



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

History 1041

Unit HIS1D

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

Unit HIS1D

Unit 1D: Britain, 1603–1642

General Comments

The examination paper proved accessible to the vast majority of students with only a few unable to attempt one or more questions. Choice of question was fairly evenly divided between the possible combinations. Question 2 proved to be the most popular single question. The overall standard was as good as in previous years; indeed there seemed to be a smaller number of very weak scripts and an improvement in the overall standard.. The quality of written communication was high given the pressure of time and the stress of public examinations. A small minority of students continue to write in the present rather than in the past tense and there were some recurrent spelling mistakes such as 'thrown' instead of 'throne', 'priviledge' instead of 'privilege' (despite privilege being on the Question Paper). Not all students use capital letters for proper nouns such as 'England' or the 'Thirty Years War' but such mistakes were a rarity. As always, the best answers focused explicitly on the question asked; had relevant, precise and specific knowledge; had a balance and range of factors; and had considered judgement. Weaker answers were generalised; often lost the focus of the question; lapsed into description or narrative; and only considered part of the question. Chronological error continues to lead some students into confusion, irrelevancy and misunderstanding weakening the overall quality of answers.

In questions asking for reasons (i.e. 01, 03 and 05) students should try to provide at least three distinct and well-explained reasons and, for the top level, provide some kind of qualitative link between the factors. This can be done in several ways: for example, by differentiating between reasons of various kinds such as background and immediate reasons; or between political, religious, financial and diplomatic reasons; or by reasoned prioritising. In essay questions (i.e. 02, 04 and 06) students might give more thought to making judgements both at the end of paragraphs as well as in their conclusions. At the end of a paragraph, students ought to try and use the theme of the paragraph to give a partial judgement on the question and an overall judgement in the conclusion. Students can approach making judgements in various ways: for example, differentiating on the importance of a factor by time; or by type; or by person; or by immediate and longer-term results. Such reasoned judgements, as opposed to assertions, gain students access to marks in the top level.

Question 1

01 This question focused on why one of James I's parliaments, that of 1614, was a failure. Students' responses fell into two distinct categories. On the one hand were those who had specific knowledge of what went wrong in the 1614 Parliament. Such answers were able to refer to the Crown's alleged use of 'undertakers'; to factional rivalry; to the issue of impositions; and to poor parliamentary management. Such answers attracted high marks in Levels 3 and 4. On the other hand there were those students who had little or no specific knowledge of the 1614 Parliament and were able to answer only in very general terms. Such answers often mixed up issues in James's first parliament with those in his second. It was difficult for such answers to get beyond Level 2. Considering that the question had not been set in any previous examination on this unit it was pleasing that many students did have quite specific knowledge of this parliament and of difficult concepts such as faction.

- 02** Overall this question was well done, with many students able to refer to clashes over issues of privilege such as *Goodwin v Fortescue* and *Shirley's Case*. Some very good answers were also able to argue that other clashes, such as *Bate's Case* and the Great Contract, though at one level about finance were, at another level, about privilege also. A minority of students did not really understand the idea of Parliament's privileges and turned every issue into one of privilege. Students should avoid long descriptions of cases such as *Goodwin v Fortescue* and instead concentrate on the issues revealed. These examples could have been used to make an on-going judgement. Students might have argued that though *Goodwin*, *Shirley* and the Apology illustrate strong feelings about privilege, they were settled (or not presented), perhaps suggesting that they were not as important as other factors. Most students were able to balance privilege with other contentious issues such as the proposed Anglo-Scottish Union, James's extravagance and favourites, foreign policy, etc. Here again students might have pointed out that to James his clash with Parliament over the Union was probably a lot more important than his clash over *Shirley*, though again the Union issue was dead after 1607. Students should avoid writing too much on religious issues in this type of question, especially the Millenary Petition and Hampton Court Conference, which either took place before Parliament met or were not directly its business. Complaints about the recusancy laws not being enforced were, however, an ongoing complaint in the House of Commons.

Question 2

- 03** This was a popular question and most students were able to find two or three reasons. However, students must be careful not to be giving the same reason in different guises. Some students latched on to anti-Catholicism as the main reason and served it up in three different ways. Better answers put at least some of the reasons into the international context between 1618 and 1623, such as the outbreak of the Thirty Years War and especially the Palatinate Crisis. It was relevant to refer to the roots of anti-Catholicism but some students wrote exclusively, and often misleadingly, about the reign of Mary Tudor (frequently confused with Mary Queen of Scots) or the Spanish Armada, which was getting rather far away from the period when the Spanish Match was being negotiated. Better answers focused on reasons in the 1618–1623 period as well as background factors. Again this question offered students the opportunity to bring out background as well as short-term reasons such as religious, political, diplomatic and financial factors.
- 04** Most students were able to write at least one paragraph examining why Arminianism led to tension between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629. Many students were able to write several substantial paragraphs. The better answers explained why Charles's parliaments were suspicious of Arminians for both their religious and political views. They were also able to give some specific examples with references to *Sibthorpe*, *Montagu* and *Laud* as well as offering proof of Parliament's concerns by quoting the Three Resolutions. Students were also able to consider a range of other factors though there was a tendency to list these rather than to bring out connections or to offer reasoned judgements as to why one factor might be more important than another. There is a tendency in answers to questions on 1625 to 1629 to concentrate too much on opposition to Buckingham. In many ways Buckingham was a symptom and a scapegoat rather than a fundamental cause of the tensions between Charles and his parliaments in these years. Few students pointed out that these were years in which a near-bankrupt Crown, saddled with an inadequate revenue system, lacking a proper navy and army, embarked on two wars against much larger rivals, partly at Parliament's prompting, and not surprisingly ran into great difficulties. Students tend to adopt a Whiggish view that it was all the fault of Charles and Buckingham and rarely consider Parliament's role, such as its failure to appreciate the real cost of equipping naval and military expeditions to wage effective war

against Spain or that Spanish treasure fleets were no longer an easy target. Neither do they always bring out Parliament's undue paranoia about Catholic conspiracies and the threat of Absolutism, nor examine the ways in which Parliament's decisions pushed Charles into provocative actions.

Question 3

- 05** Most students answered this question by referring to distraint of knighthood, forest fines and ship money but without any over-arching linkage. Students were not always clear about why these measures caused discontent or, in the case of ship money, they exaggerated the degree of discontent and their answers often contained misunderstandings. Most of the measures adopted in the 1630s had themes in common. They were non-parliamentary, they were often ancient forms of revenue given a new format during the Personal Rule and sometimes, as in the case of Forest Fines, they appeared arbitrary. Moreover they allowed Charles I to rule without calling a parliament for over a decade.

Answers to do with ship money continue to contain misunderstandings. There was a serious threat from North African pirates in the 1630s, not just against shipping but against coastal communities who were taken into slavery. Events in the south of Ireland and the English West Country attest to this threat. Charles I did not fritter away ship money – he built a fleet; indeed the ship money fleet was the basis of the Commonwealth's Navy in the 1650s and the foundation of the Royal Navy after 1660. As it turned out the mistake Charles made was to build a navy and not an army, for had he had an army then the outcome of the two Bishops Wars might well have been very different. Nor was ship money in its new form illegal, as the outcome of Hampden's test case showed. Receipts from ship money remained high until 1639 when extra financial demands for the First Bishops War proved too much. Nor was England a heavily taxed country in the 1630s, at least not for the lower classes, who were far less burdened than the peasantry of France, for example. Perhaps the fact that ship money was quite an efficient tax on the propertied classes with no parliament to challenge is a better explanation for its abolition in 1641.

- 06** Students continue to improve their answers to questions on the period from 1638 onwards but there are still weaknesses. Lack of a firm chronology is one. Many students seemed unclear that the First Bishops War was followed by the calling of the Short Parliament in April 1640, but that this failed, and there was then a Second Bishops War in the summer of 1640 ending with the treaty of Ripon and the calling of the Long Parliament in the autumn of 1640. Another weakness is uncertainty over when the Personal Rule ended. The ending might be thought of as a process rather than as a single event. The failure to defeat the Scots Covenanters in the First Bishops War and the calling of the Short Parliament seriously damaged the Personal Rule but it did not finally kill it off. Had Charles been able to obtain enough subsidies and support from the Short Parliament to form an effective army he might have defeated the Covenanters and the Personal Rule might have survived. Few students considered the Short Parliament, why it was called and why it failed. Instead the king was defeated in the Second Bishops War and the terms of Ripon forced him to call a second parliament in 1640. Few students made clear why the calling of the Long Parliament was a death blow to the Personal Rule, but three arguments might have been advanced. First, that Charles was unable to dissolve it partly because he was desperate for money now that the Personal Rule sources had dried up and the Scots were demanding £850 a day. Second, because a Scots army of occupation in the North threatened to march south should he end this parliament whilst the MPs demanded that it only be ended by its own consent. Third, the Long Parliament when it met in November 1640 was united in its determination to bury the Personal Rule once and for all by arresting Charles's leading ministers and, in 1641, forcing him to accept the

abolition of the non-parliamentary taxes, prerogative courts and regional councils which had sustained it. There is scope for greater knowledge and understanding by students of 1640, indeed of 1640 to 1642.

One misunderstanding by students which appears in answers to questions on the end of the Personal Rule concerns the Irish Rebellion. Many students seem confused both about its dating and significance. The rebellion by the Catholic Irish took place in October/November 1641, i.e. well **after**, and therefore playing no part in explaining, the collapse of Charles I's personal rule. It did **not** break out after Strafford's return to England in early 1640 but several months after his beheading in 1641. The significance of the Irish Rebellion is to the drift towards civil war in England in late 1641, early 1642, caused by paranoia about a Catholic threat, deepening divisions in the Long Parliament about whether the king could be trusted with an army to suppress the Irish, and the more extreme tactics of Pym. Material on the Irish Rebellion and its impact is therefore very relevant to questions on the outbreak of the English Civil War or to the role of John Pym, but much less to the ending of the Personal Rule. Again, a sound grasp of the chronology of events between 1638 and 1642 is important.

Related to this misunderstanding is another concerning Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford. Students should understand that the description 'Black Tom Tyrant' was given to Wentworth by his enemies and was not necessarily a fair assessment of his character and policies. Adjectives such as 'brutal' are misplaced. Wentworth was a tough enforcer of royal policy in Ireland. He did bring greater order, justice and prosperity to Ireland by curbing the self-interested activities of the Anglo-Irish gentry, successfully managing the Irish Parliament and building up an army. It was a blueprint for quite an effective form of absolutism and the fear was that it might be brought to Charles's other kingdoms. The main fault of 'Thorough' was its efficiency rather than its brutality.

Overall, there was an encouraging response to this Paper, but students do need to take heed of the comments in this and earlier examiner's reports if they are to improve still further.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion