



# Mark Scheme

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE AS  
In History (6HI02) Paper 2A

Paper 2A: Early Modern British History: Crown and  
Authority

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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).

## **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)

Summer 2017

Publications Code 6HI02\_A\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## General Marking Guidance

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

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

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

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

## **GCE History Marking Guidance**

### **Marking of Questions: Levels of Response**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level**

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

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

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

## 6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

### Part (a)

Target: AO2a (8%)

(20 marks)

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

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

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

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

## Part (b)

### Target: AO1a and AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

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

### AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

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

(40 marks)

### AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

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

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

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

	<p><b>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p><b>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks</b> As per descriptor.</p> <p><b>High Level 4: 23-24 marks</b> The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>
--	--

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

**AO2b (16 marks)**

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

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

## Unit 2 Assessment Grid

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

### Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

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

## A1 Henry VIII: Authority, Nation and Religion, 1509–40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the stated view. Source 3 seems to offer the greatest support for the view that Henry believed his marriage was against God's laws and hence invalid (<i>'if this marriage be good, many learned men do doubt'</i>). Both Sources 2 and 3 strongly imply that there was a question as to the validity of the marriage, because Catherine had previously been married to Henry's brother, Source 3 declaring that Catherine was <i>'both wedded and bedded'</i> by Arthur whilst Henry's claim (<i>'I have so long lived in adultery to God's great displeasure'</i>) in Source 2 demonstrates his religious scruples and the grounds for an annulment. The sources can be used to argue against the stated view. Source 1 (<i>'would have experienced greater satisfaction had it been a son'</i>) implies that Catherine's failure to produce a male heir for Henry was the root cause of the desire for an annulment and this can be cross-referenced with Source 2 with Henry's comment that he had <i>'no true heir of my body'</i> thus demonstrating that Henry's hopes in 1516 had not been borne out by time (<i>'if it was a daughter this time, by grace of God the sons will follow'</i>).</p> <p>Candidates cross-referencing sources and exploring such issues beyond face value can reach Level 3 and beyond. Inferential skills and consideration of provenance may also be developed through considering both the degree of and the reasons for the differences between the sources. Candidates may argue that Source 3 is deliberately toned down for the Parliament and that the emphasis is placed upon a widespread concern over the validity of the king's marriage <i>'for the safety of his realm'</i> rather than the focus on Henry's views alone and should thus be used cautiously, whilst Henry in Source 2, was bound to argue that the marriage was invalid and is likely to have been seeking to persuade others to accept his opinion, and is thus also problematic. Taken as a set Sources 2 and 3 do imply that Henry expected his opinion to gain support among the governing classes. Source 1 may be considered as reliable, written by an outsider with nothing to gain, but its usefulness may be queried given that it was written 13 years before the other sources. On the other hand, aspects of Source 1 clearly verify their implication that the need for a male heir was paramount and taken with Sources 2 and 3 may be used to query the validity of the claim in the question. Candidates considering valid aspects of source attribution as it relates to the question are cross-referencing the evidence and will achieve Level 3. Responses which reach a judgement developed from this will achieve Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to reach a judgement on the extent to which Henry achieved success in his foreign policy in the years 1512–29. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the view that Henry was successful. Both Sources 4 and 5 offer evidence that identifies success. Source 5 could be used to argue the case that Henry's foreign policy was successful at least in part (<i>'had good reason to think they had been very successful'</i>). This can be developed by the range of successes detailed in Sources 4 and 5 (<i>'captured more than 200 horsemen; 'entrusted themselves to Henry's power', 'events such as those at the Field of Cloth of Gold'</i>).</p> <p>Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge to explore the foreign policy successes possibly referring to the victory over the Scots at Flodden, the importance of the Battle of the Spurs, the Treaty of London, and the Field of Cloth of Gold and Henry's achievement of the title of Defender of the Faith. Candidates may distinguish between military and diplomatic successes and use this to begin to evaluate Henry's successes.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Source 6 to challenge the views provided in Sources 4 and 5 and to argue that, by the mid 1520s, Henry had made little progress in achieving his aims and that the events at Pavia and afterwards were confirmation that Henry had failed. Candidates may develop knowledge of failures including the Second French War, the attempt to raise funds to fight through the Amicable Grant, the diplomatic revolution of the later 1520s and the exclusion of the English at Cambrai. They may refer to Source 4's description of the destruction of Théroutte and link this to arguments even in the early days the victories were rather hollow. In this way candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that extent to which Henry achieved success is open to considerable debate.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p><b>1 (b)</b> <b>(ii)</b></p>	<p>The question asks candidates to reach a judgement regarding the extent of the opposition to religious changes in 1536–37. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that the opposition was widespread. Source 8 offer the strongest evidence in support of the stated view. Source 8 argues that in terms of geography opposition was not only to be found in the north but that '<i>there was widespread sympathy in the southern counties</i>' and develops the example from Cornwall. Candidates may develop this view further using their knowledge to consider the size of the rebel army of Pilgrims recruited from across the north. Source 7 and Source 9 can be used to introduce discussion on the composition of the rebel forces, particularly with regard to their leadership. Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge to explore the roles of men like Lord Hussey and Lord Darcy as well as the charismatic leadership of Robert Aske. They are likely to link their opposition to the animosity felt towards Cromwell's religious changes and the Royal Supremacy. They may consider widespread involvement in terms of social class and use implied references in Sources 7 and 9 to the role of the nobility as an opportunity to discuss the wider class base of the rebels from Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, including the gentry and lower orders as well as nobles such as Lord Hussey whose position in Source 9 is very ambivalent. They may refer to Source 9's implied plea for help from Hussey as a cover for his rebellious activities and an excuse for his involvement.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Source 7 to argue against the stated view and present the case that opposition was narrow in term of social class. They may refer to the claim that the opposition was composed of 'desperate men' who were '<i>out of favour at court</i>'. This can be linked to the geographical location of the rebellion detailed in Source 8 ('<i>confined to Lincolnshire and the ..northern counties</i>'). Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge to explore the roles of men such as Lord Hussey and Lord Darcy who had lost their positions in court and the loyalty of key men such as Suffolk and Norfolk. They may develop comments in Source 7 ('<i>Rebellion was an act of treason and was punishable by death</i>') to examine the factors that would limit opposition and ensure that the majority of nobility and gentry remained loyal to Henry.</p> <p>Candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that the nature and extent of the opposition was complex and varied across the time period.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding nature and extent of opposition with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

**A2 Crown, Parliament and Authority in England, 1588–1629**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>2 (a)</b>	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the stated view. Source 10 seems to offer the greatest support for the view that Elizabeth faced significant challenges over the issue of monopolies, stressing that her issue of monopolies and use of the prerogative to defend them was '<i>damaging to Her Majesty</i>' and '<i>dangerous to the commonwealth</i>'. Both Sources 11 and 12 use the examples of monopolies being repealed to emphasise how unfair they were. However, Source 11 makes it clear that some of these were repealed '<i>on Her Majesty's direct order</i>' while Source 12 emphasises that repeals would be implemented after being '<i>tried according to the law</i>'. Candidates may draw inferences from Source 12 in particular that Elizabeth's prerogative was being questioned and that it was subject to testing in court.</p> <p>The sources can be used to argue against the stated view. Source 12 offers an alternative view that the challenge was not significant since in the same Parliament she was granted '<i>so hasty and free a subsidy</i>' from which candidates may infer that the general attitude of MPs to the monarch was one of loyalty. This point may be cross-referenced with Bacon's defence of the royal prerogative and Elizabeth's right to grant monopolies to inventors in Source 11 so that the issue was not a complete challenge on monopolies but only over a certain type of monopoly where there was a '<i>glut of things</i>'. Candidates cross-referencing sources and exploring such issues beyond face value can reach Level 3 and beyond. Inferential skills and consideration of provenance may also be developed though considering both the degree of and the reasons for the differences between the sources. Candidates may argue that Sources 11 and 12 are deferential to the Queen because of the position held by the speakers and therefore difficult to trust whilst Source 10 appears to be freer to express his views. On the other hand, the fact that both Sources 11 and 12 emphasise that monopolies are being repealed gives some indication that the Queen perceived the strength of opposition against them and her actions in repealing monopolies does indirectly verify the comments in Source 10 about the dangers that monopolies presented to Elizabeth herself. Candidates considering valid aspects of source attribution as it relates to the question are cross-referencing the evidence and will achieve Level 3. Responses which reach a judgement developed from this will achieve Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the reasons for James' financial problems. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that Elizabeth's failure to reform crown finances played the most significant role. Source 13 offers evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 13 could be used to argue the case that the financial problems arose from Elizabeth's financial legacy (<i>'failure to reform taxation'</i>). This can be developed by a number of references in Source 13 (<i>'Neither she nor her chief minister had any remedy for inflation''no revision of the Book of Rates'</i>). Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge to explore the financial problems that Elizabeth bequeathed her successor including the consequences of the sale of crown lands, her failure to update the tax assessment for fear of alienating the governing class and the debt that had arisen from the Spanish war.</p> <p>Candidates may begin their challenge to the stated view by references to the care that Elizabeth took with her finances as indicated in Sources 14 (<i>'the famously tight-fisted Elizabeth'</i>) and 13 (<i>'Elizabeth had left a small surplus'</i>) and so open the argument that James' problems were, as Source 14 suggests, <i>'self-inflicted'</i>. Candidates are likely to use Sources 14 and 15 to challenge the view provided in Source 13 that Elizabeth was primarily to blame, and to argue that James' extravagance was a key cause of his financial woes that led to parliamentary opposition to providing him with funds as implied in Source 14 <i>'Cecil did his best to persuade Parliament to accept a "Great Contract"'</i>. Candidates may develop knowledge of the range of ways in which James caused his own problems including his lavish gifts to favourites, his lifestyle and the cost of maintaining the royal family. They are likely to emphasise that James rejected the demands placed upon him under the Great Contract and hence it failed. They may also refer to the implication in Source 15 that a wide range of people were extorting money from James and to the references in Source 14 that James' treasurers failed him. They may contrast the effectiveness of Salisbury as Lord Treasurer with his immediate successors. They may develop the argument that Parliament played a significant role in the financial problems because it would not provide funds unless James would give up certain feudal dues in return for the Great Contract. They may argue that the sums offered James in return were insufficient to compensate for the loss of feudal dues. In exploring these factors, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that the financial problems in James' reign were driven by a complex web of causes.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons for James' financial problems with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the reasons for the breakdown of the relationship between King and Parliament in the years 1625–29. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that Charles' personality played the most significant role. Both Sources 16 and 17 offer evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 16 could be used to argue the case that Charles' personality was the main factor and that as a result of his inability to communicate effectively, coupled with his belief in the divine right of kings (<i>'he failed to explain his ideas. He was uncompromising'</i>) the relationship with Parliament floundered. This can be linked to the view expressed by Charles in Source 17 (<i>'Parliaments are altogether in my power'</i>). Candidates may draw upon their own knowledge to explore Charles' reticent and highly private nature, his lack of confidence in speech making and his unpreparedness to be king. Candidates may link his beliefs to his religious preference for Arminianism and explore the negative impact this had on his relationship with Parliament. They are likely to link his personality to his behaviour and may refer to the role he played in the final breakdown and the dismissal of Parliament in 1629.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Source 18 to challenge the views provided in Sources 16 and 17 and to argue that there was a wide range of other causes beyond the personality of the King that caused relations with Parliament to breakdown. Candidates may use Source 18 to develop the argument that the role of Buckingham in government and foreign policy and his assassination in 1628 had a significant detrimental effect on the relationship. They may use this as the basis for an argument that Buckingham rather than Charles was chiefly to blame. Candidates may develop knowledge of key issues that led to disputes including the financial grievances detailed in the Petition of Right. They may refer to the development of a vociferous opposition in Parliament and explore their attitude to the King's prerogative, Buckingham, and the royal family, particularly to the Queen, and link this to arguments that MPs in the Commons played a greater role in the breakdown of the relationship. In this sense, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that there were faults on both sides and hence the breakdown of the relationship was brought about by a complex web of causes.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. Whatever line of argument is taken, achievement at the higher levels will be characterised by appropriately balanced use of sources and own knowledge to demonstrate a clear understanding of the reasons for the breakdown of the relationship with Parliament with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom