

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS1D: Britain, 1603–1642



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS1D Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

## **AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers**

### **General Introduction by the Chief Examiner**

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

### **Unit 1**

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

## Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

## GCE History HIS1D: Britain, 1603–1642

### Responses to June 2009 Questions

#### Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain why James I wanted a union between England and Scotland. (12 marks)

James I took to the throne of England in 1603, after the death of the popular and long-living queen Elizabeth I. James had ruled Scotland prior to this for many years, as James VI. Personally for James, uniting the 2 countries would allow him to rule much more easily. In 1604, the 2 countries were very different. Scottish churches were more Presbyterian, while English churches laid greater importance on bishops and the church hierarchy, with King James as head. James wanted to combine the 2 churches, so to achieve a greater loyalty to himself as head. The 2 legal systems were also different – in Scotland, James ruled as more of an absolute monarch, whereas in England parliament had more influence. The different legal system made it difficult to rule effectively in both countries. The 2 countries were also very hostile, due to years of conflict, and perhaps James wanted to unite the 2 to end future conflicts. Financially, the union of Scotland and England would provide increased trade opportunities with Europe, providing James with a source of income and boosting the reputation of both countries in Europe. In 1604, James hoped that English parliament would agree to the idea in principle, appoint commissioners to discuss the implications of union, and gain a common currency. He achieved 2 of these, however, it was unlikely in this time that the English or Scottish would agree to union with their old enemies.

Overall, James wanted union for different reasons. To unite the country of his first kingship with the rich land of England would bring huge positives – increase trade, one church, one parliament and possibly the end to hostilities between the Scottish and English. It would also create an increased military and possibility for more troops. However, the sheer logistics of such a huge task were to prevent it from occurring for many years, plus the English and Scottish hostilities prevented a smooth transition from England and Scotland to Great Britain.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This was a good answer providing a variety of valid reasons why James I wanted a union between England and Scotland. The candidate pointed to a range of reasons ecclesiastical, constitutional and commercial as well as reference to status. There was some development of these factors and linkage was attempted between them at the end. All this placed the answer into Level 4 being generally well-focused, offering a range of specific explanations, backed by some precise evidence and showing understanding of the links between the factors. In places however the candidate drifted off the focus of the question and at times there was hesitancy in the answer with phrases such as 'might have' and 'perhaps' appearing. There was scope for more precise development in some of the factors e.g. that James's aim of bringing the two church systems closer together was to give him more control over Church and State and the reference to hostilities could have included ending the ongoing Border wars. Missing too was the idea that James felt that through his ancestry he was destined to bring about this divinely intended union hence his determination to push ahead despite the hostility to it in both kingdoms. Overall, however, this was a strong answer and was placed in Level 4 – 11 marks.*

**Candidate 2**

- 1 (a) Explain why James I wanted a union between England and Scotland.  
(12 marks)

James I wanted a union between England and Scotland due to him wanting to reform churches so all services at church were the same. James wanted to introduce a new bible and wanted Protestant and Catholic church services to be the same, so all religion was the same and one service was used for both.

James also wanted a union between England and Scotland so that he could maybe be more extravagant with his spending. In England, he had already run up a series of debt by being so extravagant. He bought expensive gifts not only for himself but for other members/courtiers, he also spent lots of money on expensive dinners/buffets. James also wanted a union between England and Scotland because he was worrying/living in fear of assassination in England – the Gunpowder Plot panicked him severely, he may have thought that he was losing popularity and so more people in Scotland would have favoured him. James was a Protestant and many people in Scotland were as well, therefore he would have had more support as Scotland's church services were mainly Catholic and the Scottish people wanted to change this so that the majority were Protestant instead.

**Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer laboured under several misapprehensions which threw serious doubt on the candidate's knowledge and understanding and placed it in a lower level. There seemed to be a fundamental misunderstanding of the religious situation in Scotland e.g. 'Scotland's Church services were mainly catholic' and James's religious intentions 'wanted Protestant and Catholic church services to be the same' was misleading. There were also invalid reasons such as the union being a product of the Gunpowder Plot or of his extravagance. However, there was the odd valid point such as the idea of wishing to bring closer the religious practices of the English and Scottish Churches. Overall the answer was placed at the bottom of Level 2 – 3 marks.*

**Candidate 3**

- 1 (b) How important was James I's attempt to obtain a union between England and Scotland in causing difficulties with his first parliament in the years 1604 to 1611?  
(24 marks)

There were various factors causing divisions between MPs and James I in 1608–1611, with union being a particularly important one.

James aimed for three things in his first parliament to get the ball rolling for union – acceptance of the idea in principle, adoption of the name Great Britain, and appointment of commissioners to discuss with the Scots the possibilities. However, he was not to get what he wanted, and immediately faced strong opposition. English MPs saw Scotland as a backward nation of barbarians who would undermine England's prosperity. They wanted to protect their laws and constitution and would only accept this if Scotland's subordinated theirs, which defeats the object of union. English MPs feared Scottish favouritism at court and losing their identity with naturalisation.

Despite this, James did manage to get commissioners to discuss possibilities, and it was agreed that ships would carry the union flag, and the 'unite' currency was minted. However, inevitably, when commissioners reported back in 1607, union was blocked. There were two main reasons – the differences in the legal systems, and the huge opposition to naturalisation. Parliament had a victory, yet MPs were disgusted that James had considered it a possibility.

There were however, other important factors causing difficulties. One of these was the King's royal prerogative, which was brought to light in Goodwin vs Fortescue – an MP election that Goodwin won, but as Fortescue was the King's preference, it was he who got the King's favour. Goodwin was accused of debt and forced to stand down. MPs were angered by James' use of prerogative, and although another election was held and a committee created to deal with such disputes, this became a recurring issue in James' parliaments.

Another problem facing James and Parliament was finance and how the king raised money. Purveyance – the King's right to purchase goods below market price – was resented because of his wasteful court, but no agreement was made. MPs put forward a petition stopping wardship because of the King exploiting it, but James refused. Monopolies were strongly attacked yet the King continued, and his use of impositions – customs duties not in the Book of Rates – was also unpopular, however, it was made legal in the Bates case 1606.

Such problems led to MPs drawing up the Form of apology and satisfaction. This was a document MPs wrote in response to James' behaviour claiming freedom of speech, freedom from arrest and free elections for MPs, and that Parliament must discuss any religious changes.

Despite this, finance was still an issue and this is the most important factor of causing difficulties in 1504–11. Union wasn't so much because despite it being blocked and James being disappointed, he didn't argue extensively over it. He got some gains, such as the name King of Great Britain, ships bearing the flag, the 'unite', and most importantly dual nationality for those born after 1603. He was willing to settle for a gradual union, which paved the way for full union in 1707. Finance was important because in this period a financial crisis was developing, mainly because of an outdated financial system, 100 years worth of inflation, and also MPs, fear of the Crown becoming financially independent with revenue such as impositions. Also, James was found to be very extravagant with his money.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This was a strong answer being focused on the question throughout and closely argued. It dealt with the issue suggested in the title in some detail explaining why the union was an important cause of difficulties between James and the 1604–11 parliament. Reference was made to specific areas of dispute such as naturalisation, different legal systems and sheer xenophobia. This was then balanced by a consideration of other factors such as constitutional disputes and finance, gain with precise, selected evidence and with reasoned judgement towards the end. In a few places the statements needed a little more explanation and other examples. Overall however, this answer was concise and clear in style, analytical, considered a range of factors and had reasoned judgement. It was placed in Level 5 – 23 marks.*

**Candidate 4**

- 1 (b) How important was James I's attempt to obtain a union between England and Scotland in causing difficulties with his first parliament in the years 1604 to 1611? (24 marks)

James had many problems to overcome when he met with his Parliament. Amongst finance and foreign policy James' push for a union with Scotland was causing friction between Crown and Parliament leading to difficulties arising

A major problem with this union was the distrust felt by a majority of parliament towards the Scots. This deep-seeded fear between the two nations was a result of old rivalries and previous conflicts between the two nations. As a result many members of parliament did not want a union with the Scots.

This hatred of the Scots led to other difficulties between King and Parliament. The Royal finances were in a dire state by 1608 and as a result Salisbury (Lord Treasurer) proposed the Great Contract as a way of repairing Crown finance in which Parliament would pay the King £200,000 a year if wardship, purveyance etc was abolished. However many members of parliament refused to pass this or they believed that Scotland would be the main beneficiary of James' new source of income.

Another cause of the distrust felt was due to James filling his bed chamber and inner courts with Scots. Many in Parliament felt that James was showing favouritism to the Scots and this caused great difficulties between king and parliament. As a result it was this that caused difficulties between James and Parliament.

**Principal Examiner's Comments**

*The answer had some valid but underdeveloped material about why the proposed union caused difficulties such as reference to long-standing hostilities and fear of a Scots monopoly of office. There was a brief look at one other factor – finance – though again development of this was limited to the Great Contract and there was an unconvincing attempt to link this to Scotland. The answer was coherently expressed and had focus, but the structure could have been more logical. The range of factors and depth of development showed only a limited understanding of the issues. The answer was placed in Level 2 – 6 marks.*

**Candidate 5**

- 2 (a) Why did James I pursue a Spanish marriage for his son Charles in the years 1618 to 1623. (12 marks)

James's daughter was married to Frederick elector palatine who by 1621 had lost the kingdom of Bohemia and his palatinate lands. James decided not to support Frederick in regaining control of the kingdom of Bohemia but was in favour of helping his son-in law to regain the palatinate which the Spanish had gained control of. Marrying his son to the Infanta, he thought would encourage the Spanish to give the lands back to Frederick and so this is one reason why James decided to try for a Spanish marriage. However, the Spanish match in 1623 was unsuccessful with the treaties being too high and not including restoring the Palatinate back to Frederick one of the aims of the match.



1618 was the start of the Thirty Years War in Europe, a war much to do with religion. James being a natural peace maker was keen to marry his son to the Infanta because it would be convenient for him with Spain being one of the superpowers in Europe. With Parliament also refusing James the subsidies of a war James was left with no other option than to try and make peace.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer did identify a series of valid reasons why James I pursued a Spanish marriage for his son. The recovery of the Palatinate was brought out in some detail and mention was made of James's desire to be a peace-maker as well as lack of money limiting the military option. Too much time was spent early on describing the background to the Palatinate crisis, there was scope for more development of the other reasons such as James's debts, Parliament and subsidies and the hope of obtaining a dowry. The reasons needed clearer linkage. Overall, however, a good answer firmly in Level 3 – 8 marks.*

### **Candidate 6**

- 3 (b) How important was religious opposition in bringing an end to Charles I's Personal Rule in 1640? (24 marks)

Laud's views and ideas were strongly opposed and religious opposition played a massive part in bringing an end to Personal Rule.

Parliament had presented many petitions against Laud and his way of conducting things but nothing was ever done about it. Once Stafford had brought Ireland to obedience their church soon quickly became very similar to Laud's church.

When Charles' official ceremony in Scotland took place, it was done in a very highly Laudian name which had offended many Scottish people. Whilst there, Laud did not like the way the Scottish were running their church.

In 1635 Laud published a set of canons in Scotland that told them how to do things such as conducting ceremonies. He did this without consulting the Scottish National Assembly and that was felt to be insulting. The Scottish had disliked the way Laud was running his own church as well.

In 1637 Laud then published his 1633 Prayer Book of England into Scotland which was the trigger to everything. The National Scottish Covenant was set up that dismissed both the canons and the prayer book and Charles felt that this was revolution so he started raising an army but didn't let the Scottish find out.

The National Scottish Covenanters then abolished the High Commission and all the bishops and knew that Charles was raising an army so they raised one of their own. Most of their soldiers were professionals and had been fighting in the Thirty Years War.

The Scots beat Charles and had control of six northern counties. Most English had sympathy for them as they were seen as the 'honest Protestants'. The Treaty of Ripon decided that Charles had to pay £850 for every county they invaded and more so they don't advance down further. Because Charles didn't have the money to pay for this and the City of London denied to lend them money, Charles had to recall parliament and that's when it ended for him.

Religious opposition was the main reason why it ended for Charles because religion is what led to the war which ended in defeat and once parliament was in it was over.

There were no other major reasons because the foreign policy was neutral and there was no Buckingham. Henrietta Maria was a problem but not as big as religious oppositions..

Most puritans themselves believed that Charles and Laud who Roman Catholics had sympathy for the Scottish.

### ***Principal Examiner's Comments***

*This answer showed a developed understanding of the demands of the question and there was some assessment backed by appropriate material. The answer touched on key events in all three kingdoms to try to explain the importance of religious issues in ending the Personal Rule. It rightly concentrated on events in Scotland in the later 1630s to explain the Covenanter Revolt and attempted to link this to events in England. It needed, however, clearer linkage between the events and the end of Personal Rule. Some points were not fully developed nor linked directly to the question. The approach was at times somewhat disjointed and descriptive. There was little consideration of other factors, particularly why the Short Parliament was not prepared to assist Charles or why he lacked money and manpower to defeat the Scots and preserve his personal rule. There was some attempt at balance and judgement towards the end but this was negative and under-developed. The answer was placed at the top of Level 3 – 16 marks.*