

Mark Scheme (Results) January 2010

GCE

GCE History (6HI02) Paper A

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.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme 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/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: **020 7190 4784**

January 2010

Publications Code US022864

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

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

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

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

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

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

6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

Part (a)

Target: A02a (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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-5 marks 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>Low Level 2: 6-7 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 8-10 marks 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>Low Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 13-15 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>

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

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

Part (b)

Target: AO1a & AO1b (10% - 24 marks)

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

AO2b (7% - 16 marks)

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

(40 marks)

AO1a and AO1b (24 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material, which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed analytically (i.e. at the focus of the question). The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks 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>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
---	------	---

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

3	13-18	<p>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks 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>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks 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>

A02b (16 marks)

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-4	<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>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 1: 3-4 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed.</p>
2	5-8	<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>Low Level 2: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed.</p>
3	9-12	<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 the sources, although there may be some lack of balance. The response reaches a judgement in relation to the claim which is supported by the evidence of the sources.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 9-10 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 3: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</p>
4	13-16	<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>Low Level 4: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed, but material is less convincing in its range/depth.</p> <p>High Level 4: 15-16 marks 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
Total Marks	24	20	16	60
% weighting	10%	8%	7%	25%

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>Taken at face value the sources are in conflict, with Polydore Vergil accusing Wolsey of greed and arrogance, and suggesting that he was universally hated, while the Venetian ambassador praises his dedication and his achievements. He refers explicitly to his role in the Courts, and to his wider role in domestic government. Skelton's verse supports the claims of Polydore Vergil in relation to the nobility. Responses that demonstrate the conflict at this level can reach L2 if developed and supported by reference to the sources. However, using inference and awareness of provenance, candidates can develop a more complex response. The provenance for sources 1 and 2 shows that the authors are likely to be hostile to Wolsey. Source 3 can be seen as more objective, and therefore weigh more heavily in any judgement. Source 3 and source 1 both agree and disagree. Both suggest that Wolsey took control of affairs and believed that he could manage single-handedly, but source 3 suggests that his confidence was justified. Vergil claims that he was hated by the common people as well as the nobility, but source 3 suggests that this was unlikely given his care for them in the courts. However, his favour towards them may well suggest that he would be hated by the nobility, as implied by Skelton. The poet is deliberately ambiguous about whose 'majesty' they are forced to bow to, and candidates may interpret this in two ways. If they see it as a reference to the King (His Majesty) then Wolsey can be portrayed as serving his master rather than simply being arrogant. However, if the lower case letters (his majesty) are seen as suggesting a reference to Wolsey himself, then the implication of arrogance is strengthened. Either interpretation is acceptable, but candidates who note the ambiguity and the possibility of different interpretations may well offer high level inference and/or the possibility of different judgements. Candidates can therefore demonstrate both agreement and conflict, but the conflicts can be largely reconciled through different interpretations. Alternatively, sources 1 and 2 can be taken as influenced by personal relationships and their more extreme claims discounted on that basis, leaving source 3 as providing a more balanced assessment of Wolsey's character and achievements that can encompass the evidence of both. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the claim while those at L4 will develop an overall judgement.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The sources contain evidence both for and against the stated claim. Source 4 refers to Henry's financial difficulties and can be cross-referenced with Source 6 to suggest that finance was a problem across the period. However, Source 4 also refers to the problem of unreliable allies, while Source 5 suggests problems were created by events elsewhere. These arguments can be developed by reference to own knowledge, to demonstrate that while Henry's resources were limited, he was able to gain some success in 1513, and that the Treaty of London did bring considerable prestige. It can therefore be suggested that the behaviour of Ferdinand and Maximilian, and later of Charles V, posed a bigger problem for Henry. However, own knowledge of Wolsey's diplomacy on 1520-23, and of the shifts within English policy can be used to suggest that Henry was also unreliable, and that the behaviour of his allies was less significant than his own unrealistic aims and his willingness to abandon alliances in pursuit of his ambitions. If the sources are interpreted in context and cross-referenced as a set, a more complex argument can be developed. Source 4 refers to Henry's financial problems and the behaviour of his allies, and it can be argued from wider knowledge that it was the limited resources at Henry's disposal that forced him to rely on allies like Ferdinand and Maximilian. Source 5 suggests that Wolsey was sincere in seeking peace, but it can also be inferred that peace offered a cheaper alternative in Henry's search for glory. The role of Charles V can be developed to show why the Treaty failed, but Source 6 can also be used to explain Henry's ambitions in France and his relationship with Charles, as well as his inability to finance an active role. Candidates can develop this by reference to the campaign of 1523, Henry's failure, the impact of Pavia and Charles's refusal to reward the English with French territory, and Henry's reversal of policy thereafter. It can therefore be argued that financial weakness and limited resources were a part of Henry's problems, forcing him to rely on shifting alliances and unable to fulfil aims that were essentially unrealistic. 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. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well argue that problems were caused by a range of interacting factors.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The question is focused on the relative significance of Anne Boleyn among the causes of the Reformation, and specifies her character and influence so that she can be considered as something more than the object of Henry's desires. Source 7 focuses on the impact she had on Henry. Taken at face value it supports the claim by suggesting that Henry broke with Rome in order to marry her. Interpreted in context it also suggests that she was able to generate an intensity of feeling that supports such a possibility, and candidates may develop this point by arguing that her refusal to become Henry's mistress, and therefore her character, were of great significance. This can be further developed by reference to source 9, which explains the nature of her influence, her contact with reformers, and therefore her importance in encouraging the ideas and beliefs on which the Reformation was based and developed. Candidates can build this argument by reference to Anne's actions and the influence that she was able to exert, as well as the role of the named reformers in encouraging Protestant beliefs to take root, and can argue that Anne played a vital role in giving Henry both the motive and the means for his actions in the early 1530s. However, the argument can be challenged on several levels. Source 8 suggests that it was the desire for a son, not Anne herself that made Henry determined to divorce and re-marry, and that the marriage was motivated by the desire for a legitimate heir - hence Anne as a willing mistress would not have served Henry's purpose. Candidates may also consider Henry's personality and determination to have his way, as well as other sources of influence, such as Thomas Cromwell, in providing the methods and encouragement for Henry to act. In addition, source 9 points to the role of anti-clericalism and the opportunity provided for Henry to expand his power and enhance the role of the monarch at the expense of the Church. It can therefore be argued that Anne's character and personality were not significant in causing the Reformation, although her existence undoubtedly played a part. 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. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well address Anne's role in the context of other factors, and show how the interaction of political, religious and personal factors brought about the Reformation, to offer an overall judgement about the significance of her character and personality.</p>	40

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>The sources offer conflicting evidence about Elizabeth's relationship with her favourites and advisers. Taken at face value source 10 suggests that she had complete authority over them, while source 12 challenges this by referring to her fear of Essex and his disobedience in returning to England. Source 11 can also be seen as supporting source 10, given that Burghley will obey commands that he does not personally agree with. Candidates may resolve the conflict by pointing out that these are only two individuals, and may not reflect the general pattern. Those who develop responses of this kind can reach L2. However, interpreted in context and with awareness of provenance, the sources offer a more complex picture of the relationship. Naunton is writing many years later, and may well be influenced by hindsight. He may also be making a generalisation, which does allow for some exceptions. Source 11 comes from a long-standing adviser, and may well express his sincerely held principles. He is advising his son, which would suggest an honest opinion. However, in relation to source 10 it can be interpreted in different ways. On the one hand Burleigh offers complete obedience to the queen, but he also asserts his right to hold to his own opinion, and possibly offer independent advice. Only once the decision is made does he accept it, which suggests that a more complex relationship than is implied in source 10. However, he certainly does fit the description of having been raised by Elizabeth, as does Essex in source 12. Source 12 suggests that Elizabeth was not entirely in control, and could not simply raise and weaken her favourites at will. Not only is she promoting Essex because she fears his power and popularity, but she is influenced and possibly manipulated by his enemies and other factions. Essex certainly behaves as if believing that he can influence her, and seems determined to assert himself. Moryson's account is likely to be reliable, since he was in Ireland with Essex, although his links with Essex's replacement could encourage some exaggeration of Essex's behaviour. However, candidates may judge that the favourite's behaviour and career supports Moryson's interpretation. Ultimately, however, the queen is willing to assert her authority by 'ordering' Essex to retire and excluding him from the Court. The evidence therefore suggests overall that source 10 is broadly accurate, but over-simplified. Responses at L3 will both support and challenge the claim while those at L4 will develop an overall judgement.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The sources refer to several causes of hostility towards James, and therefore offer conflicting evidence as to the 'main' reason. Taken at face value Source 15 states that there was concern about foreign policy as well as corruption, while Source 13 refers to extravagance and financial policy, and is supported by Source 14. Candidates can support all of these claims from own knowledge by describing James's relationship with Carr, his lavish gifts to Scottish courtiers, his neglect of business for hunting and his relations with Spain from 1604, including his vision of himself as a European peacemaker. Candidates can also challenge the statement from own knowledge, by reference to other causes of hostility such as James's desire for Union with Scotland, or his early attacks on puritan aspirations. Interpreted in context the sources offer a range of reasons for hostility, increasing in the years after Salisbury's death, and also the means of explaining the interaction between them. Source 13 describes the importance of the Court and the relationships that were developed there, and Source 15 demonstrates the mishandling of this situation that created hostility at both central and local levels. This can be developed and explained from own knowledge as indicated. The two sources can therefore be used together to explain the nature of corruption at James's Court and extend the issue to consider his wider extravagance and relations with parliaments. Source 13 also offers the alternative problem of how money was raised, and this can be cross-referenced with Source 14. This can be developed by reference to parliamentary complaints and the many battles over finance as well as the nature and distribution of patronage. However, candidates can also utilise Source 15 to offer an alternative view that corruption was a minor issue compared to extravagance and/or James's links with Spain and his grandiose aims in foreign policy, while Source 14 offers a reconciliation of the conflict by suggesting misuse of money raised by various methods added to the resentment felt by those who were forced to pay. 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. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well address James's personality and relationships as the key problem that linked finance and corruption, offering an overall judgement.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The sources demonstrate the impact of the Thirty Years War and offer conflicting assessments of its significance in relation to the breakdown of relations between King and Parliament. Taken at face value the sources can be used to develop conflicting arguments. Source 16 emphasises the religious impact of the war and the pressure for James to act, while source 17 describes the problems involved in doing so. While there is reference to James's mishandling of the 1621 parliament, the source emphasises how the war affected a range of concerns and linked with domestic tensions to create problems for the monarch. Candidates can develop the argument by reference to the parliament of 1621, the Commons' preference for a naval war, limitation of Tunnage and Poundage in 1625 and constant refusal to grant subsidies without redress of their grievances. Source 18, however, argues that it was Charles's handling of the problems and his high-handed disregard for laws and liberties that caused the breakdown of relations with parliament. Candidates can develop this argument by reference to the Mansfeld expedition, the King's relations with Buckingham, the Forced Loan and Five Knights case, as well as the Petition of Right and Charles's continued collection of Tunnage and Poundage. The claim can also be challenged by reference to own knowledge of Charles's religious attitudes and policies. Interpreted in context the sources also offer the basis for an overall judgement. Source 16 is from Abbot, who held mildly puritan views and reflects a strongly Protestant reaction. This indicates the problem posed by the war, in that both James and Charles had to meet popular expectations that were not necessarily realistic, and for which parliaments were unwilling to pay. This can be developed by reference to events from 1621-25 and the disagreement between Charles and MPs as to the nature of the War that should be pursued. Thereafter the deterioration of relations between King and Parliament can be developed by linking Charles's actions as indicated in source 18 to parliamentary attitudes as described in source 17 and the eventual breakdown of relations over both foreign policy/religion and law/finance to produce a judgement that draws on all three sources. 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. Responses at L1 will offer limited range/depth of material and tend to treat sources at face value. L2 responses will attempt to cross-reference sources, but own knowledge will be limited or the response will be predominantly narrative. At L3 candidates will interpret and cross-reference evidence from the sources to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and support this with contextual knowledge, but there may also be passages of disconnected narrative. At L4 candidates will be able to utilise the sources in combination, interpreted in context, to demonstrate the possibility of conflicting arguments, and utilise a range of accurate own knowledge to develop the arguments and offer a judgement. The best responses may well argue that the Thirty Years War posed problems that brought other issues to the surface, and that Charles's handling of these problems was largely responsible for the breakdown of relations between King and Parliament in 1629.</p>	40

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

Order Code US022864 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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