

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2012

GCE History (6HI02) Paper A

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification 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 Pearson about Edexcel qualifications on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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 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)

January 2012

Publications Code US030597

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

## 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**

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: 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 the content 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 & 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 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><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.*

### **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.

### **Unit 2 Assessment Grid**

<b>Question Number</b>	<b>AO1a and b Marks</b>	<b>AO2a Marks</b>	<b>AO2b Marks</b>	<b>Total marks for question</b>
<b>Q (a)</b>	-	20	-	20
<b>Q (b) (i) or (ii)</b>	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>

**A1 Henry VIII: Authority, Nation and Religion, 1509-40**

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>1 (a)</b>	<p>The sources offer evidence to both support and challenge the stated view. Taken at face value, support is found in Source 1, where it shows the dissatisfaction that was prevailing and the reluctance of commissioners to press the people over the grant. Source 3 reflects this to an extent, highlighting the disquiet in the form of uprisings and quarrels. Source 2 also demonstrates particular discontent over a perceived inequity in payment between the clergy and laity, whilst the request in regarding authority if payment is denied may be taken to imply that resistance is anticipated. However, with regard to challenge to the view, Source 2 does indicate that whilst there has been discontent, the people of Suffolk are now agreeable. Candidates may also indicate that Source 2 thus seems to suggest that the discontent was more against the perceived inequity rather than the Grant in itself. In a similar manner, whilst both Sources 1 and 3 point to the difficulties in collecting the grant and advise over caution in this, neither are entirely pessimistic regarding this. Candidates may also reflect that both Sources 3 and 1 suggest that a proportion of the resentment is directed at Wolsey rather than the grant itself; directly in Wolsey's statement in Source 3 and alluded to by Warham's reference to as 'long as some liveth'.</p> <p>In exploring the differing views, candidates may highlight the attribution of sources, reflecting on the roles of Suffolk in Source 2 and Warham in Source 1 or the particular localities their evidence relates to. Similarly candidates may highlight the nature and purpose of the instructions in Source 3. The chronology of the sources may also be drawn upon for valid discussion of areas of agreement and disagreement. Candidates considering such issues with specific reference to the content of the sources can achieve Level 3. Responses which reach a judgement reasoned through a careful consideration of the evidence can achieve Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the achievements of English foreign policy in the years 1511-1525. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question. Both Sources 5 and 6 offer evidence regarding the limitations of foreign policy in terms of its cost in financial terms and subsequent gains made. Source 4 points more towards Wolsey's role as a diplomat and could be used to argue a case for his success through largely maintaining peace, albeit suggesting other ulterior motives in 1521. Candidates equally may judge that meetings such as the Field of the Cloth of Gold were somewhat hollow victories in terms of subsequent developments. This could be linked to Source 6, where it acknowledges the economic constraints on foreign policy, allowing candidates to build an analysis of the extent to which Henry and Wolsey were successful in operating within these constraints. Candidates may draw on their own knowledge in relation to this, for example highlighting how the peace that Wolsey negotiated with France in 1518 (Source 4) was at the cost of surrendering some previous territorial gains, although they may reflect that such territory could not have been maintained anyway. Similarly they may argue that the victory at the Battle of the Spurs and the capture of Tournai in the campaign of 1512-13 was more of a success than Source 6 suggests.</p> <p>Candidates may argue the extent to which the failures can be seen in the context of Henry's rather unrealistic ambitions, although the focus should clearly remain on the extent of success or failure. Such arguments could be made linking their own knowledge to various aspects of all three sources. Candidates may raise a range of other issues using their own knowledge, perhaps considering the importance Wolsey's appointment as Cardinal or Papal Legate had on his relations with foreign powers, or analysing the extent to which English actions became subordinate to the renewed conflict between the Habsburgs and the Valois from 1521.</p> <p>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 English foreign policy in the period, 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>Overall the sources provide evidence for a range of arguments concerning the debate at hand. At first sight Source 8 seems to offer the strongest evidence to support the claim, detailing financial gains made and indicating the differing intended purposes of the gains for Henry and Cromwell. Sources 7 and 9 can also be drawn from to support the view, as Innes (Source 7) goes on to indicate financial motives, albeit stating the 'bulk of the wealth' went to individuals rather than the state. Similarly, the records of Henry's office (Source 9) also suggest profit is a clear motivation in the closure of Furness Abbey. Own knowledge could be utilised to support such claims, considering how the bulk of wealth appropriated, amounting to approximately one-tenth of that of the entire kingdom, was transferred from the monasteries. The extent to which the gains made in earlier dissolutions acted as a further incentive, and the extent to which Henry personally gained from this could both be the basis for a developed exploration of issues at Level 3 or above.</p> <p>In challenging the view stated in the question, candidates could draw from a range of other possible motivations. Source 7 refers to various charges of corruption and involvement of the monasteries in insurrection of some form. Source 9 offers more specific detail concerning culpability in the Pilgrimage of Grace which could be used as both an example of general motivation and a particular incentive to these latter closures. Some candidates may explore what implications Henry's offer of money for the 'monks of an honest sort' has to the question. Candidates may also question the extent to which source 8 offers evidence that financial gain was a significant factor in bringing about these dissolutions, or merely a beneficial outcome. Drawing from their own knowledge, candidates may consider a range of other factors, such as the role of individuals such as Cromwell or arguments concern the decay of monasticism. Some discussion of the extent to which motives can be seen as pre-determined or static may also be found in high level responses, although this would be an indicator rather than a requirement.</p> <p>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 motives for the dissolution of the greater monasteries, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	<p>40</p>

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<b>2 (a)</b>	<p>Taken at face value Sources 10 and 12 seems to present the greatest support to the stated view. In Source 12, More clearly outlines what he sees as Parliament's view of the extravagance of James, whilst although in some senses Hutton (Source 10) portrays his generosity as a positive trait, he is clearly warning of the consequences this may bring to the Treasury. At face value Dorset's correspondence in Source 11 seems to counter the claim, suggesting the failures of others to make payments due to the Crown are primarily at fault. This does bear a manner of relation to the reluctance of Parliament in Source 12 to 'replenish the royal cistern' and also could be related to the fears in Source 10 being borne out. Candidates may reflect that these two issues are not incompatible; Source 11 alludes to three difficult years managing the King's finances, thus seeming to accept that James' circumstances are partly at fault. Source 12 could also be related to this as regards Parliament's view of James' finances. Argument could also be built around Source 10 offering evidence to there having existed a somewhat jaundiced view of James extravagance from early on in his reign, which ultimately served to further hamper his financial affairs. Candidates exploring some of these issues beyond face value would be expected to achieve Level 3 or above. Candidates considering the nature and provenance of the evidence may consider the particular chronology of the evidence or reflect upon the roles of individuals concerned, perhaps exploring how Dorset's particular experiences (Source 11) would lead him to a more defensive view of James, or examine how the evidence of Hutton (Source 10) and More (Source 12) are perhaps reflections of the views and perspectives they have been exposed to. Candidates utilising inferential skills or consideration of provenance in relation to issues identified in the content of the sources should achieve Level 3. Responses which are able to resolve such issues and reach judgement on the evidence will be deserving of Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to offer an assessment of James' foreign policy and the role Parliament played in this. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question. On the face of it Source 13 appears to provide the strongest evidence to support this claim, offering a range of examples from peace with Spain in 1604 through to James' change of policy in 1624 as exemplification of their desire to see his peaceful efforts fail. Cumulatively these demonstrate a reluctance to support that could be used as the basis for an analysis of the role Parliament played in undermining James. Source 15 could also be engaged in support of this. Set in the context of Parliament meeting after Spain had invaded the Palatinate, it demonstrates their support for a change in policy. An analysis of this could also be linked to the consideration of James' motives in 1621 shown in Source 14. Candidates could draw on a range of own knowledge in pursuit of such arguments, considering the prevailing attitudes amongst Parliament in support of the Dutch rebels and the Protestant states, the general reverence of the likes of Drake and Raleigh as evidence of a desire to return to an Elizabethan 'golden age' of war against Spain through to the increase in popularity of Buckingham due to his anti-Spanish policy after the failure of the Spanish match.</p> <p>Source 14 appears to offer the strongest basis for a challenge to the claim, highlighting the sheer complexity of the situation within which James attempted to work. It could also be used to argue a case that until 1621 the policy was broadly successful. In this sense it could be linked back to Source 13 in arguing that whilst Parliament opposed James' peaceful efforts, this did not cause them to fail until after this point. Similarly Source 15 could be used to counter the claim to an extent as Parliament's arguments are framed in a manner that appears broadly supportive. However, it is likely candidates may explore this source in the context of Parliament's frustration up to this point and thus seeing this as an opportunity to affect a change in policy. Candidates may draw upon a range of own knowledge to challenge the stated view, perhaps considering the truce between Spain and the United Provinces as a fragile agreement that could not be realistically held together by his intervention, particularly considering the implications of the conditions that would be placed upon any marriage. Events in Bohemia after Rudolph's death could also be considered, although candidates could utilise this in different ways.</p> <p>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 James' foreign policy, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
<p><b>2 (b)</b> <b>(ii)</b></p>	<p>The question asks candidates to offer an assessment of the reasons for the breakdown of relations between Charles and Parliament. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question. In Source 16, Charles clearly offers his view, which lays the blame on a minority of 'troublesome men' in the Commons. The extent to which Charles' own view can be relied upon may be analysed in the context of the time. Candidates may reflect that whilst Charles did firmly believe this, its purpose also serves as an appeal to what he believes can be a more reasoned majority. Source 17 could be linked to this view, suggesting it had been a longer-term belief of Charles. It could be used to develop an argument that whilst there may have been some validity in Charles' belief, his response exacerbated the situation. This could be developed to explore the extent to which Charles' wider beliefs concerning the role of Parliament, his somewhat intransigent character and his actions such as previous dissolution of Parliament could be said to be at fault for the ultimate breakdown of relations. In Source 18, Lockyer focuses on the events of March 1629. It could be used as a basis for a more pragmatic assessment of Charles' actions, in that regardless of what had happened before, Parliament was not functioning for his needs. This potentially opens up a range of issues concerning the minority alluded to by Charles, as well as the extent to which the Commons more generally acquiesced in their actions. In utilising their own knowledge, candidates could draw upon a range of issues, such as Charles' character, his religious views and policies, his marriage to Henrietta Maria, the role of Buckingham, the Petition of Right, taxation and fears of absolutism. Candidates may approach this with equal success in different ways, broadening the assessment to the wider reasons mentioned or concentrating on the issues raised more directly in the sources.</p> <p>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 in relations, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	<p>40</p>





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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code US030597 January 2012

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

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

