

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in 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 visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. 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.

[www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus)

### **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 our commitment to high standards and 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)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 43898

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## 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.

## **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 MarkPoint Within a Level**

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

### **Assessing Quality of Written Communication**

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

## 6HI02: Generic Level Descriptors

### Part (a)

Target: A02a (8%)

(20 marks)

As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-5	<p>Comprehends the surface features of the sources and selects material relevant to the question. Responses are direct quotations or paraphrases from one or more of the sources.</p> <p><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>

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

3	13-18	<p>Candidates answers will attempt analysis and show some understanding of the focus of the question. They may, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be mostly accurate, but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor. At this level candidates will begin to link contextual knowledge with points drawn from sources.</p> <p><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>



**A02b (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 both 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.*

## Unit 2 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	AO2a Marks	AO2b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a)	-	20	-	20
Q (b)(i) or (ii)	24	-	16	40
<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>

### Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the stated view. Source 2 seems to offer the greatest support for the view that Henry had been let down by the King of Aragon, stressing the failure to supply horses and carriage. Both Sources 2 and 3 emphasise the failure of the King of Aragon to deliver the promised supplies and this is also hinted at in Source 1 (<i>“the food is not what we expected”</i>). However, Source 2 suggests that Henry himself has not gone so far as to blame the King of Aragon while Source 3 suggests Aragon’s agents were following a strategy to keep Henry’s troops in their current position (<i>“a bishop was sent by the King of Aragon but he came with nothing”</i>). The sources can be used to argue against the stated view. Source 1 offers an alternative view that the weather was causing problems whilst Sources 2 and 3 both refer to the sickness that was spreading among the troops. Sources 2 and 3 also raise the issue of the loyalty of the troops, hinted at in Source 2 (<i>“it will be hard to keep order”</i>) and developed more explicitly in Source 3 (<i>“some troublemakers”</i>), to counter the claim in the question. Candidates cross-referencing sources and exploring such issues beyond face value can reach Level 3 and beyond. Inferential skills and consideration of provenance may also be developed through considering both the degree of, and the reasons for, the differences between the sources. Candidates may argue that Sources 1 and 2 are reliable sources written by men who were experiencing the conditions at the time, whilst they may criticise Source 3 as a product by a chronicler who had only second-hand experience of events and is writing long after the time. They may consider him to be showing his patriotism by blaming foreigners. On the other hand, Howard in Source 2 has a clear motive to blame the King of Aragon for problems to deflect any criticism that might come towards him as one of Henry’s military leaders, whilst Hall could be regarded as relatively impartial. Candidates considering valid aspects of source attribution as it relates to the question are cross-referencing the evidence and will achieve Level 3. Responses that reach a judgement developed from this will achieve Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the reasons for Wolsey's fall from power in 1529-30. Taken as a set, the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that the failure of Wolsey's foreign policy played the most significant role. Source 4 offers evidence providing support for the stated view. Candidates may use the account of the situation in 1529 to explore, from their knowledge, the failures since 1525 and to argue that he was removed because of his failures. Candidates are likely to use Sources 5 and 6 to challenge the views provided in Source 4. Source 5 could be used to argue the case that Wolsey was the victim of enemies at court who now had the favour of the king ("<i>Wolsey was the first victim of a new political climate</i>"). Candidates are likely to identify the role played by court faction in Source 6 and developed in Source 5 and emphasise that the nobility had long objected to the monopoly of power held by the '<i>butcher's cur</i>'. Candidates may develop knowledge of animosity to Wolsey's influence in government and the punishments he had meted out to the nobility in the law courts to demonstrate their motives in finding grounds to bring about his removal and restore their own positions in government. Candidates may well link the rise of the Howard faction to the wide range of grievances that Henry had with Wolsey, most notably also argued in Source 4 ('<i>Wolsey had failed to secure the annulment of the King's marriage</i>'). Candidates are likely to refer to Anne's animosity to Wolsey, and to draw on references to Henry's ruthlessness. Candidates may draw on their own knowledge to explore the consequences for Wolsey of the failure of his range of strategies to secure the annulment, including securing the position of acting pope and of the spectacular collapse of the case at Blackfriars. Taking the sources and knowledge as a set, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that Wolsey's fall was brought about by the king as a consequence of a complex web of causes that were underpinned by his failures in a range of arenas, and that was actively sought by his opponents at court.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. 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 Wolsey's fall, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1 (b) (ii)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the reasons for the Reformation of the 1530s. Taken as a set, the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that the Reformation was driven by the spread of Protestant ideas. Both Sources 7 and 8 offer evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 8 could be used to argue the case that the opposition to the Catholic clergy was the main factor and that there was resentment to almsgiving to support them (<i>'set these parasites abroad to get their living with their labour'</i>). This can be linked to the spread of Lutheran ideas referred to in Sources 7 and 9 (<i>'Protestant ideas and Lutheran books had reached England; Lutheran heresy which was creeping into England'</i>). Candidates may draw on their own knowledge to explore the weaknesses of the late medieval Catholic Church and the extent to which reformist views had spread in England. Candidates are likely to use Sources 7 and 9 to challenge the views provided in Source 8 and to argue that the Catholic Church was strong in the later 1520s and that the Reformation was driven from above, motivated by the king's desire to secure the annulment of his marriage and the refusal of the Church to accommodate his desires. Source 7 offers a clear argument that <i>'the Catholic Church had plenty of defenders'</i>, while Source 9 demonstrates that the government opposed the spread of Lutheranism with the <i>'repression of heretics and public burning of heretical books'</i>. These points may be used as the basis for an argument that the Reformation could not have happened without support from the king and that it was driven by political rather than religious motives. Candidates may develop knowledge of Henry's original opposition to reform as demonstrated by his composition of <i>Assertio Septem Sacramentorum</i> in 1521 and his prolonged attempt to achieve the annulment through the Church. They may refer to Source 9's acknowledgement that Henry was influenced by Anne Boleyn, herself a <i>'Lutheran sympathiser'</i>, but also driven by her desire to marry Henry. In this sense, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that the Reformation was driven by a complex web of causes, both religious and political.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. 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 Reformation, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

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

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (a)	<p>The sources offer evidence both to support and challenge the stated view. Source 11 seems to offer the greatest support for the view that James faced a significant challenge to the royal prerogative over impositions, stressing in Source 11 that the king in Parliament holds greater power than the royal prerogative. Both Sources 11 and 12 argue the necessity of the consent of Parliament and Source 12 requests that impositions ‘<i>set without the assent of Parliament may be quite abolished</i>’. The sources thus offer a significant challenge to James’s exercise of royal powers. Candidates may cross-reference these sources with Source 10 and argue that the lengthy time period over which James’s right to levy impositions is considered, also emphasises the significance of the challenge.</p> <p>The sources can be used to argue against the stated view. Sources 10 and 11 can be cross-referenced to offer an alternative view that James had the right to levy impositions as demonstrated in his victory in the Bates Case (<i>‘all the laws prove expressly that the King had the power to increase the tax’</i>) and Whitelocke’s acknowledgement of the legal position that <i>‘there is undoubtedly the right to levy impositions’</i> while candidates may draw inferences about the choice of language in Source 12 to argue that the challenge was more apprehensive than major to counter the claim in the question.</p> <p>Candidates cross-referencing sources and exploring such issues beyond face value can reach Level 3 and beyond. Inferential skills and consideration of provenance may also be developed though considering both the degree of and the reasons for the differences between the sources. Candidates may argue that Source 10 was bound to support the position of the king since the king appointed the judiciary and that this factor therefore impacts on its validity. On the other hand the fact that the question of impositions was not settled by this judgement indicates the significance of the challenge. Candidates are likely to consider the measured tones of Sources 11 and 12 to be the consequence of the situation in which MPs did not have complete freedom of speech, with Source 12 benefiting from strength in numbers. Candidates considering valid aspects of source attribution as it relates to the question are cross-referencing the evidence and will achieve Level 3. Responses that reach a judgement developed from this will achieve Level 4.</p>	20

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (i)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the extent to which England was in crisis in the last decades of Elizabeth's reign. Taken as a set the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that England was in crisis. Source13 offers the strongest evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 13 could be used to argue the case that the war against Spain had put England in a critical position (<i>'strained by the impact of 18 years of war'</i>). This can be developed by a wide range of economic and social woes, all of which impacted on the government of England (<i>'a malfunctioning of the relationship between the centre and the localities'</i>). Candidates may draw on their own knowledge to explore the range of problems, including financial problems (taxation and inflation), the increase in poverty as a result of bad harvests, challenges at the centre such as that by the Earl of Essex and challenges in Parliament. Candidates are likely to use Sources14 and 15 to challenge the views provided in Source13 and to argue that Elizabeth had enjoyed many successes in the latter years of her reign that refute the notion of a country in crisis. Candidates are likely to refer to the <i>'defeat of the Armada'</i> referenced in Source 15 and to the great reputation for English naval power that this promoted as suggested in Source 14(<i>'the bane of her enemies'</i>). Candidates may develop knowledge of the victory over Spain as well as picking up on references from the sources to explore the success of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement, and the sense of England as an independent nation state. In this sense, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that the assessment of the successes and failures of the last years of Elizabeth's reign and the evaluation of the extent to which England was in crisis show a complex matter that can be judged on a variety of levels.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. 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 issues, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2 (b) (ii)	<p>The question asks candidates to evaluate the reasons for the breakdown of relations between King and Parliament by 1629. Taken as a set, the sources offer evidence for and against the claim in the question that Buckingham's management of wars against France and Spain played the most significant role. Both Sources 17 and 18 offer evidence providing support for the stated view. Source 17 could be used to argue the case that Buckingham's failure in foreign policy was the main factor (<i>'military failures – the Mansfeld and Cadiz expeditions. Parliament blamed Buckingham'</i>). This can be linked to the comment in Source 18 about Buckingham's <i>'diplomatic blunders'</i> and the implication that it was the position that Buckingham held in the direction of policy that was the main cause of the conflict between Charles and Parliament. Candidates may draw on their own knowledge to explore the range of failures in foreign policy. They may include the failed Spanish marriage and the pressure that Buckingham and Charles put on James to declare war, as well as exploring details of the Mansfeld and Cadiz expeditions including the reference in Source 17 to the misappropriation of the funds supplied by Parliament. They may also look beyond Buckingham's conduct of the wars to consider his unpopularity that derived from his monopoly on patronage and his assumption of many offices that caused great resentment.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to use Source 16 to challenge the views provided in Sources 17 and 18 and to argue that both Charles and Parliament played roles in the collapse of their relationship. Candidates may well begin with the accusation in Source 16 that Parliament did not provide the funds necessary to fight the war and may use this as the basis for an argument that Parliament was more to blame for the foreign policy failure and the collapse of the relationship with the King. Candidates may develop knowledge of Parliament's role in the breakdown, including its deep hatred of Buckingham shown by the attempt to impeach him and the reaction of the Commons to the news of his assassination. Candidates are also likely to consider that Charles was responsible for the breakdown. They may refer to Source 18's acknowledgement that the problems were <i>'the responsibility of Charles himself'</i> and link this to arguments that Charles rather than Buckingham was the primary cause for the failure of the relationship with Parliament. They may develop knowledge of issues beyond the foreign policy, including those referenced in Source 18: the forced loan, billeting soldiers and Charles's preference for Arminianism in religion, to demonstrate that the problems between King and Parliament were not solved by the death of Buckingham. In this sense, candidates will have the opportunity to explore the issues and reconcile differences in the evidence to demonstrate that the breakdown of the relationship was driven by a complex web of causes.</p> <p>Candidates are unlikely to address all of these issues in depth in the time available, and the sources can be combined with own knowledge to reach high levels by a variety of routes. 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 of the relationship, with a sharp focus on agreement or disagreement with the given view.</p>	40



