



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **History 1041**

## *Specification*

### **Unit HIS1D**

# **Report on the Examination**

## *2010 examination – January series*

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

---

# *Unit HIS1D*

## **Unit 1D: Britain, 1603–1642**

### **General Comments**

The examination paper proved to be accessible to the vast majority of candidates. All the questions were attempted in approximately equal proportions. Most candidates attempted two full questions but there was a small minority who, through mistiming or lack of revision, did not attempt, or barely attempted, one of the questions. This lost them many of the marks available. Most candidates approached the questions with a reasonable degree of knowledge and understanding and were able to allocate their timing sensibly. However, there was a significant minority who did not seem well prepared either in terms of knowledge and understanding, or in terms of examination technique. Such candidates were not able to do themselves justice. The standard of written communication was generally high with some candidates expressing their arguments in an impressively focused and controlled way. Time in this examination is at a premium however, and other candidates would do better if they answered the questions directly rather than outlining what they propose to do first, sketching elaborate plans or writing long paragraphs giving unnecessary background material. The quality of spelling and grammar was generally good although a minority continue to misspell words such as 'puritans' ('puritains'), parliament ('parliment') and 'throne' ('thrown').

### **Question 1**

- (a) Question 1 produced some strong answers which considered both what the Puritans wanted in presenting the Millenary Petition and also why they had hopes that James I would be sympathetic. Less strong answers explained what the Puritans wanted but not why they had hopes of James. Weaker answers were either too generalised, confused Catholics with Puritans or wrote too extensively about Catholicism often confusing it with Anglicanism. Another problem which candidates need to guard against in answering (a) questions is to outline reasons rather than going off focus onto effects and results. Quite a lot of candidates were able to give two valid and well-developed reasons for the Millenary Petition but then drifted off into accounts of the Hampton Court Conference which was not what the question was asking.
- (b) Question 1(b) produced some wide-ranging answers with a depth of support and sustained assessment, which demonstrated a high level of knowledge and understanding. Most candidates considered both domestic and foreign policy issues in their answer and ranged widely over James' reign. A surprising number of candidates however, did not consider the new translation of the Bible as something, which might have pleased puritans; indeed quite a lot of candidates either confused the Bible with the Prayer Book or omitted it altogether. Similarly a significant minority of candidates were only able to write about the Hampton Court Conference (or 'Hamptden Court' as it was frequently referred to) or were only able to write in general terms with a lack of specific knowledge in support.

---

**Question 2**

- (a) Question 2(a) produced some problems for a large number of candidates mainly because of confused chronology. The question focused on the disputes over foreign policy in the 1621 parliament including the issue of what to do about the Palatinate, the Spanish Match issue and the constitutional clash between James and the Commons over whether foreign policy ought to be debated in Parliament. Many candidates were able to produce two of these but then tended to jump to 1623–25 and describe the Charles/Buckingham trip to Madrid, the French marriage and the arguments about financing war in 1625. Some candidates ignored 1621 altogether and wrote only about a later period. Candidates do need a firm sense of chronology about the 1620s if they are to avoid confusion and error.
- (b) Question 2(b) had as its main focus the role of finance in worsening Crown/Parliament relations between 1625 and 1629. Although most candidates knew something about financial issues in this period they were not always good at explaining these or about linking them to the legal, constitutional and political clashes between the parliamentary gentry and the Crown in the years 1625 to 1629. Often candidates simply wanted to write about the Duke of Buckingham and went into great detail about the failures at Cadiz and La Rochelle but rather ignored the main focus of the question. Others confused the 1630s with the 1620s and wrote about ship money, forest fines, distraint of knighthood and Hampden's Case rather than about the forced loan, Petition of Right and Five Knights Case. However, there were some impressive answers. In these candidates were able to assess the importance of financial issues from 1625, show how these led to a breakdown of relations between Crown and Parliament as well as arguing that the causes were not entirely financial and that there were issues of personality, religion, pressure of war and misunderstanding, as well.

**Question 3**

- (a) Question 3(a) contained many assertions that ship money was illegal, unfair and used to support an extravagant life style by Charles I, failing to note that there was a strong argument the other way and that the decision in Hampden's Case was not just a political fix. Most candidates brought out some of the changes in the levying of ship money in the 1630s as a reason for opposition though relatively few were able to explain the changes coherently. There were many assertions that ship money collapsed after Hampden's Case whereas it seems to have produced very high returns until 1639–1640. Few candidates were able to explain clearly the political / constitutional reason for opposing ship money i.e. that its very success in raising money threatened to allow Charles to manage permanently without parliamentary subsidies. Few candidates also put ship money into the broader context of a revived 'fiscal feudalism' in the 1630s. Candidates continue to under-estimate the real threat from North African pirates in the 1630s and the potential threat caused by Spanish, Dutch and French fleets operating in the Channel.
- (b) Question 3(b) produced some very good attempts at a challenging question. The strongest answers were able to bring out the successes of a united Parliament in limiting Charles' powers in early/mid 1641 when it was able to remove the ministers, end the taxes and dismantle the legal and administrative machinery of the Personal Rule. Most candidates knew about the Triennial Act and many were able to refer to some or all of the reforms (the 'Legal Revolution') which passed into law and which Charles, albeit reluctantly, accepted. The strongest candidates were then able to contrast the less successful phase of the Long Parliament from mid 1641 onwards when it became increasingly divided over the more extreme proposals advocated by Pym and point out that these proposals did not become law, were not accepted by Charles and enabled him

to rally enough support to challenge Pym and fight a civil war. Weaker candidates did not always bring out this distinction and tended to assume that because something was proposed it was accepted. There was also a surprising lack of knowledge about the successful reforms of early/mid 1641 with the exception of the attainder of Strafford and the Triennial Act. It might be helpful to think in terms of a 'legal' and an 'illegal' revolution in 1641–1642. Like the 1620s, the period 1640–1642 requires a sound chronological grasp if candidates are not to become confused.

### **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.