

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2010

### GCSE 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 Edexcel's free online tool that offers teachers unrivalled insight into exam performance.

You can use this valuable service to see how your students performed according to a range of criteria - at cohort, class or individual student level.

- Question-by-question exam analysis
- Skills maps linking exam performance back to areas of the specification
- Downloadable exam papers, mark schemes and examiner reports
- Comparisons to national performance

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2010

Publications Code US024075

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## Introduction

Within this option, a significant number of candidates were able to achieve marks at Level 3 or above in all assessment objectives, offering a considered analysis of the given source evidence, focused towards the demands of the questions, allied to strong contextual understanding and with effective deployment of well-selected own knowledge. It was pleasing to see that many of the issues raised in previous sessions which had hampered candidate performance were reduced, with skills in handling evidence generally being demonstrated in relation to the specific issues raised. That said, certain common errors were apparent, in some cases, where candidates appeared to be attempting to apply source skills in a manner not appropriate to the questions. Therefore, this report attempts to set out certain areas in which future responses could be improved, whilst also illustrating different levels of response across the various questions.

## A questions

In January it was suggested that the most common reason for low performance in the part (a) question was an inability to comprehend and interpret the source material effectively, and that, more often than not, it stemmed from rushed and careless reading. Thankfully, fewer examples of this issue were found this time around, although there is still a correlation between the degree to which candidates examine the content of the sources, considering the detail within in the context of both the attribution and the issues raised by the question, and the degree to which the subtleties of the sources are explored towards a successful response. Together, the sources offer a range of views, and the vast majority of candidates were adept at identifying and developing from these. However, the evidence provided by individual sources often has certain ambiguities which can be developed in different ways, and some otherwise sound responses fail to consider this. The following reasons seem to account for some of these limitations:

1. Some responses took sources taken at face value, or seem to ignore the information given in the source header.
2. Whilst most candidates seek to evaluate the sources, some tend towards generic or stock responses which fail to really engage consideration of attribution with the specifics of what the sources have to say. Although many candidates are able to draw upon taught approaches to provenance, nature and the like, it is those who are able to balance this with independent thought who tend to produce the strongest analysis.
3. Most candidates were able to cross-reference successfully. However, a significant minority of candidates still conduct a sequenced trawl through the sources. Such responses thus focus too heavily describing the sources and/or drawing inferences from them, resulting in a limited summative comparison.
4. Some responses still tend to deal with reliability as a separate issue, either sequentially, or as a comparison of the reliability of the three sources.

In the main, candidates seemed well prepared concerning the issue of the application of context understanding for question A, an issue highlighted in January. Many candidates were able to consider evidence in the light of historical context, using this to consider discrepancies between sources or towards giving weight to the evidence. However, a small minority still seem to desire to go beyond this, offering an explanation of the issues in the question in depth, with limited reference to sources. Such responses at best became sidetracked, and in the more extreme cases failed to address the demands of the question, which is the analysis, interpretation and evaluation of evidence from the sources in order to reach a judgement.

A small minority of candidates were hampered by time management issues, in terms of devoting too long to the a) question at the expense of the subsequent question. This was often where candidates had described the content of individual sources at length.

## B questions

Candidates were, on the whole, focused on the question with many at least attempting analysis. However some responses offered relevant and in many cases well detailed factual knowledge that they did not always link to arguments in the given sources. The sources provide viewpoints on issues or stated factors that candidates can utilise, offering an analysis of these drawing on contextual knowledge. A number of candidates engaged with sources with clear conceptual understanding but failed to support their answer with sufficient contextual detail. These disappointingly relied on the sources too much, without showing their ability to balance the presentation or argument, although this was not in itself a barrier to the higher levels. On the other hand, a significant minority of responses were both well detailed and with a very secure connection between own knowledge and the sources. The best candidates synthesised sources and knowledge to develop a clear line of reasoning and to test the validity of the views provided using their knowledge. Such answers were able to reach Level 4 in both assessment objectives by offering a balanced analysis, integrating contextual knowledge with source material.

There was some overall improvement in candidates' handling of evidence within the part b) question, with greater focus towards the demands of AO2b. However, there is still a minority of candidates in attempting to address issues of the provenance and reliability of secondary evidence in answers. Whilst reasoned and focused consideration of historiographical issues can obviously play a role in the analysis and evaluation of the given views at the highest levels, this at times tended towards doing so for the sake of it. Speculative comments regarding the authorship of one source being twenty years after another, or assertions based on the title of the book it is from does little to help candidates engage with the views and interpretations. At best this means candidates are wasting time and at worst it became a substitute for valid argument and analysis. Many students addressed the question as they might a part a), by simply analysing the sources and commenting on the provenance. Stronger responses often clearly identified the views within the given evidence as a starting point, analysing these through interrogation and corroboration using their own knowledge, exploring the relationship between and relative strengths of the different views, offering judgement on their overall strength and validity, or aspects of these.

One further aspect in which candidates could develop their work is through considering the specific demands of particular questions and what higher level analysis would be for these. Where a question has essentially asked which is the most important factor in bringing about an outcome, the majority of responses are well able to identify these from the sources and own knowledge, offering a mainly focused response with some analysis. However, such as on the A2 Bii) question on Elizabeth, fewer candidates offer real explicit awareness and development recognising that factors are often interrelated. Similarly, many candidates reach Level 3 by broadly examining success and failure on such questions, without weighing up the relative merits in order to judge whether success outweighed failures. The given evidence often gives consideration to these issues, either individually or as a set; whilst students are clearly free to reach alternative judgements, students giving careful consideration to these in the first place are more likely to achieve the highest levels in both assessment objectives.

### *Question 1(a)*

There were some very good responses to this question. Most candidates used the sources as a set and, as a result, managed to highlight the similarities and differences in their assessment of the significance of the rebellion in 1536. Many candidates developed points with detailed cross-referencing of the sources. Most were able to recognise clearly that both Sources 2 and 3 related to different aspects of the Pilgrimage of Grace, and that on the face of it Source 1 suggest other motives. A significant minority were able to develop inferences further, such as the extent to which Source 1 alluded to involvement in rebellion, or applied reasoning in considering the attribution, such as Fairfax's motives in reporting to Cromwell. Such responses were clearly able to reach well into level 3 or above. However, a small minority recognised issues of provenance, but only offered rather speculative or sweeping judgements, such as Hall (source 1) could be trusted because he was there, or, with perhaps an eye on contemporary events, that as an MP he could not be trusted. Ultimately, higher level responses were aware of the need to arrive at a judgement and made an attempt to weigh up the relative importance of the issues highlighted within the sources. The very best employed the source attributions to assist in this evaluation, going beyond simple assertions of bias.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a)

Intro - Source 2 & 3 - part of Polk  
- Source 12 - ~~un~~<sup>immorality</sup> & immorality

P1 - Source 2 & 3 - "stir up poor..."  
- their holding part = closure.

Ⓐ. Possibly working up (so approaching so as to have  
monetary relation ~~PC~~<sup>PC</sup> ~~UK~~<sup>UK</sup> ~~CR~~<sup>CR</sup>.  
"fat abbeyes"

P2) Source 1 - "old <sup>old</sup> rotten Oaks"  
Source 2 - "kissing evil <sup>love</sup> by mother!"

Source 1

Ⓐ - part of R.P., supported Reformation, therefore wanted to  
see ~~sets~~ Calvary bell. Possible used morality as  
course.

Ⓐ - source 3 - other monks took part in Polk.

((a) continued)

How far does link with Polk bring about dissolution of greater monasteries.

~~Source~~ Whereas source 2 indicates that it was the ~~rebellion~~ fact that monks took part in the rebellion of 1537 which led to their monasteries closure, sources 1 and 3 suggest it was their ~~sp~~ spiritual corruption which was the main reason.

Source 2, from a report sent to Cromwell by Sir William Fairfax, clearly suggests that the monks of Ferrisby Priory had taken part in the rebellion of 1537. He describes how the monasteries, "stir up the poor to stick by them" which ~~sp~~ shows how the monks were openly encouraging rebellion. This would give reason for the monasteries closure. This is supported to a certain extent by source 3, where the Abbot, Roger Pyle, ~~states~~ ~~gives~~ surrenders his monastery after the monks took part in the Pilgrimage of Grace, the main rebellion at the time of 1537.

However, it ~~must~~ the reliability of source 2 should be called into question, as Fairfax had just ~~4~~ had his property stolen by the rebels, therefore it is likely he would want revenge. ~~B~~ This may lead him to



((a) continued)

exaggerate or even make up propaganda about the monks so as to encourage Cromwell, who was openly against the monasteries, to close them down.

Also, source 3 was only signed by Abbot Roger Pyle, therefore it does not necessarily mean he believed in the statement, but may have been forced to sign. This consequently reduces the reliability of both sources 2 & 3.

Source 1 however, makes the point that it was the moral corruption of the monks in the monasteries that led to their closure. St. Edward Hall, describes how at the time of the smaller monasteries being closed down, the speaker ~~was~~ stated the larger monasteries were "rotten old oaks" which indicates severe corruption. This is supported, to a certain extent, by source 3, where Abbot Pyle describes the "evil life lived by the brethren", thus reinforcing the lack of moral discipline which ~~was~~ caused parliament to want to close monasteries.

However, the "evil life" described by Abbot Pyle is possibly a reference to the activity in the Almsgiving of Grace, which would have been considered evil by those who wrote the document condemning the abbey.



((a) continued)

This gives the impression that the activity in the rebellion was merely an excuse to ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~monasteries~~ <sup>accuse</sup> the monasteries of spirit moral corruption when in fact it was revenge for their activities. Also, as Edward Hall was a member of the Reformation Parliament, and therefore agreed that many of the laws were 'good and wholesome', it can be assumed he agreed with the dissolution of the large monasteries. This must be taken into account as it is possible he is presenting a biased account, which reduces ~~the~~ the ~~source~~ reliability of the source.

Overall, ~~the~~ source 2 indeed describes how the monks took part in the rebellion, as does source 3, however source 3 ~~also~~ makes the link that the activity in the rebellion led to the closure of monasteries on grounds of immorality. Source 1 however, indicates that ~~the~~ there had been a plan to close the larger monasteries from 1536, prior to the rebellions, thus indicating that the monks ~~is~~ involvement with the rebellion was merely an excuse, ~~the~~ not the actual reasons behind the ~~the~~ dissolution of the larger monasteries.

((a) continued)

Henry surrendered power to Wolsey

Intro - source 4 - yes  
 .. 5 - no  
 .. 6 - yes.

P1, Yes - "Surrendered... state" - source 4  
 ↳ Shows a lack of control  
 "Wolsey controlled parliament?"  
 of whom you are suspicious?

Freedom in Star Chamber etc. Head of Church & Chancellor.  
 Henry allowed Wolsey to do admin

Ⓐ - Source 6 - Henry is instructing Wolsey, giving him freedom but instructing. Henry in control.

Ⓐ - Carew's friend, possibly biased so for accuracy.

Ⓐ Doesn't say when, after the start, yes, but foreign policy, was not here 1512, 13.

'1518 - treaty of London, FoCoh. Henry involved.  
 Cast aside Wolsey after Warwick's matter shows Henry still retained some power.

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

(b)

22) No - Wolsey no.

Source 5 - "dominated by Richer".

"~~Wolsey controlled patronage~~":

"lacked daily contact with king".

"all power was king" - shows lack of power.

Henry held primary control, ~~Other sources~~ Wolsey handled admin, and "patronage" therefore could control factions

However, once fell out with king, Richer says of him. Seve right - king all power but.

⊕ Wolsey's 12-6 in Gentleman's bedchamber.

Henry left domestic with Richer, but with a interest in foreign policy, got involved.

((b) continued)

Henry Surrendered power to Wolsey, 1515-25?

~~Whereas source 4 and 5 suggest that Wolsey was all powerful, a had been given power~~

Whereas sources 4 and 6 suggest that Henry had given all power to the Wolsey, source 5 ~~suggests~~ contradicts this argument, ~~stating~~ describing how the king had overall power.

Source 4, an extract from Scarsbrick's 'Henry VIII', ~~states~~ gives the impression that Henry gave all power to Wolsey, so ~~even~~ ~~at~~ in place of ~~the~~ hunting, ~~poasting~~. whilst he "hunted <sup>and</sup> gausted." Scarsbrick ~~then describes~~ ~~the~~ Cowardship then states how the king had "surrendered the cares of the State into the Cardinal's hands." This gives the impression that Wolsey had the powers of the king, and was in charge of running the country. This is supported by source 6, where Henry asks Wolsey to watch some key nobility as well as "any others of whom you are suspicious." This ~~is~~ is clearly Henry giving Wolsey freedom to act as he wishes, thus suggesting power being given to Wolsey. Additional evidence of Wolsey's power, especially over the nobility can be seen in his work in the





((b) continued)

Source 5 however, presents the king as ultimately the only source of power, and suggests factions were competing for his approval. The author Lotherington, describes how government was "dominated by... competing groups" but that overall "all power" the "source of all power was the king." Lotherington argues that as Wolsey lacked the "intimate daily contact" enjoyed by others within the court, that this meant Wolsey was not all powerful. Also, the king also looked to his Privy Council, and Chief Officers besides him for advice on issues, as well as Wolsey, which shows that Henry shared the power throughout the court. Saying this however, Wolsey did have more power than others, as seen in the Eltham Ordinances, where Wolsey halved the members of Henry's Chamber of the Bedchamber from 12 twelve to six, and moved key advisors, for example Richard Pace, overseas. This suggests that although the power was shared ~~throughout~~, Wolsey could still decide who the king heard advice from, which indirectly could be interpreted as Wolsey in overall control.

However, although ~~Wolsey~~ Also, although source 5 describes the power of the factions, Lotherington also states how Wolsey "controlled the



((b) continued)

distribution of patronage "which was essential to ~~the~~ gain power and status. This gives the impression that Wolsey, ~~was~~ had overall control of government, and could either aid or hinder the careers of the "ambitious ones." Saying this however, once the Amicable Grant failed in 1525, ~~which made~~ Henry lost faith in Wolsey. This allowed the competing factions, many of whom opposed Wolsey due to his power, to undermine his authority which eventually led to his dismissal and eventually ~~the~~ arrest for treason.

This shows how although Henry did grant Wolsey significant power in between 1515-25, he was also able to ~~reclaim~~ ~~re~~take that power if he desired. Thus, Wolsey was dependent on Henry, which cannot be considered in overall control.

In conclusion, sources 4 and 6, on the face of it support the idea of power being surrendered to Wolsey, however, as source 5 points out, the ultimate source of power lay with the king. It is clear that Wolsey was most favoured by the king from 1515-25, and was often left ~~as~~ ~~was~~ ~~in~~ ~~charge~~ in charge of certain ~~state~~ national issues, however, when the king chose to become involved, Wolsey was at Henry's service.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The script was awarded a level 4 for A02a, and, whilst examples with greater depth of development were found, clearly illustrates some of the key issues. The response clearly sets out the overall relationship between the sources on the issue at hand. Direct and developed comparisons are made between sources, drawing on inferential skills and exploring the views in relation to the question. Attribution is taken into account and, whilst at times this can be speculative, at best this is related to the specific evidence provided and there is some attempt to use this to give weight to the views. The response ultimately reaches a judgement on the extent of agreement, which is well focused and with reasoning to support the conclusion that despite the misgivings that would be expected to be held over Hall's evidence, it nonetheless suggests deeper motives. Thus the candidate also shows awareness of the chronological relationship between the given evidence.

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

Most candidates were clearly aware of the representations in the sources, as well as displaying knowledge of the historical debate regarding Wolsey's role in government. Responses were thus often well focused. The best candidates used their knowledge to develop the debate, with examples that were carefully selected. In a minority of cases candidates provided detailed knowledge of events but did not relate them to the question whilst many candidates engaged with the ambiguity offered within Source 6 to debate the issue at hand. A significant number of candidates astutely raised and developed the extent to which the situation changed as Henry grew older, whilst explicit distinctions were made over the nature of the power held by Wolsey or Henry. For example, many recognised Wolsey's authority over the legal system, although few gave explicit consideration to the wider growth in such administration over this period. A significant minority of candidates spent time examining issues outside of the stated date range of 1515-25, whilst a small number focused predominantly on foreign policy. Many of the strongest responses gave explicit consideration to the use of the word 'wholly' in the question, using this to reach judgement on the extent to which power was surrendered.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) How far do sources 1, 2 & 3 suggest that it was their links with rebellion in 1536 that brought about the dissolution of the greater monasteries and abbeys in the years 1537-1539?

There is reason to suspect that the link between the greater monasteries and the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536 was what led to their later dissolution.

~~The~~ The idea that the monasteries were corrupt is one propagated in source 1, ~~though~~ However unlike the other two sources it does not specify the Pilgrimage of Grace as a factor of their dissolution. It merely states that 'the ~~great~~ great abbeys were like rotten old oaks', ~~so~~ suggesting that their corruption was what led to their dissolution. This is a trustworthy, first-hand account written at the time by someone involved in politics.

Contrary to source 1, source 2 states that the monks of Fennyng Priory 'daily urge the people to put them in again'. This suggests that the monks did not incite rebellion and ~~also~~ participate in the Pilgrimage of Grace, which was the reason why their monastery was later dissolved. This again is a first-hand account written at the time.

((a) continued) This view is supported by source 3 which further propagates that ~~source 3~~ involvement in the 1536 rebellion led to the dissolution of the monasteries. After the monks of Whalley Abbey rebelled, Robert Roger Pole wrote 'knowing the evil life lived by the brethren of Whalley Abbey, do freely and wholly surrender the said abbey unto the King's Highness'. This is also a first-hand account written at the time.

In conclusion, whilst source 1 cites corruption as the reason for the dissolution of the monasteries, the other two do specify that it was their ~~to~~ links to rebellion, and as such their is more of a case for the latter being true.

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

(b) Do you agree with the view that in the years 1515 - 1525 Henry VIII wholly surrendered power to in government to Cardinal Wolsey?

Sources 4, 5 and 6 all give different accounts of who ~~had~~ had power in Tudor government between 1515 and 1525. Source 4 suggests that Wolsey had complete power whilst sources 5 and 6 refute this claim.

It is stated in source 4 that 'Henry hunted and hunted, jested, played tennis, made music, danced and banqueted' and thus 'wholly surrendered the cares of the state into the Cardinal's hands'. This clearly supports the question's claim. However, it is a ~~secondary~~ secondary account, written in 1968, by a historian who could be looking for an alternate ~~theory~~ theory to the traditional theory in order to sell books.

We also know a lot of other information which indicates that Wolsey had complete power in court. For example it was he<sup>\*</sup> who implemented new tax reforms, new laws on enclosure and dealt with the court of the Star Chamber.

The view that it was indeed Henry who maintained political power is one propagated by source 5, which states:  
\* not Henry.



((b) continued) 'the ultimate source of all power was the king'. This again is a secondary source, which also might as well source 4, be written by a revisionist historian.

This view is supported by source 6 which in which Henry ~~was saying~~ says 'I desire you [Wolsey] to keep a careful watch on the Duke of Suffolk...'. Here we can see the king giving Wolsey an order, so we can see that he has not surrendered political power. This is a first hand account written at the time by Henry VIII so it is very reliable.

Again there is evidence to support this view and we know that it was Henry who decided to war against France and Henry who eventually dismissed Wolsey from his offices; so he made many decisions without Wolsey and all Wolsey's decisions had to go through him.

In conclusion, I disagree with the view that Henry VIII surrendered political power to Wolsey and believe that Wolsey did have some control in government, but no where near the extent the question suggests.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This script was awarded a level 2 in both assessment objectives. Whilst focused and showing an understanding of both the question and views of the given evidence, the response generally lacks sufficient development. Sources are used in a supportive manner, and attempt to analyse the views contained within tend towards assertive and generalised attempts to consider the provenance of both contemporary and secondary evidence. The answer does maintain an overall focus on the question with some attempt at balance, although application of contextual knowledge is thin and lacking in analytical development.

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

Whilst this was a less popular choice with candidates than bi), the majority of those who did respond produced answers of a good standard, with some excellent analysis. Some candidates were clearly familiar with the term “nation state”, where as others made use of the source material to develop the definition and relate it to their wider understanding of Cromwell’s contribution to the process of the Reformation. A minority did focus more on the role of Thomas Cromwell generally, whilst other factors considered in the shaping of the Reformation included the rise of the Boleyn faction, the Great Matter, Cromwell’s own legal arguments, English religious wealth, religious ideology and State supremacy. A minority of less successful responses seemed to offer a biography of Cromwell or a narrative of the Reformation. Overall, the question provoked the range of responses that would be expected. 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, although a range of approaches were used in order to achieve this.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

- (a) Source 2 suggests it was the links with the rebellion that greater monasteries had that led to their ~~abolition~~<sup>abolition</sup> in the years from 1537-39. This source ~~states that~~ is written by Fairfax to Cromwell reporting the reaction of the monasteries that remained after the Pilgrimage of Grace was carried out in 1536. Cromwell hearing that the monasteries that weren't suppressed were trying to 'stir up the poor to stick by them' would concern him because it would sound as if they were putting up a resistance and therefore be threatening Cromwell of another uprising. Furthermore the fact that the 'Ferriby Priory near Hull' was 'seized' and then 'restored to the monks' would urge determination from Cromwell to bring about the dissolution of the greater monasteries and overcome this force. There is also the fact that Fairfax states the monks 'daily urge the people to put them in again' reinforcing the fact that they are trying to stop the dissolution + giving evidence of determination and rebellion again even after the Pilgrimage of Grace.

(a) continued) However Source 3 differs from this because it shows an abbey surrendering in '1537' after the Pilgrimage of Grace. ~~This suggests that~~ This shows ~~of~~ less passion to withhold the monastery, as ~~suggests that even if the~~ if it wasn't actually important. ~~This would be~~ It brings in ~~the~~ the idea that it needed to be brought down due to 'the evil life lived by the brethren of Whixley Abbey' suggesting the cause for the dissolution of the greater monasteries was because they were corrupt and clerical abuses or 'evils' took place within them. However the fact that they surrendered their Abbey suggests fear from the consequences of keeping it, shown in the Pilgrimage of Grace. Therefore in this light the Pilgrimage influenced their decision to surrender the greater house.

The fact that the monasteries were corrupt is supported by Source 1 as well it states that 'the great abbeyes were like rotten old oaks and they must fallow' - since these were words from 'the Parliament House' it suggests the dissolution would carry on regardless of the Pilgrimage of Grace which hadn't happened in February 1536 yet. ~~It~~ <sup>The fact</sup> these were words that came from a speaker in the Parliament

((a) continued) House shows that opinions were already rife that the larger houses were corrupt. This source is also very reliable since it was written by Hall who was a lawyer and MP in the Reformation Parliament and therefore he would have experienced the events and given accurate accounts of what happened.

However there is also the opinion in this source that there was 'the hope that their ~~greater~~ monasteries would still continue'. It suggests that the decision to destroy the greater monasteries had not been confirmed and therefore since the other two sources hold accounts of what happened afterwards it is implied that the Pilgrimage of Grace confirmed the decisions for the abolition of the <sup>greater</sup> monasteries in 1537-39.



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

(b)(ii) The decisive influence in shaping the Reformation in the 1530s ~~was~~ <sup>could</sup> prove to be Cromwell's idea of a 'nation state'. Cromwell's influence in the 1530s did shape the reformation however there is reason to believe that it wasn't necessarily the idea of a 'nation state' that caused him but Henry VIII's own reasons for ~~the~~ the changes such as trying to grant an annulment after the failure in 1529.

All three sources show Cromwell was very active in shaping the reformation. Source 7 shows one of his many acts of legislation the 'supplication against the Ordinaries'. In this evidence is found that show the influence was Cromwell's idea of a 'nation state'. For example: They are not even published in English' attacks the foreign side or source of the laws and the fact it is stated that 'some dash with the laws of your kingdom' supports the idea of Royal Supremacy and only following the royal authority. Since this was drafted in '1529' it shows how Cromwell had ideas of putting through this legislation before the idea of Royal Supremacy came about in 1530 by the Collectanea Patris Copiosa presented to

This source is of the upmost reliability since it is an extract from the second <sup>supplication of protest</sup> the king. Furthermore this ~~text~~ <sup>is only the Ordinance</sup> is one example of the numerous Acts of legislation Cromwell put through that ~~directed~~ appeared to support the theory of a 'nation state'. The idea of 'nation state' is described in source 1 as ~~the~~ the establishment of 'a kingdom and people subject to no outside authority'. It ~~was understandable~~ also states how there was an 'increase' in 'the role and status of Parliament'. This ~~shows~~ <sup>suggests</sup> Cromwell took control of this not Henry and his Privy Chamber. However the reliability of this source is uncertain since it is from a book published in 1984 much later than the actual event therefore it may be rough and not guided by accurate evidence. On the contrary it would give an overview and the general picture and not controlled by politics of the world to my and censor or change things in order to please a monarch. Source 9 supports source 7 since it shows how Cromwell actually did ~~the~~ the 'formal establishment' of a 'nation state' by this evidence of legislation. Other Acts that followed this idea include The Act of Annates and the Act of Appeals in 1534. Both of these acts are designed to stop



(b) continued) What Henry wished, ~~the~~ the charge of praemunire set against ~~the~~ Wolsey and the clergy, Cromwell uses it later on in the 1530s to build his other Acts that suit the King. Furthermore some parts of the Reformation were for financial and monetary gain for Henry to strengthen the crown especially after tax disasters and the threat of attack from Catholic states. The dissolution of the monasteries was a large part of the later 1530s that's main focus was money shown by Cromwell's Valor Ecclesiasticus <sup>in 1535</sup>, the survey showing that religious income was £150 000 ~~£~~ and also that they owned a  $\frac{1}{3}$  of land. The dissolution brought money to the crown as did the charge of praemunire against the clergy showing they had to give a fine in 1531 of £118 000. Therefore this ~~was~~ idea and motive of Henry's directed parts of the Reformation.

Furthermore it was Henry's initial plan to marry Anne and divorce Catherine that made the acts necessary. In this light the acts were actually specific for this influence. This is supported by the fact that source 8 states that 'the direction of policy was always



((b) continued) decided by the King'. This act of Appeals in the early 1530s when Anne was pregnant was done so Catherine of Aragon wouldn't be able to Appeal to Rome. Therefore Cromwell could declare papal dispensation was incorrect and he could marry Anne and Henry so their child would be legitimate.

Furthermore the Act of Succession and the Treason Act in 1534 confirmed the importance that the marriage between Anne and Henry was valid and so Catherine would be forgotten. Additionally the Acts attacked Rome in particular and the Reformation began because of the annulment failure. Therefore in the early 1530s the Reformation was shaped by Henry's ideas and influences even though Cromwell put in the work to carry them through. ~~It is not that Cromwell was executed suggests~~

Henry even had disagreements with some of Cromwell's policies and changed them such as the act of ten articles that abandoned 4 sacraments was restored in 1537 and also the Act of Six Articles in 1539 that confirmed Catholic beliefs.

There were suspicions that the drive behind Cromwell's ideas was protestantism

((b) continued) however these were proved rumours and false and it was more certain that the idea of the nation state was a stronger influence. Overall it could be seen that it was the combined influence of Cromwell's idea of 'nation state', his willingness to serve Henry and Henry's own ideas that shaped the Reformation in the 1530s.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This script was awarded a level 4 for AO1 and level 3 for AO2b. There is a clear focus throughout on the claim in the question and a good range of accurate and relevant own knowledge is deployed to support the analysis. The sources are used to identify issues relevant to the enquiry, and these issues are then weighed up in the light of the evidence of the other sources and the candidate's contextual knowledge. Thus, after an opening paragraph in which the basic debate is outlined, the candidate uses Source 7 to enter into an analysis of the stated issue in the question. The candidate continues in the same manner for much of the rest of the script. However, at times the sources are used for support only or are less well integrated, and thus the response could do more to explicitly evaluate the views in the sources. Nonetheless, for the most part, the answer is well focused and offers, depth, range, and integration.



### *Question 2(a)*

The vast majority of candidates were able to reach a strong level 2 or higher, through an effective cross-reference of the evidence given concerning Charles I's approach to religion. Most responses were able to identify the differences between Sources 10 and 12 concerning attitudes towards Catholicism. Many were also able to develop these issues by appreciating the extent to which the desires of Charles as Prince in 1623 (Source 10) were of greater concern to MPs in 1629 (Source 12) when translated into policy as king. Common ground was also explored, particularly between Sources 10 and 11. The provenance of all three sources was largely dealt with effectively, and the majority of candidates were able to reach level 3 or above by applying this to Charles' position. Candidates who were most effective in analysis and reaching judgement were those who had a clear grasp of relationship between Protestantism, Catholicism and Arminianism, thus applying contextual understanding.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) The Church of England had been divided up into smaller groups such as the Puritans and the Arminians. The Protestants and Catholics were against each other for example in The Thirty Years War.

Source 10 says that England was still a Protestant country when Charles ~~ascended~~ became King in 1625. His father James I was Protestant but tolerated Catholics. There was only one way to achieve a truce between Catholics and Protestants and that was a marriage. Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham went to Spain to see if they could get Infanta Maria to marry Charles. They got as far as Dover before they were found out.

Source 10 says that Charles wants a ~~unity~~ unity between Catholics and Protestants. He says that ~~we are~~ he wants to be joined together in one faith as ~~we~~ we worship one undivided God and Trinity and Christ crucified. This shows us that he wanted everyone to be joined together no matter what.

((a) continued) Source 10 says that Charles has 'reissued the orders in favour of the Catholics.' Already this tells us that he is not depending the Protestant religion. However later on there is slight ~~conflict~~ contradiction 'majesty seems devoted to his own faith.' He is Protestant but will be tolerant of the Catholics. This source suggests that he could defend the Protestants because he would not give the Catholics liberty, only protection. He had to support the Catholics because his wife Henrietta Maria was Catholic. He allowed her, & her servants and future children to worship in a Catholic chapel in London served by 28 priests and one bishop. Again, he is not depending the Protestant faith.

Source 12 says that the Church is becoming uncontrollable but Charles supported Arminianism which was a branch of Protestantism. It mirrored his own beliefs. This shows that he could defend the Protestant church. His closest advisor the Duke of Buckingham promoted Arminianism which meant that King Charles also did by default.

((a) continued) Sources 10 and 11 give the idea to  
a certain -

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

(b)(i) The Anglo-Spanish war ended in 1588 but there were still other problems. Due to the war, Elizabeth found herself in financial difficulties. More and more people wanted ~~to be~~ control. For example Essex:

~~Elizabeth~~ when England and Spain went to war, there were other countries involved, for example Ireland. Source 15 is ~~the~~ ~~Irish~~ the Irish rebel leaders appeal to Philip II of Spain ~~and~~ appealing for ~~the~~ help ~~English~~ to drive the English out. As the main religion of Ireland was Catholic they called on the largest Catholic country ~~in~~ in the continent for help. They also knew that Spain would most likely be glad to assist. Elizabeth was <sup>wary of</sup> ~~not~~ Catholics. The English were ruling Ireland at this time. ~~The~~ The main leader in Ulster was Tyrone. He fought Bancroft's army and won but when the Earl of Essex took over Tyrone was defeated. This meant that England took over Ireland and lots of people rebelled. ~~The~~ ~~Irish also knew that~~ Source 15 also ~~says~~ says that if the Spanish helped the Irish then ~~Spain~~ a kingdom would be secured.

Elizabeth's financial problems caused her and Parliament



((b) continued) a lot of grief. The war with Spain ~~is~~ was very expensive. Source 14 talks about inflation. Inflation happened twice in the reign of Elizabeth. Once in the 1560s and then again in the 1590s. However it is likely that the war with Spain played a role in the ~~1590s~~ inflation period of the 1590s. ~~The~~ <sup>↑</sup>Reasons ~~for~~ <sup>were</sup> ~~that~~ <sup>were</sup> debasement of the coinage, ~~new~~ harvest failure, importing large amounts of silver from South America and ~~pop~~ an increase in population. ~~a~~

Elizabeth's government tried to make these problems better but when ~~it~~ <sup>inflation</sup> returned in the 1590s, they ~~stayed the same~~ re-appeared due to the actions taken.

Some historians argue that Elizabeth became unpopular during the last decade of her reign. There were a few clashes with Parliament over subsidies. Source 14 ~~is~~ ~~so~~ tells us that Elizabeth had to turn to Parliament for subsidies. However when MPs wanted to help her this could not be done as the parliamentary subsidies were collected by the local gentry.

There was some civil unrest for example the Essex Rebellion in 1601. Source 14 shows ~~us~~ ~~that~~ Elizabeth was ~~having~~ ~~trouble~~ having ~~trouble~~ trouble with Parliament and that she was



((b) continued) Struggling financially.

In source 13, Lord Burghley, the Lord High Treasurer, ~~is~~ believes that if England and Spain were at peace with each other then there would be more money because of trade. ~~It is not~~ The source also states that it is not ~~just~~ only just England that it is affected but Portugal, Barbary, France, Flanders, Hamburg and the Netherlands. Lord Burghley thinks that if ~~the~~ Elizabeth and Philip of Spain do not make peace then ~~a~~ ~~the~~ people in the kingdom will rebel and perish.

I agree that these ~~these~~ sources together ~~do~~ give the idea that the majority of Elizabeth's problems in her reign were caused by the continuing war with Spain. ~~The~~ I ~~agree that~~ ~~to~~ think that Elizabeth became unpopular ~~when~~ ~~the~~ due to the war with Spain. The Catholics disliked it so ~~that~~ held plots against her, for example Throckmorton Plot, Ridolfi Plot and Babington Plot. ~~The majority of~~ ~~her~~ Her financial problems ~~lay~~ ~~with~~ caused civil unrest and Parliamentary clashes during her last years before her death and I agree that the war with Spain caused these difficulties.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This script was awarded a low level 2. Whilst the response clearly demonstrates some understanding of the contextual issues necessary to answer the question and at times offers a sound account of the sources, the direct focus on the demands of the question are limited. Sources are dealt with sequentially, with no real attempt to directly cross-reference evidence. Thus, whilst there is some comparison of the views of individual sources to the issue at hand, this is in an implicit manner. The candidate offers relevant own knowledge to supplement their understanding of the sources, although again, this is not applied to the demands of the question.

### *Question 2(b) (i)*

Overall candidates dealt well with a question centred entirely on Elizabeth's reign. The question clearly offered opportunity for use of the sources and for the addition of other material as supportive references and in analysing the given views. Many candidates were able to achieve level 3 or above by clearly focusing on the relevant factors, prompted by the given evidence and developing these using the sources and contextual understanding. Stronger responses were able to explore the connections between issues, such as tying foreign policy to concerns with Parliament or with favourites, or poverty and economic difficulties. Within such responses, many developed arguments assessing how the war simply exacerbated underlying problems and weaknesses. However, whilst most candidates were able to offer some external knowledge on issues as ranging as famine, taxation, population growth and the deaths of key advisers, a small minority offered sound detail yet in a descriptive manner which added to supporting arguments made without offering real analysis. Overall though, the majority of candidates were able to access level 3 or above, with consistency of analysis within this being a key discriminating factor in higher achievement.

### *Question 2(b) (ii)*

The question clearly allowed candidates to use their knowledge of the reign of James to consider his performance across a range of areas. Within this, responses varied from those that showed excellent awareness integrated with well selected own knowledge of the differing views of James, through to those that provided a very general treatment of issues such as finance, religion and foreign policy, which were limited in explicit focus and were not always accurate. That said, the majority did manage to at least attempt analysis of the issues and given evidence. A minority of responses strayed beyond the date range of 1621 as specified in the question. In some cases, there was too much attention made of James' personality and predilections, which, whilst sometimes relevant, such as linking extravagance with financial failure, this lacked the more measured, objective approach which was more suited to a proper analysis of the extent of his success. Overall though, many were able to shape an 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 representations offered in the sources.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a)

How far sources 10, 11 & 12 suggest that Charles could not be relied upon to defend the church of England.

Source 10, by Charles himself - bias.

11 - Marrying a Catholic - worried people he was becoming too tolerant. Letter to London - Charles in good light.

12 - MP - Charles had issues with parliament bias. Support of Arminianism gave Charles enemies.

Money issues.

Marrying Catholic.

Support of Arminianism

Arguments with parliament

Personal rule 1629+

((a) continued)

Source 12 in particular suggests that Charles could not be relied upon to defend the Church of England and quite obviously does not approve of ~~James~~<sup>Charles'</sup> religious affairs. Source 10, even though it was written by Charles himself also seems to suggest that he can not be relied upon, even if that was not the intention when writing. Overall the sources do suggest to a fair degree that Charles could not be relied upon.

In source 10, Charles ~~talks~~ writes of banding 'together unanimously to one faith'. However this is almost entirely impossible as there had, for many decades, been religious turmoil, and the chances of all his people following one religion was essentially ridiculous. This source was written by Charles himself so he ~~is~~<sup>was</sup> highly unlikely to give a view that would make him appear bad so this source will contain bias. Also as it is to ~~be~~ pursue his Spanish marriage he would want to show his toleration to Catholics as he could gain something out of this. So although the source perhaps shows Charles being overly tolerant of Catholics, and therefore suggesting he can not be relied upon to defend the Church of England, this is more than likely the view Charles wanted to give across and



((a) continued) unlikely to be representative of his true actions.

Source 11 is also likely to contain bias. It would be trying to show Charles in a good light and prove that his marriage to Henrietta Maria is the right thing. This source does show that Charles could be relied upon though, as, unlike source 10, this source does show that Charles is not completely tolerant to Catholics. 'He will give them protection, but not liberty.' He is limiting their freedom to do as they wish whilst making it possible for him to have a marriage to a Catholic. So this source suggests that Charles is able to defend the Church of England more so than source 10 which one would think should suggest it to a greater degree.

Source 12, which was <sup>presented</sup> ~~wrote~~ by a committee of MP's is highly likely to be biased against Charles. From the beginning of his reign he had problems with parliament and they were unlikely to want to show his ability to handle religious matters. They talk of the spreading of the Arminian faction of which Charles was a supporter. His support of Arminianism caused great distrust and many other sources support this view that the majority disliked Charles for

((a) continued) This. Of the three sources, source 12 seems to support the view that Charles <sup>could not</sup> ~~couldn't~~ be relied upon to the greatest extent.

Charles did have a firm hand when it came to religion. People worried his marriage to Henrietta Maria would make him too tolerant, but he did not become overly tolerant and in that respect was reliable. His arguments with parliament meant he was often refused subsidies so did not have the money to fund the Church.

Therefore it can be said that sources 10 and 12 suggest to quite a degree that Charles could not be relied upon but that source 11 opposes this view and suggests that he would be able to defend the Church of England.

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

(b)(i) 1621 - James Successes outweighed Failures?  
 Union. Great contract. Avoided war.  
 Extravagance Debt. Favourites.  
 Seen to prefer the Scots.

(b)(ii) The view that up until 1621, James successes outweighed his failures could be seen as valid, as James did make for a good monarch from certain aspects of his rule. His successes <sup>had</sup> more accounts of an impact whilst his failures were more numerous. They need to be balanced out to create an accurate judgement.

Source 16 was wrote ~~at~~ just after James death by a MP. This source shows James in a good light, suggests he was a good monarch even with taking into account his faults. However this could merely be the view taken because Charles was now in power and parliament did not approve. This source appears to be comparing James and Charles as it talks of many of Charles' main faults, including: his ~~o~~. The source talks of how James opposed arminianism, and did not enforce illegal taxes, both of which Charles did. So in comparison to Charles maybe James made a good monarch but not necessarily when viewed alone.

((b) continued) Source 17 is a secondary source, not written at the time of James so would be held as less reliable. However its discussion on James' extravagance seems accurate as many other sources support this view. Extravagance was one of James' main faults as it meant he lacked the money to go to war when he needed it and put the whole country in debt. As source 17 says, the MPs did not want to vote subsidies for James to waste on himself and his favourites. This source does seem to suggest his failures outweighed his successes whilst source 16 suggests the opposite.

Source 18 is from James himself, so as far as he is concerned he is a good monarch. He appears to be very disapproving of parliament, most likely because they will not grant the subsidies he wanted and opposed his decisions. 'I am obliged to put up with what I cannot get rid of' He believes that he is a good leader for managing to deal with parliament.

James' extravagance was one of the major faults of his. He spent extravagantly on himself, family and favourites and as source 17 suggests, parliament were not willing to grant money for this. Having favourites also caused



((b) continued) problems and distrust and many Englishmen believed that he gave an unfair amount of royal patronage to Scotsmen. In reality the dealing of royal patronage should have actually been a success as he did share it out evenly. It was only because the Scots got money and the English got positions that it seemed unfair.

Another of James' failures was the concept of union. There was a vast amount of hatred between England and Scotland & so he was naïve to think that union would be so easy.

As Source 18 suggests, James did have a fairly high opinion of himself. The great contract and his disregard of Lionel Cranfield's advice were also failures as source 17 ~~suggests about~~ says.

However James did have few successes, his most notable being the avoidance of war. From the beginning of his reign, up till 1621 he managed to maintain peace, seeing himself as a mediator. People have suggested that his main reasons for avoiding war were cowardice and financial difficulties. However, whatever the reason, there is no doubt that the country benefited from his reign of peace. Also, even though the union

((b) continued) did not work out before 1621, it did set the stepping stones which meant that in the future, union was achieved.

It is fair to say that James' successes outweighed his failures, as although he had many more failures than successes, his successes were more notable and of greater importance. In particular, his ability to avoid going to war and as this prevented what could have been many more problems.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This script was awarded a level 3 in both assessment objectives. A focus of the question is largely maintained throughout the answer, and there is some attempt to consider a range of views and different aspects of James I's reign. The views within the sources are clearly identified and there is some analysis of these beyond merely use to support points. There is also integration of own knowledge, although more detail may be expected on this. There is some reasoning from the evidence, although the response lacks real analytical depth. Similarly, whilst there are attempts to offer judgement, the response does not give weight to different arguments that could be arrived at through a full consideration of the various points established. Nevertheless, the candidate has clearly engaged with the issues and the given evidence.



## Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	38	34	30	26
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code US024075 June 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

