

Examiners' Report
January 2013

GCE History 6HI02 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 visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and Edexcel national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

January 2013

Publications Code US034627

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from many candidates in this examination series. Indeed, many candidates wrote with understanding and insight about the key themes.

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in 80 minutes. Examiners commented on the fact that many candidates this series had clearly used their time to very good effect. Although some responses were quite brief, there was little evidence of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

There was a wide range of responses across the mark range, but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched whilst the less talented were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination.

In part A, most candidates were able to use the language of cross-referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross reference. In part B, it was again disappointing to note that a significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have a reasonable range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part B questions. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, many candidates continue to comment on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are often very generic e.g. "the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight" or "they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event". In any event, such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is what is being tested in question B. Candidates would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than to write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. Some candidates over-used words such as 'inference' and did not demonstrate a secure understanding of its meaning. However, overall, the language used by candidates seemed to contain fewer colloquialisms and abbreviations this year than in previous examinations.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1 (a)

Most candidates addressed the question directly and were able to use the sources to find evidence that both supported and opposed the claim that Wolsey was half-hearted in his efforts to bring about the king's annulment; frequently this was achieved by highlighting the use Wolsey was making of his contacts. The best answers cross-referenced the sources convincingly and used the provenance skilfully to weigh the sources and reach a judgement in relation to the question. Effective answers drew out the significance of the difference in the dates between source 1 and sources 2 and 3, and were able to use this to discriminate between the sources. Less well focused answers tended to fall back on knowledge, which is not rewarded in AO2a and/or worked sequentially through the sources describing their provenance and falling back upon claims that sources were 'biased'.

(a) half-hearted not half-hearted

not made use S2 + S1 advised gave Henry hope S1 + 3
(Lack of action) personality + determination S2 +

Although some sources pick up on the fact that Henry was unable to gain an annulment, both his determination and ability to fill Henry with hope show that he wholeheartedly wished to secure an annulment of the king's marriage.

Sources 1 and 2 both argue that Henry did not make efficient use of his resources and situation. Source 2 talks of 'manifold contacts' and says ~~that~~ Wolsey has 'not made use of this' implying he could have secured the annulment had he ~~to~~ tried harder to change the views of the Pope. Source 2 concurs with this view, suggesting 'Stafford has changed his opinion', once again implying he has useful connections. However there is still a distinct lack of action being implied by Wolsey as a result of this, ~~as~~ as he describes himself as 'well instructed of the facts'. It is possible source 2 ~~is~~ is more reliable, as it was written by Suffolk who was not directly involved in events. The ~~fact is~~ ^{fact is} ~~letter~~ is a letter and is private means he would not have feared

((a) continued) upsetting Wolsey. In comparison, source 1 was written by Wolsey, and he may have wanted events to seem more positive than they were. The fact source 2 was written two years after source 1 could not be further evidence to suggest that Wolsey had not acted on the relationship he had formed.

However, Wolsey successfully gave Henry hope, and would therefore have not wanted to let him down. This is shown in source 3 which states 'You have kindled the fire in Henry' and ~~is corroborated~~ this quote corroborates with source 1, when Wolsey states 'Stafford has changed his opinion'.^{*} The matter-of-fact tone of this further shows Wolsey's confidence in putting hope into the mind of Henry. Source 3 was written by Catherine of Aragon. Although there is a chance of misinterpretation, the fact Catherine felt threatened by Wolsey shows the way in which Wolsey was able to change Henry's mind. ^{*} Showing, once again, Wolsey's powers of manipulation, this time over Stafford.

Finally, it is suggested that Wolsey's attempt to secure an annulment were not half-hearted, due to Wolsey's determination. Source 3 ~~is~~ talks of Wolsey's 'arrogance, power and tyranny' and source 1 ^{agrees and} ~~just~~ shows Wolsey's determination in that he has persuaded Stafford to ~~write~~ write a 'scholarly book' as a result of their discussion. ^{Both} source 3, a face-to-face conversation and source 1 would be

(a) continued) subject to exaggeration, not least because of Catherine's anger. The negative language in source 3 does, however, imply that Wolsey may have been going about the arrangement the wrong way, angering his opponents rather than trying to win them over. Overall, the sources suggest that Wolsey was not half-hearted in securing an annulment. Source 3 seems the most revealing, as Catherine is clearly angry and concerned. This corroborates both Wolsey's determination in source 1, in which he would not want to kill Henry with false hope. Therefore, it is clear that although Wolsey was not fully successful, as highlighted in source 2, he was not half-hearted in his attempts.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a level 4 response. The sources are cross-referenced for both agreement and disagreement and effective inferences are drawn. On pages 1 and 2 perceptive comments are made on the provenance of sources 1 and 2. There are a couple of errors, but these do not detract from a response that does weigh the sources and reach a judgement based upon that weight.

Question 2 (a)

Most candidates addressed the question directly and were able to use the sources to find evidence that agreed and disagreed that the Addled Parliament was short lived because of the actions of the House of Commons. Candidates used sources 10 and 11 effectively to offer the view that the Commons were willing to make concessions and to contrast with the idea of plotting that emerged from source 12. The better candidates were able to analyse James' role effectively and compare it to the role played by the Commons, and were able to draw out good inferences from source 11 i.e. that only part of the Commons opposed James. Very few candidates picked up the date of source 12 which could have been used successfully when weighing the sources for value.

The evidence displayed in sources 10, 11 and 12 ~~convey that~~ do not go far to suggest that the Addled Parliament was short-lived as a result of the actions of the House of Commons alone, but moreover the result of neither the Commons nor James being willing to concede to the others demands without concessions.

Source 10 suggests that the King should
(a) continued) "make concessions to those who are critics within the Commons", ~~although~~ this could be used to support the argument that it was the actions of the Commons because these "critics" of James may have antagonized the King and should not expect concessions. Furthermore, the language used in Source 11 is forceful and confident "they must make a settlement in matters of religion" this use of the word "must" implies a tactless pressure on the King to do the bidding of the lower Chamber. Also supporting the suggestion that the Commons brought about the end of the Addled Parliament is the evidence in Source 11 that suggests that despite of the King knowing he could impose subsidies he "had wished to assemble the parliament"; it could therefore be inferred that if James had wanted to call Parliament it seems

unlikely that he would ~~not~~ have wanted to dissolve it so quickly.

On the other hand, it could also be argued that it was ~~the action of the king~~ not the House of Commons that made the Addled Parliament so short-lived. This is supported in Source A by the public proposal of Sir Henry Neville and the ~~begin~~ cooperative language he used. "You should find these gentlemen exceedingly

(a) continued) willing to do your Majesty service" this prompts the suggestion that it was James' unwillingness "to make concessions" that brought about the end of the Parliament. Furthermore, the concessions being not those that would appear to encroach prerogative, it could be concluded that James was being unreasonable. This willingness of Parliament to cooperate can be seen again in Source 11 with the words "the parliament had assembled to serve the king and for the good of the realm" this does not suggest unruly action from the commons. Furthermore, Source 12 presents an interesting argument that it was a "A plot discovered within Parliament to overthrow all orderly proceedings" that caused the Addled Parliament to fall. This could suggest that some of the commons were involved but there is little evidence to support these claims presented in this letter by John Chamberlain. But from this we can infer that any particularly unruly requests or concessions from the Commons may have been the result of a plot and thus not

the actions of the Commons as a whole.

The reliability, context and purpose of these sources should be accounted for. Source 10 is a public proposal, it therefore needed to appear courteous and respectful to the king and thus may not be entirely representative of Sir Henry Neville's motives, he was also an influential courtier meaning he would have been aware of the impact of his words. Source 11 was written by an outsider of the Commons as a report to the government of Venice, this ~~may hinder its reliability~~ may strengthen its reliability because it should be impartial. Finally Source 12 is a friendly letter and this may be why Chamberlain is willing to go into details of a conspiracy, he may also just want to ~~spread~~ spread rumours to his friend, however ~~the~~ his "good contacts" make his account more reliable. All three sources are contemporary.

To conclude, given the reliability of these sources and the ~~arguments~~ arguments presented in each. It is viable to ascertain that the fact the Added Parliament of 1614 was short-lived as a result of the unwillingness of both the Commons and James to negotiate and does not go far to suggest it was the actions of the ~~Commons~~ House of Commons



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a level 3 response. The candidate identifies the issue in the introduction but initially works through the sources individually drawing out reasonable inferences. The candidate does begin to cross-reference on page 3. Comments on the provenance of the sources are reserved until the end of the answer and a judgement is given.

Question 2 (b)

This was the most popular question in part b and encouraged a range of well focused responses. Candidates were able to use the sources to identify a range of problems beyond the given factor, Court factions, that Elizabeth faced in her later years including conflict with Parliament over monopolies, the impact of the wars with Spain and in Ireland and the financial difficulties these caused as well as issues of poverty and social discontent. The best responses skilfully integrated sources with well selected own knowledge to examine the significance of the problems. Some weaker candidates had little to offer beyond referring to Essex bursting into Elizabeth's bedchamber.

Whilst a majority of candidates were able to use the sources as evidence not information, some commented on the provenance of the sources. Where comments about historians were included they added nothing to the response.

* (b) When looking on the face of the sources it appears that source 13 agrees that the greatest problem faced by Elizabeth was court factions. Whereas source 14 appears to show other reasons as her greatest problems, and source 15 can be used to argue both for and against, court factions being Queen Elizabeth's greatest problem.

When looking at source 13 it appears to show that the factional struggle between Cecil and the Earl of Essex was the Queen's greatest problem as it states that it led to "difficulties" during the last years of her reign.

This source could also suggest that the disagreement Essex and Cecil in parliament caused a divide because the source states ~~for~~ the "government dominated by Elizabeth and the Cecils." This could imply there was a large divide between ~~between~~ the Court, which may have caused the uprising of Essex, that resulted in the failure of ~~the~~ Essex mob in attempt to overthrow the Queen.

Furthermore source 15 states that when the rebellion broke out in Ireland the rebel leaders Tyrone and O'Donnell appealed to Spain for help. This problem caused Elizabeth to bankrupt the Country to regain control. The rebellion in Ireland could have been put down to court factions as

it was Essex who was originally supposed to stop the rebellion but instead he made a deal with them. Therefore

((b) continued) this shows court factions was her largest problem during her last years.

Comparatively Source 14 appears to suggest that monopolies ~~was~~ caused Elizabeth great problems during her last years as parliament began to see them as corrupt. Parliament refused to pay Elizabeth taxes until she had agreed to look into monopolies. This made Elizabeth desperate as she needed the taxes to pay off the Irish rebellion, therefore Queen Elizabeth made a golden speech this regained the control of the parliament. Therefore source 14 appears to imply that it was monopolies that was her greatest problem during her last years as she was losing the support of her parliament and of her subjects. Also source 14 implies that ~~religion~~ ^{the ending Anglo-Spanish trade.} was a problem during the last years of her reign because it "imposed ~~an~~ economic and social burdens on the country". This suggests that because the trade ended ~~of~~ the Queens economy was falling as no one was buying the products and we had lost all of our social connections.

Therefore when looking at these sources overall it is clear that there were other problems ~~due to~~ faced during the last years of Elizabeth's reign ~~as~~ for example the monopolies shown in source 14, the prolonged war with Spain and the ending of Anglo-Spanish

Question

((b) continued) trade in source 15, and also the rebellious mob referred to in source 13. Source 14 carries the most weight because it was written during the time by the house of commons.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This enters level 3 for A01. The candidate is focused on the question and works through Elizabeth's problems. The knowledge is limited in range and depth and there are occasional inaccuracies. The sources are used mainly for information rather than for analysis and so this is a level 2 response for A02b.

This was less popular than 2(b)(ii) but produced some good answers, although a number of candidates struggled to develop secure knowledge to address the question. The most effective answers weighed up the importance of James' opposition in comparison to the lack of funds for war provided by parliament and also considered the roles of Buckingham and Prince Charles in moving England closer to war. Weaker responses worked sequentially through the sources adding little to them.

* (b) James I was a King who went by the motto "beati pacifici" - blessed are the peacemakers. ~~Although~~ This gives insight into the mind of a man who wanted to unify Europe in peace and not create wars. However it can be argued that James did not want to intervene in the Thirty Years war because of financial reasons and the fear of handing over too much power to Parliament in order to achieve this. Given James' history in creating peace throughout his reign it does however seem viable to infer that it was indeed James' opposition to war that served as the main obstacle to England's intervention of the Thirty Years War.

When war broke out in 1618 James had not anticipated that his union of his daughter to Frederick Elector Palatine would put him in such an awkward position. James' dismay at the actions of Frederick can be perceived in source 16 with the strong words of "Godless man an an usurper" ~~that~~ after Frederick accepted the throne of Bohemia.

James' opposition to war can be seen in the line ¹⁷ that Frederick should surrender the throne "than that I should be involved in a bad cause" this phrase "bad cause" is indicative of James' opposition to war. Furthermore, when James had finally

((b) continued) finally agreed to launch an expedition to help Frederick. Source 17 indicates that the King refused to believe that he was engaging in warfare with Spain. He preferred to insist the expedition was "concerned solely with the recovery of Frederick's German lands", he did not want his expedition to fight with the Dutch nor be "directed against Spanish troops". This infers again that James did not wish to take sides and engage himself in warfare with either. This may be the result of ~~the~~ James' hatred of war and desire for peace that he had pressed so strongly for ~~the~~ with the protestant marriage for Elizabeth^{in 1613} and the attempted Spanish^{Catholic} marriage for his son Charles. He could not have guessed that the Spanish would agree to help the Habsburgs invade the Lower Palatinate. Furthermore, the evidence presented in Source 18 suggests that James ~~is~~ "did not lose all control" and that resultedly ~~the~~ war with Spain was not declared until after his death in 1625. This infers that the element of control that James had retained was used to prevent the declaration of war.

On the other hand, the argument that it was not so much James' opposition to war that proved the main obstacle to England's intervention in the ~~the~~ Thirty Years War but moreover his lack

((b) continued) of sufficient funds to intervene. James had always proved cautious with money and was sometimes unwilling to concede to Parliamentary demands to secure subsidies, as seen during the Addled Parliament of 1614. James realized that conceding to Parliament would result in loss of power and this in itself provides ~~an~~ an obstacle for war intervention. This argument is supported in Source 18 with the information regarding the willingness of the Commons to grant only £300,000 for hostilities against Spain. Parliament had however liked Buckingham's ~~tempted~~ tempting strategy of naval war as this brought glory and bounty in the days of Drake and the Armada. However, in order to get Parliament on side James ~~had~~ gave Parliament the authority to "appoint treasurers to oversee the collection and specific uses of subsidies", this is an example of James slowly conceding to Parliament as a result of prepared warfare, not something that ~~was~~ he had ever intended to do. The planned expedition of recovering Frederick's lands was already coming at a price of an expected "one million pounds a year" - intervention with the Thirty Years War was going to cost both the Royal Purse and the Royal Ego a rather large sum, and this may indeed have proved the greater obstacle if it were not for James' long

((b) continued) history of Peace negotiations seen ~~as~~ by his unification of Scotland and England in 1604, his part in the Truce of Antwerp at 12 years truce in 1609 and help with the Treaty of Xanten, ~~to return the Netherlands~~

The sources presented for analysis here should also be assessed. Source 16 is from the Spanish Ambassador to King Philip II, therefore we should note that the King may have been telling the ambassador what he wanted to hear. Sources 17+18 are ~~the~~ modern interpretations and thus have the gift of hindsight but, loses the advantage of being contemporary. ~~Source 17 is also~~

To conclude, although James was under financial pressure and unwilling to concede too much ^{power} to parliament, ~~his~~ ~~was~~ the main obstacle for England's intervention in the Thirty Years War was indeed James' opposition to war. ~~and desire~~



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response achieves level 4 for both assessment objectives. It is driven by the sources with a clear focus on the different representations. The knowledge is securely integrated and there is an analytical focus. There is a judgement in the conclusion although this would have been better developed by use of the sources.

Paper Summary

Based on performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross-referencing. Weaker candidates often resorted to a brief summary of each source in turn. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. This aids its use as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
4. The best responses cross-reference not only the content of the sources but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.

Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not a descriptive or chronological account.
3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and it is not required for this assessment objective. Indeed, some candidates engaged in generalised comments about the reliability of a particular historian at the expense of developing argument and analysis supported by specific own knowledge.
4. Candidates need to ensure that where the question asks them to deal with a specific time period they do not stray beyond those parameters.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Order Code US034627 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

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

