <sup>((b) continued)</sup> the dispute over cash under Charles also had to do with other disagreements, such as foreign politics and religious issues, which ~~led~~ led to the MPs pulling the purse-string ~~to~~ in order to compel the King to do what they asked for. Nevertheless, financial problems ~~particular~~ (mainly caused by James) aggravated as Charles disagreed with the MPs over numerous other issues.

Finally, the treatment of court favourites, most in particular with the Duke of Buckingham, caused disagreement. S. 17 points out that 'Charles and Buckingham' were responsible for the tension which these conflicts imposed on ~~the~~ English Society'. ~~On~~ S. 18, as it suggests the outlaw of promoting Arminianism, may also be referred to the fear of growing influence of people such as Buckingham over ~~the~~ religious.

policies. Indeed, S.18 is supported by the fact that in 1626, Buckingham openly promoted Arminianism during the York House Conference, which led to much paranoia among the MPs during the Parliament of that year. ~~He was also corrupted during both James' and Charles' reign.~~ Though ~~by~~<sup>in</sup> 1628, he was assassinated, this fear is evidently present still in 1629. He controlled royal favour during both James' and Charles' reign, which his corruption led to

((b) continued) discontent among the MPs. ~~to~~ The 'foreign adventures' in S.17 ~~as~~<sup>may</sup> also be attributed to him, as his leadership in the Cadiz expedition and later La Rochelle expedition led to complete disasters on ~~the~~ overseas battlefields. The ~~arm~~ troops had not even get to shore before they were either drunk (in Cadiz) or fared with ladders five feet short (in La Rochelle)! These brought dispute over whether Buckingham should be impeached, which was aggravated during Charles' Parliaments. Though James also protected his favourite from impeachment in 1620, Charles' defence of Buckingham led Parliament to dictate over tonnage and poundage, as well as not giving any subsidies in 1626. Arguably, though, it continued to be the case that religious views ~~and~~ ~~are~~ ~~to~~ ~~be~~ ~~the~~ ~~say~~ in the root of the problems around Buckingham. Thus, though he was a centre of disagreement, religious dispute may as well be at the heart of this problem.

((b) continued) In conclusion, it may be suggested that foreign policies, <sup>mainly</sup> arose disagreement between the Crown

and Parliament 1621-29. Yet this should be dealt with more examination into the problem. Though S. 16 and 17 strongly supports this view, it was arguably religious dispute that led to this problem. S. 17 ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> 18 most starkly pointed out this issue, as particularly S. 18 carries a good weighing, as seen in the ~~ex~~ exclaiming and harsh criticism of Arminianism by the MPs, suggesting they were really concerned. The nullity of ~~per~~ <sup>per</sup> ~~strong~~ <sup>strong</sup> and ~~in~~ <sup>in</sup> protestation over Buckingham, as we can see, ~~is~~ <sup>are</sup> also largely due to this ~~po~~ <sup>po</sup> disagreement. Charles in particular, ~~po~~ <sup>po</sup> created this dispute over religion. Thus, though foreign policy were ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> important, it was inevitably religious disagreement that led to the breakdown of relationship between Parliament and the Crown, 1621-29.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a level 4 response for both assessment objectives. The candidate uses the sources in the introduction to identify the given factor of foreign policy and an alternative, religion, as being responsible for the breakdown of the relationship between king and parliament. The sources are used effectively to explore the importance of foreign policy. They are tested with securely developed and detailed own knowledge. There is a real appreciation of the time period set and the candidate covers issues in both the reigns of James and Charles. The alternative significances of religious and financial disputes are explored in depth and the roles of James and Charles are considered. Finally the candidate examines the role of Buckingham, again ensuring that the whole time period is covered. Overall this is an outstanding response which explores the question through both sources and extensive knowledge and reaches a substantiated judgement which is fully supported.

## 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 set phrases such as 'using the source as a set', without actually engaging in that task.

### 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. Weaker candidates work through sources sequentially. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
- Provenance should be integrated within the argument and decisions need to be made on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the sources. 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 and avoid labelling a source as both reliable and unreliable without coming to any judgement on its worth.
- The best responses cross reference not only the content of the sources, but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh 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. Weaker responses usually relied very 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. Sources should be used to develop lines of argument and reasoning rather than used for information to develop a descriptive answer.
- 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 the time period specified and that they maintain the focus throughout their answer. They should 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