

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report January 2010

### GCE History 6HI02/A

**ResultsPlus**  
look forward to better exam results  
[www.resultsplus.org.uk](http://www.resultsplus.org.uk)

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

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

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

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



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

**To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit**

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022881

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## GCE History 6HI02 Option A

There were some very good responses to this examination, with a sizeable number of candidates able to combine effective source handling skills with focused deployment of accurate and relevant own knowledge to achieve marks at level 3 and above. It was encouraging to see that many of the issues which had been identified in the summer report as posing problems for students were no longer causes for concern. However, there were still some common errors which undermined the quality of students' work and the purpose of the following comments is to offer some guidance for raising attainment.

1. Some candidates continue to lose marks because they seem unaware of the skills that specific elements of the exam are addressing. Overall 3 assessment objectives are being addressed in the Unit 2 exam; part (a) addresses AO2a (analysis, cross-referencing and evaluation of source material) and part (b) addresses AO1 and AO2b (analysis and evaluation of how issues have been interpreted and represented, in relation to historical context). It is vital, therefore, that students appreciate the differences between these assessment objectives and understand which of the 3 AO's is being tested in the two questions they are required to attempt.

2. The most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively. Occasionally, this was the result of limited vocabulary. However, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. It is important that candidates take time to read the sources, both content and attributions, carefully and precisely. One of the key characteristics of high performing responses to part (a) questions is detailed cross-referencing and this, first and foremost, demands clarity and accuracy in source comprehension.

3. One other area of confusion in the part (a) question surrounds the application of wider knowledge. Candidates cannot be rewarded for wider knowledge included in responses to part (a), since the questions target AO2 only. However, candidates should not ignore the historical context, or 'pretend they know nothing' outside the sources. At best, the placing of sources in a contextual vacuum may lead to a tendency to take them at face value and restrict responses to L1 or L2, or to speculation that is not focused on the defined enquiry. Therefore contextual awareness, especially an understanding of issues and attitudes, should be applied in order to help candidates:

- See the implications of statements within a source and make inferences relating to the enquiry –
- See the significance of the information given in the provenance of a source as a means of interpreting and evaluating the evidence offered by the source content. However, it should be emphasised that any references should be brief, and directly applied to developing arguments from the sources.

Contextual knowledge therefore plays a role in enabling candidates to interpret and evaluate evidence in order to reach higher levels, but it cannot be rewarded by separate marks. A brief reference may be useful in explaining the implications of a particular piece of evidence or the significance of its provenance and therefore support higher level arguments within AO2. Longer passages of contextual knowledge are a waste of time and may actually lead the candidate away from the task – which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources, in order to reach a judgement. However, candidates should not be discouraged from applying contextual awareness in handling the sources.

4. For part (b) questions it is important that candidates appreciate what they are being asked to do. A Part (b) task focuses on combining and integrating evidence from sources with wider knowledge in order to evaluate a given statement or view, and develop a substantiated judgement on this basis. It, therefore, draws on a conceptual understanding that all historical judgements are, in fact, based upon interpretations. Thus, candidates should analyse the evidence of the source material to support and challenge the representation in the question. The sources should be approached as a set and there will be some cross-referencing of evidence between sources and/or between sources and contextual knowledge to develop relevant arguments. At higher levels, conflicting arguments will be evaluated by reference to context and provenance to attempt to establish an overall judgement. However, it is important here that candidates do not engage in formulaic or routine evaluation of provenance. Provenance need only be assessed where it helps to weigh up the quality of the evidence in relation to the claim under investigation. Thus, in the best responses discussion will proceed on the basis of reasoning from the sources and discriminating use of evidence that has been weighed and contextualised to examine conflicting arguments and reach a reasoned conclusion.

5. Both part (a) and part (b) tasks are challenging, requiring candidates to engage in complex cross-referencing and analysis. To meet the assessment objectives effectively requires careful preparation and it is noticeable that more and more of the higher performing scripts include substantial plans. It cannot, therefore, be stressed enough that thorough and detailed planning centred around the source material is a prerequisite for success in this unit.

### Question 1(a)

The vast majority of candidates were able to reach a strong level 2 or higher, through an effective cross reference of the portrayal of Wolsey as found within all three sources. Most responses were able to identify the similarities between Sources 1 and 2, in particular concerning attitudes within the nobility, and contrast this to the more positive view of Wolsey found in Source 3. Many were also able to develop this by appreciating the common ground that did exist between Sources 1 and 3 in considering the merit of his abilities. To a lesser extent some candidates were also able to explore the relationship between Source 2 and 3, such as interpreting Skelton's poem as demonstrating an albeit grudging admiration of his strength, or exploring how the evidence of all three sources relates to the attitudes amongst particular classes towards Wolsey. Candidates who were less successful in handling the sources tended to deal with the sources separately with limited direct cross-referencing, although such responses were fewer than on previous examinations. In reaching the higher levels, many candidates were able to draw upon the attribution of the sources, e.g. considering how the earlier date in Source 3 as a reason why the Venetian Ambassador had such a positive view of Wolsey, or drawing on Skelton's relationship with the Howard family with Source 2. However, some candidates are too hasty in writing off evidence as being unreliable or struggle to consistently apply attribution to the specific evidence as it relates to the question, recognising provenance in a mechanistic manner without really considering where this relates to the evidence given. At the highest level, the strongest responses were effectively able to develop their arguments towards overall judgement that considered the attribution of the sources and the impact this had on the weight of evidence. Whilst such conclusions were varied, the most successful had a logical reasoning that fitted with their examination of the evidence, e.g. successfully arguing that despite concerns with Sources 1 and 2 due to their personal relations with Wolsey, the strength of their bitterness is evidence that Wolsey was indeed arrogant and incurred hatred from many.

(a) As it says in Source 1, Wolsey was a very arrogant and unpopular individual due to his pride as well as his hostility towards the nobility. This hostility is confirmed by Source 2 as Skelton uses language which portrays Wolsey as hostile and abusive towards the nobility. Therefore it is clear that Source 2 supports the view in Source 1 about Wolsey's unpopularity because of his inconsiderate treatment of the nobility. Source 1 states that Wolsey's arrogance and unpopularity arose from hostile treatment of the nobility and Source 2 ~~is states~~ describes how Wolsey treated the nobility. The use of language by Skelton shows how violent and intimidating Wolsey was with the use of words such as "he plucks them by the hood" and "he brings them in such fear. However when analysing the nature, origin and purposes ~~for~~ of the sources, it is clear that the authors may not have been writing what was fact but rather writing their own interpretations which best suited them and their personal opinions of Wolsey. Source 1 was published after Wolsey's fall and so it could seem that Vergil may be writing as accurately as possible, especially as

(a) continued) he ~~is~~ was a contemporary and so was able to see what happened. However due to the fact that Vergil was imprisoned by Wolsey, it is likely that he ~~was~~ portrayed Wolsey in such a negative manner out of spite. Since Wolsey was dead and Henry VIII had lost respect for Wolsey by 1534, Vergil has nothing to be afraid of and so it almost seems as though Vergil was not holding any of his opinions of Wolsey back. Similarly in Source 2, Skelton portrays Wolsey as ~~being~~ hostile towards the nobility because of his close ties to members of the nobility - the Duke of Norfolk. He will probably have first-hand accounts from Norfolk's family about their opinions of Wolsey and so may be writing with the material he had. However given that he was a satirical poet, it is also likely that he chose to portray Wolsey negatively because he would gain a reaction from the public. Therefore it is clear that Source 2 ~~is~~ supports Source 1 in that Skelton describes Wolsey's harsh treatment of the nobility but the motives for the authors to show Wolsey in a negative light differ.

On the other hand it is clear that Source 3 does not really support Source 1. Source 3 portrays Wolsey in a very positive light, describing him as someone who was "extremely just" and that he was



(a) continued) very considerate of the people, especially the poor. This is a very different interpretation of Wolsey as in Source 1, Vergil states that Wolsey was incredibly hostile towards both the "folk and nobility". We can infer from Source 1 that Wolsey did not care about anyone but himself and the king in order to secure his own personal interests, whereas in Source 3 we can infer that Wolsey did care about the English people. Once again we are differing motives for ~~port~~ interpreting Wolsey's behaviour. Source 3 was written by the Venetian ambassador at a time when Wolsey appeared to be the arbiter of Europe. He had also secured his position as papal legate and so the ambassador may only speak of praise for Wolsey because he did not want to upset the Pope or insult Wolsey or the Pope's decisions to make him legate and cardinal. Also 1519 was after the Treaty of London where Wolsey had come across as the peace maker of Europe and so the ambassador may be describing just a selection of "good" deeds done by Wolsey in order to glorify him. Vergil has no need to avoid the truth or his own opinions of Wolsey and so it seems that his own opinion comes across in Source 1. Therefore it is clear that Source 3 does not support Source 1 in that they are two different interpretations of the same man based on



((a) continued) contrasting motives and responses to different events.

It is therefore apparent that source 1 is only supported by source 2. This is likely due to the fact that both Vergil and Shelton held negative opinions of Wolsey for differing personal reasons.

Nevertheless they both show that Wolsey was a very unpopular and arrogant man. Source 3 claims Wolsey to be a considerate man, which is completely different to sources 1 and 2. This will be due to the authors holding contrasting opinions or even writing for different reasons.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The response clearly illustrates some of the issues discussed above in reference to question 1a). The candidate has a clear focus on the question, offering a well developed response considering a range of issues with detailed cross-referencing. A range of skills are demonstrated in analysing the meaning of the sources, drawing inferences from their content, assessing the impact attribution has on them and placing them within a historical context. This is in some respects a lengthier example than may often be found, and is in no means perfect. It does in places over elaborate on historical context, or could do more to directly focus the analysis of provenance towards the specific demands of the question. However, it does reach a judgement that is reasoned through a careful examination of the sources, taking attribution into account and using sources in combination. As such it merits a secure Level 4.

**Question 1(b)(i)**

Candidates opted for the two choices in part b) in roughly equal measures. For 1b(i), there were many good responses with many candidates displaying an impressive grasp of the aims and achievements of Henry's foreign policy. Most responses were able to shape this towards the focus of the question, considering the reasons for the assumed failure. Only a very small minority offered a narrative approach without recognition of the demands of the question, although a discriminating factor was an ability to maintain an analytical focus, with some responses drifting to descriptions of events such as the French campaigns or the Field of the Cloth of Gold. Many candidates were able to use the sources to develop points for and against the claim, although use of own knowledge tended to be stronger on financial constraints and Henry's own aims than on diplomatic developments. Such responses tended to rely on Source 5 to support this factor and so were less successful, in this aspect at least, in linking to contextual own knowledge. Some candidates challenged the assumptions of the question in considering diplomatic successes and or the extent to which policy can be seen as Wolsey's. If such a judgement on the claim was reached through a reasoned examination of the evidence from sources and own knowledge, the highest levels could be reached. One issue that did compromise otherwise sound responses was a tendency in some cases to apply source evaluation skills more suited to a) questions where not needed, or else make generalised assertions about the worth of the work of secondary historians. The strongest responses demonstrated an understanding that the demands within AO2 in the b) question are distinct from those in the a) question, and were, for example, able to identify that the line of argument given within Source 5 sees developments elsewhere as being central to the issue. Responses which considered the given representations and the basis for their arguments were best able to offer an analysis which related this to other evidence towards reaching reasoned judgement.

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

(b) i) PLAN:

- Lack of resources
- Wolsey
- Europe

Source 4 = Europe.

Source 5 = Wolsey

Source 6 = money.

Henry VIII's foreign policy of his early reign initially appeared to be successful with victories in France in 1514. However as events in England concerning money, changed, it is clear that Henry's early foreign policy was destined to fail. However there were other events which occurred in Europe and also Wolsey's rise to power and his instigation of foreign policy may well have been more important or more influential in the failure of Henry's foreign policy from 1514 to 1525.

It was obvious that as soon as Henry took the English throne, he was a man who wanted to fight a war. However war meant very expensive costs to the country. Since his father, Henry VII left England in a reasonably stable economic situation, it seemed that Henry would be capable of achieving his goal of aggressive foreign policy. Between 1514 and 1525, Henry devoted most of the money in the Treasury to the invasion of France as he felt he had a right to the French Crown. Due to his

((b) continued) lavish spending on his policies, Henry was unable to focus on much else due to a lack of economic resources. He was unable to raise armies other than the one fighting in France and what little money he did have available, he spent on building exquisite palaces and on trinkets for himself such as Hampton Court Palace. As it says in Source 6, all the sums that were gained from policies such as the Amicable Grant were already spent on the invasion of France. We can infer from Source 6 that it seemed as if Henry almost wasted all of his available resources on France, meaning he did not have many resources left over on other parts of foreign policy such as his focus on Spain and the Holy Roman Empire. As well as this it is clear that Henry's ~~was~~ economic demands were too high as it says that "some would give but cannot" meaning that people did want to donate to the crown's invasion of France but could not afford to.

¶ Henry could not gain the sufficient funds for ~~these~~ all of his foreign policy and so it would mean that his foreign policy would eventually fail because he would not deal with certain, more important situations and instead devoted the little available resources he had to his invasion of France, which ~~was~~ only seemed to be for his own personal

((b) continued) interest. Source 6's nature, origin and purpose ~~appears to~~ does not seem questionable as Archbishop Warham appears to only be concerned by the resistance to the Amicable Grant and so he is likely to be describing what he sees and hears rather than bringing his own opinion into the argument. Therefore it seems as though Henry's foreign policy failed because he was unable to raise sufficient funds to deal with all of his foreign policy and chose to devote all of his resources to France.

Despite a lack of resources being a key factor in explaining why his foreign policy failed, there appear to be other reasons such as Wolsey's instigation of foreign policy. Wolsey did not wish to wage war in Europe but he felt he had to in order to please Henry. Since Wolsey was Henry's ~~chief~~ chief advisor, and so Henry took Wolsey's advice on foreign policy. ~~Wolsey~~ Wolsey's own personal interests may well have jeopardised ~~the~~ Henry's foreign policy because Wolsey appeared and encouraged Henry to pursue war and military victories in France, such as at Tournai in 1513 rather than guide Henry in the right direction. Despite Wolsey appearing as the arbiter of Europe after the Treaty of London, he had actually worsened relations with Rome due to



((b) continued) him hijacking the Pope's plans for a pan-European alliance against the Turks. Then when Wolsey struck up an alliance with Charles V against Francis I, ignored the Treaty of London, appearing as someone who went back on his word. Therefore it ~~is~~ also seems that Wolsey's instigation of foreign policy is one reason for its eventual failure because he went back on his word and even worsened relations with Rome.

The final factor is the uncontrollable events in Europe between 1514 and 1525. As pointed out by sources 4 and 5, other events within Europe were responsible for the failure of the foreign policy because of their consequences having negative repercussions on England and Henry's ~~the~~ pursuit for England to be the ~~the~~ greatest power in Europe. Henry's invasion of France in 1514 failed due to Maximilian and Ferdinand signing treaties to ~~be~~ not invade France and so Henry had to pull out. This often happened as there were many Anglo-Habsburg alliances in the era that fell through for various different reasons. Also Charles I of Spain's election as Emperor shifted the power in Europe from London to Spain and ~~to~~ Rome.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following is a good response to question 1bi). Overall the candidate has structured an analytical answer which relates well to the focus of the question. The stated issue is examined in sufficient depth, with integrated use of contextual own knowledge with material drawn from the sources. The response is structured around factors, demonstrating an understanding of key issues. Judgement is offered within the response, although this is not always fully reasoned nor are issues fully weighed. Sources are used as evidence, with attempts to analyse. The representations offered are acknowledged, although at times the response becomes a little sidetracked over this. Other responses were certainly found that made greater and more effective use of source material. Nevertheless, the response befitted the level descriptor for level 4 at AO1 and Level 3 at AO2b.

((b) continued) Morris may choose Spain over England as the centre of power because the title of his book is Europe and England and so wants to ~~effect~~ compare England's power and policy to the rest of Europe. Randall is likely to give an accurate interpretation because he was analysing Henry and his government and so highlights the failure of France as a failure for Henry and his government.

Therefore it is clear that a lack of resources was one of several reasons why Henry VIII's foreign policy failed. As mentioned in Source 6, Henry was unable to raise sufficient funds for a successful foreign policy especially if he focussed on France. However there were other factors such as Wolsey's ulterior motives as well as the events in Europe which were as important as a lack of resources and all 3 factors were related to each other somehow.

**Question 1(b)(ii)**

Most candidates demonstrated a sound or better understanding of the English Reformation, and many were able to place Anne Boleyn in an analysis of the causes of this. The majority were also able to consider some of the other factors involved. Many candidates agreed that Anne was the trigger for developments, relating this to aspects of Sources 7 and 9 or contextual knowledge and considering her influence upon Henry and the impact her contact with reformers had. Stronger responses were able to successfully examine the extent to which Henry's concern over his failure to achieve a male heir preceded his relationship with Anne, relating this to an analysis of the representation in Source 8 and exploring the interconnected nature of related factors. Whilst some candidates were able to draw upon Source 9 to identify a range of issues, a significant minority were unable to fully extend many of these with contextual own knowledge. In particular, few were able to go much beyond the source in considering the influence of the reformers named in more detail. Whilst some candidates lapsed into a narrative at times, such as on Henry's divorce or his love for Anne, the vast majority were able to keep a focus on the demands of the question overall. Many were able to shape and essay around the claim in the question. The strongest responses were able to give reasoned weight to their judgements and relate this securely to the interpretations offered in the sources.

### Question 2(a)

2a) This question produced a more varied range of responses than 1a). Candidates who reached the highest levels were able to apply reasoning to examining the evidence over Elizabeth's relationship with her advisers, drawing on attribution to consider both the conflict and agreement between the sources, such as the extent to which Sources 10 and 11 are in agreement. Inferential skills were also applied to consider the meaning of phrases such as 'only favourites' in Source 10, or the nature of Burghley's 'duty' in Source 11. Similarly some responses made good use of the attribution of Sources 11 and 12, considering Burghley's relations with the Queen or Moryson's connection to Essex's replacement. However, some candidates approached the sources sequentially, and so struggled to develop the detailed comparison required for access to Level 3. Some candidates recognised issues surrounding the attribution of sources, although drifted into descriptions of Essex or Cecil, or even assertions over Elizabeth's approach to factions at court. Candidates may note that successful responses do not tend to offer preconceived notions as to the reliability of particular sources based on provenance, more an ability to adjudge its evidence in relation to these attributes. In this way there were differing conclusions drawn regarding sources with equal success, where candidates were able to develop issues such as the nature of Naunton's recollections over three decades after the event and relate this to the impact it has upon the weight of his evidence.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The following is a response which is worth contrasting with that provided above for question 1a). It does demonstrate a sound understanding of some issues and the sources. However, it is limited in offering a direct focus on the demands of the question. All three sources are used, yet in a largely descriptive manner, and cross-referencing is largely left as implicit. There is some evidence of inferential skills, understanding of attribution and context, although these are not sufficiently utilised in a manner required to reach Level 3, e.g. provenance is noted in places and knowledge of relevant people and events are offered, but these are not directly focused towards the demands of the question. Thus the response merited a Level 2.

(a) Elizabeth was a very generous queen to some extent. She often handed out monopolies to her favorite members in the Royal Court. It could be said that she done this to keep them on her side. She was pretty much rewarding them for being good to her. She often handed out monopolies of sweet wines or gave them land. They were however ment to act as advisors towards the queen. We can see from source 10 written by Sir Robert Naunton that her ~~appointment~~ apparent favorites acted more by her rules and judgements rather than by their own will and preference. This shows us here that perhaps she had great authority over them when really it was only because she was 'bribing' them with extraregent gifts. It also states that the main impression of her reign was that she ruled through factions and parties. This is also evidently true. Her privy council was one of the main

((a) continued) ... parties she used she would often rely upon the members to do things for her. For example she had sent the earl of Essex to Ireland to deal with problems originally caused by her. Due to the Spanish Armada in 1588 England had become tight on money. Ireland felt as if they were being rejected as money was not being distributed to them firstly. This was because of the expenses paid out on the war, <sup>therefore</sup> ~~this~~ <sup>resulting</sup> ~~caused~~ in the tyrone rebellion.

In source 12 we can see the outcome of sending Essex to Ireland. After achieving nothing Elizabeth began to get annoyed and had sent him a sharp letter. This resulted in the Essex Rebellion. He had burst into her majesty's bed chamber and therefore been banished from the court.

To some reasoning she managed to stay firmly in charge of her advisors. But as said in source 10 it was all her own doing. She both made, upheld and weakened her parties

(a) continued) as it were her own judgements that were ~~was~~ advised. Lord Burghley made a good point in a letter written to his son Robert Cecil in 1596. From looking at source 11 he claims that he will not pretend to agree with matter in which he differs from his majesty's opinion but will simply obey her commands as a servant and councillor. This shows to us that she may have had a great sense of power and control over her advisors as even they felt as if they were in some way servants and even if they didn't agree with her they would simply just do it. These sources quite strongly agree with the fact she stayed in control of her advisors. She made her own decisions and took whatever outcome they had and dealt with it ~~was~~ whether she was right or wrong.



### Question 2(b)(i)

Most candidates who opted to answer this question were able to make at least sound use of the sources and often detailed own knowledge in shaping a response. A majority were able to structure responses to at least attempt analysis with some focus on the question. Many candidates drew from Sources 13 and 14 in considering James' finances, with some success in relating both how this was raised and distributed in examining the issue of corruption. Source 15 was also used as evidence of both corruption amongst Charles courtiers and immorality, often highlighting the divorce case. Whilst there was a range of acceptable variation in considering the concepts in the stated claim, it was often the candidates who attempted explicit consideration of these who offered the strongest analytical focus, such as exploring the boundaries between corruption and mere extravagance. Many candidates were able to bring in a range of specific own knowledge in examining the stated claim and other factors contributing to hostility, in particular over foreign policy and patronage, with the best integrating this well in analysing the evidence of the sources. However, some responses did drift to generalised accounts of difficulties between James and Parliament, and a small minority did find it difficult in making the distinction between Court and Parliament. Whilst many responses demonstrated a confident understanding of issues surrounding the advisers and favourites at Court, some candidates did go beyond the boundaries of the question in relating events after 1618, in particular concerning the impact George Villiers had on relations with Parliament. Candidates may be minded to consider that a well structured response making good use of evidence from sources which is integrated with well chosen own knowledge will perform better than one which attempts to cover every issue regardless of relevance and focus.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The following response illustrates some of the issues identified regarding question 2b(i), both in terms of strengths and areas that could be further developed. The response has a focus on the issue of hostility and does attempt to come to terms with the stated factor. The response makes extensive use of the sources. At times this is analytical, considering the representation in Source 13 and attempting analysis of source 14, or identifying connections between the evidence and so beginning to integrate them into the response. At other times though this is more on an illustrative level of demonstrating where they support or differ from points raised. The response covers a good range of issues pertaining to the question and at times links to specific own knowledge of these, extending beyond the evidence in the sources. The response is also broadly structured in an analytical manner. However, this is not always consistently reasoned or developed and the integration and depth of own knowledge is not as consistently found. Overall the response merits a good Level 3 on both AO1 and AO2b.

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

(b) James's reign began in 1603 with him succeeding Elizabeth I. ~~He~~ There was hostility towards James from the beginning. In his early years it can be said that his way of ruling was much different to Elizabeth's in his way of controlling court which caused hostility towards him mainly from Parliament as it says in source 13 "The royal court, rather than Parliament, was the main point of contact between the crown and political opinion" This meant Parliament felt they were losing power and influence due to the court. It can be said the actions and corruption in court were the main reason for hostility towards James but there were other factors that influenced this such as his extravagance towards favourites causing jealousy in Parliament much like jealousy of the court being close to James as seen in source 13 with James choosing "Scottish favourite, Robert Carr". Also his extravagance on other things, the year he could be absolutist or turn to Catholicism.

✶

The reputation of court was always a main concern of Parliaments in that James's court was very different to Elizabeth's.

During the first years of his reign James was

((b) continued) seen to be buying his loyalty by ~~not~~ being very generous with patronage source 13 says 'It was also the source of the patronage needed to maintain the nobility and greater gentry.' This caused a lot of hostility towards James as the number of courtiers were rising rapidly and in James's reign there were over ~~40~~ forty courtiers compared to Elizabeth who only had a small amount. This caused many problems in parliament as they did not like the fact there were so many people in court close to James and that James was losing his reliance on them as he only called them for money and later in his reign he doesn't call parliament for eleven years. These concerns on corruption in court can be seen in source 15 as it says 'he needed another Lord Treasurer and regrettably his choice fell on Suffolk whose corruption surpassed anything yet seen.' This shows that people were hostile to James because he favoured the wrong people who were corrupt in court.

In addition source 15 says 'The king's acceptance of this behaviour damaged the reputation of the court.' This shows that hostility was there in the form of the people did not like how James

((b) continued) could accept behaviour in court with scandals of sex, drinking excessively and overall unacceptable behaviour. This again was frowned up by Parliament as it was not how court was supposed to be run. For example source 13 supports this as it says "It was the place where different factions could meet regularly" this was not the reason for court it was to advise the king on different matters and so this again caused hostility towards James. In corroboration with James' choice of how to run court and his choice of favourites source 15 agrees with the idea that court was being misused as it says there were also concerns about the development of a pro Spanish foreign policy because "the Howards were either Catholic or had only a shallow commitment to the Church of England." This again shows the hostility towards James over his choice of courtiers ~~as~~ because if people were ~~ago~~ against the Church of England they were undermining James as he was supreme Governor and so this lack of loyalty shows corruption in court. Also it shows that there were other agendas in court such as promoting other religions such as Arminianism which the Howards could have



((b) continued) been source 15.

However although corruption in court was one of the main reasons of hostility to James there were also other contributing factors such as James's extravagance on most things. Source 14 is a speech by Thomas Wentworth who was an MP showing his views on the Great contract which was brought about by Robert Cecil to find ~~corrupt~~ cooperation between James and Parliament over finance which was a main reason for hostility towards James as his extravagance was out of control. Source 13 says "James may have been unduly extravagant in distributing patronage" this is in conjunction with his spending £4,000 on courtiers in his years of reign and ~~is~~ also with that he spent £36,000 on a royal wardrobe compared to £9,000 in Elizabeth's reign. This caused great hostility from Parliament and so the Great Contract of 1610 was introduced where James was to receive £200,000 per annum as an annual salary. James disagreed and so did Parliament because of James's extravagance source 14 says "when soon as it goes into royal coffers it runs out again". However source 14 may be one sided as it was a speech by

((b) continued) Thomas Wentworth and so he would disagree with the Great Contract because Parliament felt if James had this annual salary they would no longer be called because he only called them for money and due to the decreasing in power because of his reliance in court they feared James would become absolutist source 13 says "King was intent on undermining the powers of parliament" This showed signs of the king ~~not~~ extending his power ~~along~~ and Parliament feared this. This meaning source 14 may not be reliable as Thomas Wentworth as an MP would be one sided in dismissing the Great Contract to save himself giving him a vested interest.

Furthermore other factors such as the king extending his powers by raising money in ways parliament did not agree with source 13 says "but the greatest problem was how he tried to raise the money" this is in reference to James using monopolies to raise money which caused hostility because Parliament did not like him having his own money. Also he had wardship and perbevyance which in 1610 in the Great Contract he was asked to give up causing



((b) continued) further hostility.  
In conclusion I think the main reason for hostility to James was because he was a completely different monarch to Elizabeth. I agree his corruption in the court is one main reason which is shown in both source 13 and source 15 on his indulgement in favourites but also that other factors such as finance and his relations and actions towards parliament also caused hostility in that he was an unruly king and parliament were very assertive causing a clash and hostility.

### Question 2(b)(ii)

There were some very good responses to this question that were able to identify key issues and use factual knowledge and the sources to do very well, with most candidates being able to focus on the reasons for the breakdown of the relationship between King and Parliament. However, use of own knowledge was not always as secure or detailed as on bi), particularly in regard to the impact the Thirty Years War had on relations. Whilst it is perfectly valid for candidates to look elsewhere for explanations, responses at least need to give suitable consideration to an issue that is stated in the claim of the question, evidenced through the sources and outlined in the specification. That said, many candidates made good use of the sources, using Source 16 to reflect on the connection between religious issues and the war or Source 17 in examining the difficulties James faced in acting in response to developments in Europe. The strongest answers, whilst able to identify other factors such as the relationship between Charles and Parliament, the role of Buckingham, and financial, religious and military concerns, often demonstrated an analysis that examined the interlinked nature of these issues. In doing so these candidates were able to carefully select own knowledge developed from issues in the sources, with some considered analysis of the arguments raised by the sources. As with bi), a small minority of candidates needlessly related information from outside the stated period of 1618-29. Only a minority made substantial distinctions between the two monarchs in analysing the breakdown of relations over the time period.

**6HI02 A Statistics**

## Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	38.7	7.6

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	36	32	28
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		23.2	46.4	66.3	83.1	93.7



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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US022881 January 2010

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

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

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

