

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2009

GCE

## GCE History 6HI02 Option A

**ResultsPlus**  
Helping you to raise attainment  
[www.resultsplus.edexcel.com](http://www.resultsplus.edexcel.com)

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/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit <http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2009

Publications Code US021428

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

## Contents

### *History 6HI02 Option A*

General Comments	2
Question A1	5
Question A2	16
Conclusion	20
Grade Boundaries	20

## 6HI02

### General Comments

There were many candidates who attained high levels in this examination, having demonstrated a good range of historical knowledge, clear understanding of historical development and its related concepts. While the option-specific comments set out below offer detailed reference and examples of student work, the purpose of the comments that follow is to highlight problems experienced by students across all options, and to suggest strategies for improving performance in the future.

Some candidates continue to create difficulties for themselves because they do not plan their time and do not read the sources with sufficient concentration.

The marks awarded for (a) and (b) questions indicate the amount of time that should be spent on each. The best responses in both (a) and (b) tended to be based on **analysing the sources as a set, with a sense of context**, to establish arguments that relate to the question. This approach allows the response to be source-driven, directed towards developing a judgement, as the question requires. It is therefore likely to score highly because **it is coherent and focused**. A key point is that the analysis should be carried out **before** the response is planned and written, so that the response is **structured around points of argument**, with **selective** source reference offered in support. Candidates who base a response on the sources in isolation are rarely able to cross-reference effectively and build a developed conclusion, sometimes running out of time.

Under pressure, candidates sometimes overlook key words or connections within the source, which can cause a serious misunderstanding that undermines a whole response. This is less likely if they habitually ask themselves whether what they **think** the source is saying is logical and appropriate in the context of the period to which it relates. Confidence in reading and using historical sources is derived **from regular and ongoing use of historical texts for research**. The essential skills of reading, comprehension, analysis and making notes from a range of historical texts lay the necessary foundations for handling extracts from such texts under examination conditions.

It is pleasing that the great majority of candidates avoided these basic pitfalls, and produced responses that varied from competent to excellent. Most candidates achieved good L2 in at least one objective, thereby demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of the period that they had studied, and the ability to analyse and comprehend individual sources, at least at face value. The skills of inference and cross-referencing, however are required to reach the higher levels.

Broadly speaking, the performance descriptors related to the E/U boundary, as described in the Specification, page 233, indicate a secure L2 performance, and a candidate achieving good L2 in all three descriptors will move beyond the borderline area.

**Progression towards higher levels in objective AO2** depends on the ability to make **developed inferences** from sources that have been **cross-referenced** as a set. Candidates who analyse sources into relevant points, reason from the evidence and link points taken from more than one source are likely to achieve L3. Those who also demonstrate the ability to **apply provenance and contextual understanding** to the **evaluation** of such evidence are moving into L4. It is the ability to **weigh the evidence** in order to come to an **overall judgement** that takes account of any conflicts, takes a response to the top of L4.

**Progression in AO1** depends on the **contextual understanding** that is applied to the sources as a set, in order to **develop and explain their implications as relevant arguments**, and on the deployment of **contextual knowledge to support, challenge and develop such arguments towards an overall judgement**.

Examples of such progression are included in the option-specific comments below, but certain points are

applicable across all options and may usefully be summarised here to highlight the ways in which candidate performance can be improved.

Most candidates made some attempt to draw inferences from source material but weaker candidates tended not to develop them. A **developed inference** requires the point to be clearly stated and supported by some reference to the source material, and **the connections between them made explicit**. This can be described, as in the AO2b mark scheme, as 'reasoning from the evidence' and the reasoning needs to be explicit. It is the key difference between treating sources as information (L2) and treating them as sources of **evidence**, which needs to be interpreted and explained.

Many candidates appeared to believe that pointing out agreement or disagreement between sources or parts of sources meets the requirements of **cross-referencing**. There remains a widespread tendency for candidates to analyse (or too often describe) the content of each source in turn, then try to draw out points of comparison. This tends to lead either to responses that are overly long, or to comparisons that are brief and general. The purpose of cross-referencing is to develop and bring out the implications of **sources as a set**, on the basis that if they are used in combination they offer more understanding than can be developed by considering them separately or cumulatively. **Cross-referencing therefore requires sources to be broken down so that comparisons can be drawn between points, rather than between whole sources**. The candidate can then reassemble the points into an answer to the question.

An area of particular weakness seems to be the **application of provenance**, using the nature and purpose of a source to evaluate the significance and reliability of the evidence within it. Very few candidates failed to mention provenance, and equally few were able to **apply** it effectively. Many candidates could identify 'bias', often quite accurately, but few were then able to make a **reasoned judgement as to how far this discredited the evidence within the source**. Many simply discounted the problem by finding a matching bias in other sources. Others assumed that the nature of a source dictated its value – newspapers were generally deemed unreliable, private letters accurate. Some candidates had difficulty accepting that opinions could be both sincere and objectively unreliable. There is also a tendency for candidates to see provenance only in negative terms, and not to take into account that testimony which is unwitting or from a 'biased' source can provide very strong evidence if it runs against expectation. The key issue is that **provenance needs to be related to particular points** within a source to **demonstrate its effects** on the **quality** of the evidence **in relation to the particular enquiry**. In (a) questions, where candidates are dealing with contemporary sources, this is often the means by which they can come to an overall judgement.

Candidates also offered some strange perceptions as to the value of historians' interpretations. Some candidates were aware of different 'schools' of historians, and often sided with one or other according to their own preference. A few engaged in polemics to the point where their response was seriously undermined. It is clear that the concept of reliability remains difficult for many candidates, but most have some idea of how to approach contemporary sources. However, historians' views do not lend themselves to explicit evaluation for 'reliability'. **The best candidates demonstrated an understanding that historians offer views that are based on reliable research, but are nevertheless interpretations using evidence and judgement**. As such, they indicate possible explanations of the past, from which we can learn by comparing the different interpretations, and evaluating them in the light of the evidence in order to develop our own. Candidates will address this more fully in A2, especially in Unit 3. It is not expected that they will routinely demonstrate a full appreciation of historical interpretation at AS level. However, those who understand that historians' views are interpretations, and that they can be both valid and varied, are likely to reach high levels at AS as well as laying good foundation for further progress. In the context of the Unit 2 examination, the historians' sources often provide a structure for the (b) response as a whole. They allow conflicting arguments to be established, evaluated against the other sources and the candidate's contextual knowledge, and used as the basis of a balanced judgement as required for L4. In doing this candidates can evaluate the historians' sources without specific consideration of 'reliability'.

In both (a) and (b) questions the best candidates offered an overall judgement drawn from their preceding arguments. However an effective judgement cannot simply ignore the existence of conflicting evidence, or describe differences before asserting a preference. The key to L4 is recognition of different or conflicting interpretations **and** an attempt to **weigh the quality of evidence** in order to judge between them or resolve apparent conflicts. In (b) questions candidates could also assess historians' judgements, such as the role and significance of particular factors, in the light of the evidence and their own knowledge. Some candidates offered these elements within the body of their response, others in a developed conclusion. The best did both, pointing to evaluation as they developed their arguments, and summarising the results in a direct comparison at the end.

## Option A

### Question A1

1a Most candidates found Question 1a very accessible, and few candidates reached less than good L2 of the marking grid. The most common reasons for failure to achieve higher levels were the tendency to deal with Sources in isolation, and to treat them as sources of information rather than evidence. Many candidates asserted that Sources 1 and 3 agreed that the Church did exploit people's faith, and that Source 2 disagreed, then proceeded to summarise each source in turn with brief assertions that 'this shows exploitation' or that 'Aske thought that the Church was a good thing for people'. Responses of this kind could gain marks at borderline L2/3 if they were thoroughly covered, but candidates often took too much time to do this, at the expense of part (b).. Better responses linked Sources 1 and 3, quoting from the criticisms made by Simon Fish and pointing out that Source 3 offered an example of the Church receiving money in both taxes and payments, and contrasted this with Aske's claims that the northern abbeys 'gave great alms' as well as providing physical and spiritual support. Most candidates saw that neither Fish nor Aske were entirely reliable witnesses, and argued that Joan Brytten's will was more objective. Responses of this kind achieved L3. However, very few candidates offered an effective overall judgement. Most described the conflict, with some utilising neat, but superficial, solutions based on varying dates, geographical differences or simply individual practice. Few linked and weighed the quality of the evidence to develop a balanced assessment of 'how far'. The best responses integrated the Sources to argue for and against the claim in the Question, often recognising that Source 3 could be interpreted in different ways, and developed their conclusion on that basis.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The example that follows is characteristic of a good response to this question. There is clear focus, developed analysis and cross-referencing. There is also awareness of provenance and its impact on the quality of the evidence with an understanding that evidence cannot be conclusive. This is exemplified in pointing out that Joan Brytten's will can be seen as evidence of exploitation and also as evidence of a healthy Church that inspired genuine faith and trust. However, there is also a tendency to work through the Sources separately and to address reliability as a separate issue, thereby making the response a very long one. It may be for this reason that the response fails to develop an overall judgement and simply summarises the conflicting evidence. The quality of analysis, interpretation and evaluation in this case merited a mark of 18 out of 20, but a more frequent outcome of this approach was a borderline L3/4 at 15/16 marks. An interesting comparison can be made with the response to Question 2a, printed below, which adopted a much more economical structure.

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) did exploit

didn't exploit.

source 1

source 2

sources

From the sources given, it is clear to identify that source 1 and 2 completely agree with the phrasing of the question, in that the Church exploited people's faith to increase its own wealth.

Source 1, begins this accusation by using the metaphor 'ravenous wolves' to describe the bishops, consequently implying that they are vicious creatures with no concerns



((a) continued) of others in order for their personal gain. The source further goes on to saying that the bishops own ~~half~~ a third of the land (which they may lease out for more profit) and further to this take 1/10 of everybody's income. Those who refuse to pay are labelled heretics and face dire consequences. He further goes on to saying that money is obtained by priests through a variety of ways including fees, for wills, testaments, pilgrimages and first masses. By calling these priests 'greedy' he furthers his claim. ~~the~~ Similarly, Source 3 also talks about how priests gain their money i.e. through wills (as mentioned in source 2). It is clear from the passage given that people had complete faith in their religion and were willing to do anything to <sup>not</sup> risk eternal damnation. In this source ~~the~~ Joan Brytten has given money so a priest ~~will~~ will sing 'for [her] soul' i.e. pray for her spirit. Some people may regard this as exploitation ~~this especially includes protestants who~~ of people's beliefs in that they have had to pay to ensure they enter heaven. <sup>whereas others may say this shows complete faith and a trusting source (church)</sup>

((a) continued) The furthermore, the source 3 given can be highly trusted in showing the views of normal & Christian people at the time as it is a primary source. This in turn means that the author was there to acknowledge all the going-ons before coming to a conclusion of what to fight in the will. As a result, this will from an ordinary person shows the wills of people in general in the 1540s. Source 1 on the other hand, although sharing the same view can not be as relied upon. ~~Although it~~ Although it is also a primary source (therefore the author was present) ~~it~~ and therefore shows the different opinions on religious exploitation, the author had come into conflict with Wolsey. As Wolsey ~~is~~ was one of the most regarded people in England's clergy it comes as no surprise that the author is writing against ~~the~~ the clergy. Moreover, as it is a pamphlet 'attacking' the church, it contains vast amounts of bias and therefore the author, without a doubt must have exaggerated in order to persuade others to follow his view point. (his purpose for writing).

((a) continued)

In complete contrast to this is source 2. It argues that the bishops instead of exploiting wealth helped poor men. (ie instead of taking they gave) He argues that ~~bishops~~ abbots had vast jobs in educating and preaching and weren't therefore 'greedy'. Their mission in life being to help others. Again, this source is primary adding to its reliability (although it doesn't have the benefit of hindsight as a secondary source would). Therefore it can be trusted in ~~a~~ certain extent. However, one factor that majorly undermines the source ~~it~~ is the author himself. As mentioned Robert Aske was the leader of the Pilgrimage of Grace and consequently, it would be in his interest to forward the idea of bishops and priests doing their job well. Moreover, the evidence was given after failure of his rebellion, this may add to his spitefulness against Henry VIII and his policies and would therefore write ~~a~~ ~~some~~ give evidence to undermine Henry VIII's authority. However, as Robert Aske is clearly a religious man, it would

((a) continued) be hard to discredit this source altogether as it was taken under oath and therefore it is unlikely he may have lied. On the contrary, there is no certainty as to how far he could have lied in order to further his cause.

On balance, the sources 1 and 3 support the idea that the Church exploited people's religion to increase its own wealth. Source 1 does this in a more direct, harsh way, whereas Source 3 does this subtly (as some may argue leaving money in wills for prayers is exploitation, however others may not). On the other hand, Source 2, completely contradicts the other 2, arguing that the Church and its follow's returned to please/help people as oppose to exploiting them.

**1bi** This was by far the more popular Question (b) and was generally handled well by candidates. Most were able to utilise Sources 4 and 5 to establish conflicting explanations for Henry's failure to obtain an annulment, and to develop their points with some contextual knowledge, reaching L3 in AO1. Some weaker candidates relied almost entirely on the sources, and a few went beyond 1529 to include irrelevant material, but the majority were able to focus well and to integrate Sources with wider knowledge to argue a case. Good responses cross-referenced Sources 4 and 6 to highlight Catherine's role, covering her refusal to enter a convent or to accept Wolsey's jurisdiction, and supporting this by reference to her popularity, her behaviour at Blackfriars and her determination to protect Mary. They also referred to her 'Spanish links' and the role of Charles V as outlined in Source 5. Supporting knowledge of the European context was good, and many candidates also developed arguments relating to the role of the Pope and the weakness of Henry's case. Candidates were less secure in evaluating the Sources. Wolsey's evidence was variably reliable/ unreliable, but most arguments were plausible. Treatment of Sources 4 and 5 was often weak – e.g. Scarisbrick is a revisionist and therefore reliable, 'Tudor England' is a general textbook so the author doesn't know much about Henry VIII. As suggested in the General Comments, centres could usefully address the nature of historical interpretation to help candidates in dealing with such sources. The nature of the task in (b) questions provides evaluation of the sources, often with contextual knowledge, and if provenance does not add to the argument there is no need to make explicit reference to it. Another feature that restricted the levels achieved by some candidates was the tendency to deal with factors separately, and not to address their role/contribution in any precise way. This often led to judgements that were assertive, indicating a personal preference for one factor over another without weighing the arguments. The best responses considered the precise role of different factors, such as Catherine causing delay that made Henry reliant on a judgement from Rome, or more directly, invoking the help of Charles V and utilising her Spanish and Imperial contacts. This allowed them to consider the relative importance of different factors or to demonstrate how they combined and interacted to prevent the annulment, in an overall judgement.

**1bii** This was a much less popular question, and posed some difficulties for a number of those who chose to attempt it. There were, however, some very good responses. Many candidates simply listed changes drawn from the sources, and made very limited use of Source 7 while attempting to describe the political changes taken from Source 8. Some reached L2/3 by this method, offering some contextual knowledge to develop points taken from the sources as information. Understanding of what constituted 'political' or 'religious' change tended to be superficial. Some candidates were able to draw out the long term significance of the Reformation Parliament, and many could describe features such as the dissolution of the monasteries and the translation of the Bible into English as having a religious impact. Others, however, labelled the dissolution as a political act, because the motives were financial. Very few understood the full significance of the royal supremacy, and even fewer were able to argue that in the 1530's religion was, in itself, a political issue, and the Church an integral part of government. Candidates are not required to address the concept of a Tudor Revolution in government as part of this option. However, they cannot understand the Henrician Reformation without some grasp of the changing nature of royal authority, the King as God's representative, and the role of the Church in supporting or challenging his powers.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Below is a good response to this question.. It is far from perfect – the nature of the royal supremacy is not addressed, the religious significance of the removal of the Pope is not recognised, and the argument lacks balance, but it does demonstrate strong skills that took the response to the L3/4 borderline. Analysis and interpretation of the two sources is detailed and accurate, with excellent contextual understanding. The response as a whole lacked breadth and factual reference to material outside the Sources is limited. Hence it could not achieve L4. However, the handling of the sources, the inferences and the comparisons made would not be possible without developed understanding of the issues, and it is worth bearing in mind that AO1 refers to historical knowledge and understanding, not simply to factual reference. For this reason, and for its focus and coherence, the response was awarded 17 out of 24 marks for AO1. It is also clear that the response is source-driven, with clear reasoning from the evidence. However, the sources are not analysed together and fully cross-referenced to define the issues raised in the question. Hence the response reached L3/4, but not L4 in AO2b.

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

(b)

Source 8 is in clear agreement that the most significant changes of the 1530s were political rather than religious. It cites changes in Parliament's legislation - 'developments', from its previous role. It also describes injunctions and directives imposed by the king 'upon the church'. These were not religious in effect, but rather focusing on the political interests and assets of the church. These show that Henry's actions in the 1530s contributed more to his 'extension of power' than to his country's religion.

This argument is lent even more weight by the position of its author. As a modern historian, DeLoraine has a much greater opportunity to understand the real effect of changes in the sixteenth century - he has access to more and more varied resources than a contemporary counterpart. He is also permitted to draw whatever conclusions he wishes - a historian from nearer the time would no doubt be heavily influenced by the reigning monarch's religious policy.

Source 7 is that religious policy, and at a quick glance suggests a more religious change than political - an Act describing the faith of Henry's Church, in which doctrines are set out that are nothing if not religious - 'communion', 'priests', 'vows of chastity', 'private masses' and 'spoken confession'. However, if these religious rulings are examined in detail, it is clear that almost nothing has changed in purely religious terms since the early years of the sixteenth

((b) continued)

century. For example, the ~~real~~ blood and body of our Saviour 'being' present really in the sacrament is almost no different from the existing Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation; the marriage of a priest is 'as before', with no change; even 'spoken confession' is to be continued. Words like 'continued' and phrases like 'as before' only contribute to the implication of lack of change, despite the fact that they are not needed, as it is clear that most of the points of Some 7 are existing Catholic teachings.

It is even possible to discern political change in the religious Act - 'The King' is 'Supreme Head' of the Church - and 'the congregation', with the agreement of 'the Lords' and 'the Commons' - all political changes to the way the Church is run and the power both it and the King have over the people of England.

What must also be taken into account is the other events of the 1530s - more radical proceedings were begun in 1539 and 1540 than at any other time, a sure sign that change was not recognised. Established, conservative Church leaders like Archbishops ~~and~~ were kept - and survived long into the post-reformation Church of Henry's lifetime. All of this shows lack of religious change, and Henry's abandonment of the Lutheran principles in favour of a Franco- or Hispano-English Alliance is a sure sign of his narrow political, not religious; Cromwell's reforms of laws and courts give the same message



((b) continued)

Thus it is clear that there is little more than superficial conflict between sources 7 and 8. While 7 describes religious doctrine, this doctrine does not betray any changes or surprises to surviving Catholic preachers, but it does betray the change of authority behind this doctrine - a political change. Source 8, on the other hand is unequivocal in its assessment of a 'political revolution', and, while it makes no judgment on religious matters, it is clear that political reform takes precedence in Henry's changes to his country. Other evidence from the events of the period from 1930 - 1940 is in support of this case - clearly Henry was motivated by political power, not religion; and this shows in the social change to England in these years. It is unmistakable, the most significant changes of the 1930s were definitely political, not religious.

## Question A2

**2a** Question 2a caused some problems to candidates who did not apply sound contextual knowledge to the sources, in that a significant number did not appear to identify 'Charles, Prince of Wales' and to realise that in 1621 James I was still King. Hence they assumed that 'the King' in Source 9 was a reference to Charles I. This significantly undermined a number of responses. It is worth reminding candidates that, while there is no value in extended reference to wider knowledge as part of responses to part (a), they should apply their knowledge of the period to accurate understanding of the Sources, and to identifying the significance of their provenance. Candidates who did place Source 9 in context were able to relate Charles's impatience to the claims about his 'compassion' and 'hesitation' made by Clarendon, and in many cases, to explain the conflict by reference to age and experience. In contrast, most candidates saw the link between Clarendon's view that Charles had a strong sense of justice, of right and wrong, and religious convictions, and the evidence of Laud in Source 10. A few side-tracked themselves by dwelling on whether a man who lacked confidence could be relaxed and light-hearted, and others dismissed anything said by Laud as flattery in a search for promotion. Most, however, were able to focus on historical, rather than logical, inferences, and to apply provenance with some discretion.

In comparison with responses to Question 1a, the quality of analysis and cross-referencing was high. On the other hand, many candidates found it difficult to come to a developed judgement. It may well be that these characteristics arose from the nature of the two Questions, in that Question 2a demands direct comparison of specific claims, but focuses the judgement on 'agreement' between the sources. Most candidates began by analysing Source 11 and were able to make specific inferences and comparisons on that basis. Many, however, saw agreement between the sources as an end in itself, and weaker candidates tended to produce surface matching. Better candidates realised that 'support' does require a judgement, and developed the implications of the evidence, including the unwitting testimony of Charles himself in Source 9. The best saw that the sources could be interpreted in different ways to both support and undermine Clarendon's claims. The very best argued that Clarendon was writing in retrospect about a mature Charles, and that the elements of his character depicted in Sources 9 and 10 might well develop or soften with time into the balanced picture provided in Source 11.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response set out below illustrates many of these points and provides a useful contrast to the response set out above for Question 1a. Its strength lies in the clear and specific cross-referencing between sources, based on detailed analysis, specific points of comparison, and developed inference. As a result, it reached the top of L3 in a much more economical way than the 1a response. There are attempts to apply provenance and context for the purpose of evaluation as the argument is developed rather than as a separate exercise. Some of these are simplistic, but others are secure. Its weakness is that some points could be better developed, and the final conclusion summarises the points as 'mixed' and 'to a medium extent' without any real attempt to weigh the evidence. The final comment on Source 11 hints at a resolution of the conflict on the basis of Clarendon's purpose and perspective, but it is not securely developed. The response was therefore given 16 marks – borderline L4.

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 9 & 10 = 11 Charles character

Sources 9 and 10 both, to a certain extent, support Clarendon's assessment of Charles character, in that, they are all written by people close to Charles, and are praiseworthy, though they do disagree in some areas.

Clarendon writes of Charles being prone to "hesitate and delay", and yet this does not seem apparent in Source 9, with Charles expressing his wish for strong, decisive action — to "make an example" of those in the Commons who are restricting his right to debate foreign policy. Of course, expressing a wish for decisive action is not the same as actually carrying some out, and in Source 9, a letter to his friend, it is possible that Charles was displaying <sup>false</sup> bravado to impress.

If anything, Charles seems rash, rather than hesitant, and Source 11, from the <sup>former</sup> chief adviser to Charles I, may be Clarendon trying to pass some of the responsibility away from himself and onto others, for the ultimate failures of Charles' reign.

Source 10 clearly supports Clarendon's depiction of a Charles with a "strong sense of right and wrong", with Laud sycophantically recounting Charles' observation that he could not "give up a good cause". Although Laud was later to be highly rewarded by Charles, the fact that ~~it is~~ <sup>the source is</sup> a diary entry, presumably to be kept personal, does suggest

((a) continued) That Laud's feelings were true and that he, like Clarendon, was impressed by Charles' "virtues" although more so than Clarendon.

Sources 9 and 10 present mixed support for Clarendon's views on Charles' character. Source 10 ~~is~~ agrees with the "virtuous" nature of the Charles of Source 11, and yet Source 9, directly from Charles himself, present a Charles who seems anything but hesitant and delaying. Source 11 is rather more negative than Source 9, perhaps because it is likely that Clarendon's exile came about as a result of Charles failing to listen to his judgement as Chief Advisor, and instead listening to others, to their ruin. This said, the two sources do ~~not~~ agree, to a medium extent, with Clarendon's assessment.

**2bi** Although slightly less popular than 2bii, Question 2bi attracted a good range of candidates and a full range of responses. Most candidates began with Source 12, and used it to demonstrate that James inherited financial difficulties from Elizabeth. Good candidates developed the points from the source with reference to other problems - such as inflation and Ireland, and the impact on the Crown's relations with parliaments. Weaker candidates tended to rely on the source as information, and failed to explicitly address problems 'with parliaments'. As a result they also tended to miss the significance of Source 13, and some candidates ignored it completely. Many challenged the claim in the question using Source 14, and a range of wider knowledge, to argue that James caused his own problems through financial extravagance and immorality, as well as Scottish links, the 'perfect union' and favourites. Developed responses of this kind could reach L3 in AO1, but tended to treat sources as information or make only limited reference to them, reaching L2/3 at best in AO2b. Better candidates developed the link between finance and parliamentary complaints about such issues as impositions and the failure of the Great Contract, to establish a more explicit focus and address a greater range of problems, including James's high-flown rhetoric and apparent absolutist tendencies as well as the personality depicted in Source 14. Most offered conflicting arguments, but few were able to move to an overall judgement. As in other options and questions, few candidates attempted to consider links between the sources and arguments, treating finance, parliaments, James's beliefs and personality as separate issues. The best cross-referenced between Sources 12 and 13 to define the nature of the problems that James inherited and Sources 12 and 14 to contrast parliamentary responses to Elizabeth and James, before offering a judgement about James's role. A few demonstrated the interaction between Elizabeth's legacy and James's reactions to offer a balanced judgement that resolved the apparent conflict posed by the sources and the question.

**2bii** This question also produced a good range of responses, based on secure contextual knowledge and inferences drawn from sources. Many candidates began with Sources 16 and 17, using them to establish a number of causes for Charles's difficulties. Weaker candidates compiled a list, taking the sources at face value, which included Buckingham's failures, parliamentary obstruction, the French marriage, religion, and eventually Charles himself. Contextual knowledge was deployed to develop the arguments, and few indulged in long narratives or lost focus on the issues. Many achieved L3 in AO1. However, many had difficulty in making good use of Source 15, and simply argued that it showed Buckingham to be a fool. Better candidates cross-referenced the sources to argue that while Buckingham was a liability in many ways, Source 16 suggested that Charles took the major decisions, and that parliament reacted to his refusal to dismiss Buckingham. Reference was also made to religion and foreign policy and the point was developed by reference to Source 17 and the events of 1627-29. Source 15 was used either to highlight Buckingham's role (in the fall of Cranfield) or to illustrate his power. Responses of this kind were able to achieve L3 in AO2b. The best, however, used the sources as a set, and deployed wider knowledge to bring out the interaction of Charles and Buckingham across the period, to show how Charles created problems for himself. James's warning in Source 15 was contrasted with Charles's defence of the Duke and his willingness to override parliament's fears and concerns (Source 16), while contextual knowledge was integrated to trace growing problems that emerged in 1628-29 as depicted in Source 17. On that basis, candidates were able to offer a balanced judgement as to the relative significance of Buckingham and other factors, including Charles himself.

## Conclusion

There were many good responses offered in all options. A few lacked sound knowledge of the periods that they had studied, and there were a number whose understanding was simplistic. Some had difficulty in expressing their points clearly because they lacked confidence in using the terminology of the period. However, most candidates had some range of knowledge and some understanding of how to approach the questions. Most attempted to focus on the question and there were relatively few who wrote purely narrative or descriptive responses. A significant weakness in part (b) was the tendency to rely mainly on the information taken from sources, but most candidates offered some contextual knowledge or showed contextual understanding. Most candidates were capable of reaching L3, although poor planning and timing sometimes prevented them from doing so.

### Points for improvement are:

In both (a) and (b) questions, sources should be analysed as a set to draw out points for and against the claim in the question, before planning a response. This allows conflicting interpretations to be established to structure the response.

Both (a) and (b) questions require a developed conclusion that addresses the conflicting arguments and judges between them or shows how they can be combined.

Any judgement must be based on both quality and quantity of evidence – i.e. the content and provenance of the sources, interpreted and evaluated in context. In (a) questions contextual knowledge informs interpretation; in (b) questions it is deployed to develop it.

## Grade Boundaries

### 6HI02 A

Grade	Max-Mark	A	B	C	D	E
6HI02 A grade boundaries	60	46	41	36	31	27
UMS	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 US021428 June 2009

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

