

Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS2D: Britain, 1625-1642: the Failure of Absolutism?



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 HIS2D 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

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 HIS2D: Britain, 1625-1642: the Failure of Absolutism?

Responses to June 2009 Questions

Candidate 1

1 (a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the role of Laud in the religious reforms of the 1630s. (12 marks)

Source A explains that the Laudian reforms were down to Laud solely, "Laud was willing", "it was Laud", and that Charles had little involvement in the Laudian reforms. However, source B believes that Charles was more to blame for the Laudian reforms "while Laud carried much of the blame for Charles' religion policy, they were in fact very much the Kings own." This is seen in Charles' decision to move the altar to the East wall of the church, and make it a law.

Source A and B also differ in the way that they felt Laud went about making his reforms. Source A says that Laud "was willing to trample on those who opposed religion policy", like the way Laud used visitations and punishment as well as necessary fines, to make sure people would conform. The quote suggests Laud had no time for those who were unwilling to become Armenian.

Source B is different as it suggests Laud did not want to force people to conform "the placing of alters was intended to be merely recommendations".

The sources also disagree on their view of Catholicism while Source A says Laud "sought to limit the Catholics influence", Source B says "Charles appointed Catholics". This is referring to Charles' wife, the designer of his art, and even the court dwarf.

The sources do agree on the fact that what Charles and Laud wanted was uniformity. In Source A, Laud is said to "trample on those who opposed religious policy", and Source B explains that Charles issued a prayer back in Scotland, which was done to stop protestants in Scotland, having a big influence on the Church. Both men wanted Armenianism to control the church. Source A and B Strongly differ.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The answer shows a very good understanding of the similarities and differences between the two sources. In particular the answer indicates a grasp of the central issue of responsibility for the religious reforms. The comparison of the sources is well supported by selected own knowledge but this could have been more sustained in places and the candidate could have communicated in places more as well as being more secure with spelling of key terminology. Level 4 – 4 marks.

Candidate 2

1 (a) Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the role of Laud in the religious reforms of the 1630s. (12 marks)

Laud was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 and thus had great influence both over the Church and the King. He set about a program of reforms aided by the King. Source A says 'the programme he (Laud) pursued'.

This suggests that they were Lauds ideas and it was Laud himself who wished to see them enforced in England. It also says 'Laud was willing to trample on those who opposed religious policy'. Some Historians may interpret A as Laud wanting to see his reforms reach success, whereas others may see it as Laud being loyal to Charles and just doing as he is told. Source B amplifies the second interpretation. It says 'they were in fact very much the King's own'. This further suggests that Laud merely implemented his masters policies. Source A shows Lauds reforms in a positive light. It says 'Laud who poured money into the universities for the encouragement of better policies'. This suggests that Laud knew what the people wanted. I feel this to be the case as Charles did not know his people as he was so isolated at court that they must have Lauds ideas. However Source B mentions 'the placing of Altars'. I feel this was a reform that came straight from Charles as Source B suggest. It shows a reflection of Charles Catholic influences i.e. his wife.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The answer begins with a basic description of Laudianism rather than focusing on comparing the sources. The answer then offers a summary of the content of Source A before trying to link this in a limited way to B. It was awarded a mark of 5 – Level 2 because it does not directly offer a comparison.

Candidate 3

1 (b) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How important was opposition to religious reforms in the years after 1633 in bringing an end to the Personal Rule of Charles I? (24 marks)

I believe that the opposition to religious reforms was absolutely integral to bringing the end the personal rule. The manner of Charles religious reforms showed, as revisionist Barry Coward has stated, "underlying discontent" which was to culminate in the collapse of Charles' authority and bring an end to the personal rule. I do believe, however, that opposition to contextual factors, such as finance, link in with religion and why the foundations for explaining why opposition to religious reforms brought Charles personal rule to an end.

It is safe to say that Charles' religious reforms brought much opposition that was to be extremely detrimental to his authority. In England, Charles's imposition of such means the "placing of altars", mentioned in Source B, and the prominence of catholics at court also mentioned in B, created underlying discontent. Furthermore, Charles imposition of the beauty of Holiness and the (abolishment) of

the fed fees impropriations in 1633 made puritans extremely fearful of the apparent “catholic” tendencies of charles.

It can be argued however, that these changes did not create truly vocalised opposition for several years. The case of John Williams and his challenge to the altar policy and the early use of Prynne are evidence, I believe of how vocalised opposition to the religious reforms was of vital importance to the collapse of the Personal rule. The general build in opposition, e.g. the case of Lilburne and prynne, Barton Badwick, are evidence of how, by 30 vocalised opposition to charles and Laud’s reforms I believe began to completely undermine charles’ authority and thus begin to bring an end to the personal rule.

Of course, it can be argued that without the imposition of Laudianism in Scotland, vocalised opposition to Charles’s religious reforms would not have brought an end to the personal rule as there was no physical threat. As B states, the imposition of the ‘anglican prayer book on Scotland’ antagonised the Scottish immensely as to them, the arminian changes, with emphasis on episcopacy, looked like nothing more than Catholicism to the Presbyterian Scots. The national covenant of 38 to me is a clear example that opposition to the religious reforms in Scotland brought the end to Charles’s Personal rule, as the subsequent rebellion proves that opposition was vital in Charles’ “multi-kingdom dimension” as Farr had stated, in bringing an end to Charles’ authority. After all, it was ultimately the rebellion in Scotland that charles was forced to call Parliament. Furthermore, Charles’s’ manner of dealing with opposition as mentioned in Source C “show trials in star chamber” further shows the importance of opposition to religious reforms in the collapse of charles personal rule, of his brutal methods of dealing with the likes of Lilburne undermined social order and created more underlying discontent that led to the Scottish rebellion.

I think it can be argued however, that although Laud attempted to bring “order to religion” (A) – this had an adverse effect. I do believe however, that without the Hampden case (a financial matter) opposition to religious reforms would have not been as effective in brining the end to charles personal rule. The closeness of the votes undermined Charles’s prerogative asking, and this in turn links with religion as many of the Scottish covenanters were driven by the manner of success Hampden had, which in turn led to opposition to religious reforms in the form of rebellion; effectively bringing an end to Charles’s’ personal rule as he was forced to call parliament.

Ultimately, opposition to religious reforms brought an end to Charles’s personal rule, as the build in vocalised opposition to reform combined with Hampden and culminating in religious rebellion, ended the personal rule.

Principal Examiner’s Comments

This is an excellent response which, although has some confused attempts at historiography and need for rephrasing in places, is generally well written, detailed and shows a very good knowledge not only of the narrative of the period but the key concepts.

The introduction is very effective. The candidate addresses the wording of the specific question. They make a sound judgement and link the specified factor in the question, religion, correctly to the issue of finance.

The first paragraph is set up nicely with an opening sentence clearly indicating the

theme of the paragraph. Details are provided of some of the religious policies of the period and the source material is clearly and well integrated as part of the paragraph. While the evidence could go further it is acceptable in the overall context of the essay and where the candidate has put more weight on other aspects of their argument.

The next paragraph links clearly to the first and provides good commentary on the question by assessing the level and nature of the opposition provoked by Laudianism. This paragraph also works in the context of the next where the candidate rightly places emphasis on the importance of the Scottish rebellion as a religious revolt and its impact on England. Good reference is made to the 'multiple-kingdom dimension' although reference to Conrad Russell to support this would have been more impressive than Farr. The candidate again incorporates more source material as part of their argument. This paragraph, perhaps it would be better as two, also has key comment on the Scottish rebellion bringing about the need for Charles, eventually, to call an English Parliament as well as linking this to the key concept for this period of underlying discontent.

The next paragraph again comments directly on the question and indicates knowledge of the importance of Hampden's Case. The candidate could be clearer in link between Hampden's Case, the collapse of Ship Money and Charles's defeat in war at this stage.

The conclusion is direct and effective, linking the two factors and stressing the importance of the Scottish Rebellion.

While this essay clearly could be more precise in relation to the Bishops' Wars and refer to other examples of discontent in the period (the diaries of the Kent gentry) or indeed the apparent positive aspects to Charles' rule prior to 1637, perhaps supporting this with reference to Kevin Sharpe, it reaches the standard expected for a top Level 5. The candidate shows excellent understanding of the period, selects a range of precise support, incorporates the sources effectively and communicates their argument clearly. Little more can be expected in the context of the time constraints. Level 5 – marks.

Candidate 4

1 (b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important was opposition to religious reforms in the years after 1633 in bringing an end to the Personal Rule of Charles I? (24 marks)

The Laudian Reforms were issued in 1633 near the beginning of Charles' personal rule. They were designed to better and glorify the church and the same churches had been falling apart since the reformation and the maintaining of the Broad church which encompassed many different slight religious differences known as the Jacobethan balance maintained by Elizabeth I and James I, Charles however with the religious changes tipped the balance to the Arminian side. The two main historical arguments are the Whig and Post Revisionist argument that the personal rule was planned from the beginning and wasn't as calm as it appeared to be, and it was doomed to fail and the Revisionist argument mainly Kevin Sharpe that the personal was a great success, period of calm and order that only some major event could destabilize it i.e. the Scottish Rebellion 1637.

The First side of the argument would be that the opposition religious reforms were not important, view agreed with by Kevin Sharpe that the personal rule was calm with little opposition. The only opposition was Puritan extremists whom with most of the population did not agree with.

There was little opposition to the Laudian reforms in England and the introduction of the new prayer book hence, people were happy with the reforms agreeing with Source A that the reforms were good, there were better educated, better paved ministry, he attempted to bring order into religion.

However on the other side of the argument which is the Whig and Post Revisionist view that the personal rule was flawed and it was inevitable that it would fail.

The Religious changes effected everyone in the country and mainly Puritans in the country were outraged by the changes but had little opportunity to give opposition, there was no parliament, so the calm was only on the surface. Source C also says that the Pliny and Laud worked together in the changes ad pushed them through and implying that there was some resistance to the changes. Source A also says that Laud would trample upon anyone getting in the way of the religious changes.

Prynne Bastwicke and Burton were also examples of opposition particularly to the religious changes, although they could be seen as extremists they were worried about the Kings apparent 'catholic' reforms and were worried over the influence of his catholic wife Henrietta Maria as it states in Source B that Charles employed a Catholic pope representative at court.

In conclusion I think the religious changes were very important in the breakdown in Personell, they afterall were the reason behind the Scottish Rebellion which historians agree was strong enough to topple even a strong system. I believe that the religious changes made people very angry that grew into a hysteria about Catholic influences and that the apearance of a Catholic Queen and a court that could be catholic, led to a coiled Spring Theory proposed by Morrill who said the discontent built up untill 1637 when it all came out with the start of the Scottish Rebellion.

Principal Examiner's Comments

The candidate does not provide a focused introduction shaped to the specific wording of the question. The opening paragraph is further blurred by vague attempts to introduce general historiography and although a useful reference is made to Sharpe such material should also be shaped directly to the specific question.

The next paragraph is a useful attempt at balancing the argument and is valid. It does, however, need support of examples of opposition from Puritans, eg. Bastwick, Prynne etc. The next paragraph is too general and needs more thought with regard to the assertion that 'people were happy'. The candidate does, however, try to use one of the sources.

The next paragraph needs to be developed in relation to Puritan reaction but particularly with regard to the idea of the limited opportunities to express discontent. The content would also be more effective linked to the previous reference to Puritans and the paragraph also wanders into a general attempt to tack in the other two sources on the paper. The flaws in the structure are further

reinforced by the reference to Prynne, Burton and Bastwick at the start of the next paragraph.

The conclusion is too jumbled with too much information that would be very useful if clear and developed in other sections of the essay. In particular much more could be made of the Scottish Rebellion and Morrill's idea of the 'coiled spring'. There is also the suggestion of 1637 as a turning point.

Thus within this essay there is clear evidence that this candidate has accessed a lot of very relevant information but, unfortunately, the way it has been constructed within the essay and the lack of real comment on it indicates that the candidate has not really fully grasped the material or concepts for this period.

They thus show a limited understanding of the question rather than the 'developed understanding' needed for Level 3. Level 2 – 11 marks.

Candidate 5

2 (a) Explain why Charles I called for a forced loan in 1626. (12 marks)

Charles had only been in power for one year when he called the forced loan in 1626. This was for a variety of reasons.

Firstly, in 1623 had been rejected in marriage proposals from the Spanish. Charles had wanted revenge and instigated a war with Spain. This went through into the 1625 parliament. Charles had planned a war expenditure of £1m however parliament only gave him 3 subsidies of £120,000, they also only provided Tonnage and poundage for one year. This was because they needed time to discuss Charles and most of the tonnage and poundage went to the Lord High Admiral. In 1626 this was Buckingham who Parliament didn't trust. This meant Charles was fighting a war with barely enough money. Charles was not prepared to end the war – and was in no position to win, therefore he was in debt. Also, James had died in 1625 leaving Charles a debt. All this debt overrode into the 1626 parliament when Charles dissolved the 1625 parliament. Therefore Charles was in a position needing money from the 1626 parliament. They did not give him any subsidies as they wanted to impeach Buckingham. Through impeaching Buckingham and seeing the core of Bristol as a threat, Charles dissolved the 1626 parliament.

Subsequently, after 1626 Charles was in a position where he was in debt. He did not want to call parliament as they would not grant subsidies whilst Buckingham was in a position of authority. Therefore Charles had to raise his own money and introduced the forced loan. This was a gift of money to the king and could result in imprisonment if you failed to pay. Another reason Charles imposed the forced loan was that it cost him little as others below him collected it.

In conclusion, the forced loan was the most appropriate method of collecting money in a time when Charles was in desperate need. Charles turned to benevolence as it was not a new method, many kings had done it before, but they never offered punishment. In 1627 70% of 267000 had been collected therefore it was effective in raising money.

Principal Examiner's Comments

This answer secured Level 3 because there are some reasons offered and they

have some support. The candidate does not, however, offer a range of reasons or provide always secure support for the reasons provided. The candidate begins well with the first full paragraph in referring to foreign policy, tonnage and poundage, Buckingham and the attitude of Parliament. The next paragraph could have offered more support for Charles's ability to raise money without Parliament. In general to move towards the top of Level 3 and into Level 4 the reasons could have been extended to include the failure of the benevolence, the advantages of prerogative income or Charles's deliberate use of the Forced Loan as a 'test of political loyalty' (Cust). The reasons given should have been more clearly organised and the candidate would have benefitted from being more explicit about the links between the reasons and suggested a priority for Charles's actions.

Candidate 6

2 (b) 'Foreign Policy was the main cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Foreign policy was certainly an important cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629 but the main cause of conflict, as argued by other historians, was Charles I himself – issues of the time such as foreign policy, finance, favourites and religion were difficult and caused conflict, however this was because they were badly handled – if Charles had been more communicative and appeared less absolutist, these issues could have been resolved. However, his undiplomatic handling of them greatly aggravated each situation. Whig historians would argue that this period was the build up to the 'eleven year tyranny' that was about to take place, whereas Revisionists may argue that these events were short term only and that there was no ideological struggle as such, during this time.

The early instance of the Madrid event demonstrated to parliament that Charles was not the most tactful foreign diplomat (in 1623 he and Buckingham went in disguise to try and secure a marriage between Charles and the Spanish infanta), however foreign policy really became an issue in 1625-29, starting with the Cadiz expedition – a complete failure, followed by La Rochelle – also a failure. (This also implemented other aspects of conflict – finance and favourites). However, foreign policy did not just include these failed wars but also the complex negotiations between them. For Charles, foreign policy also revolved around issues of finance and it is evident that he made war with France and Spain only when he could afford to – when he needed to save money during the personal rule the Treaties of Madrid and Susa were signed, in order to cut expenses. Charles was not diplomatic, did not have a strong navy or fighting forces and his plans often fell through – as in the case with the Palatinate, or the Huguenots (when he decided to fight for them, against France, Louis XIII Richelieu had already made peace with them!) It is evident that the foreign policy of the time was complicated, but once again, it was how Charles handled it that really brought about his failure.

Another important cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament at the time was the issue of Charles favourite. Buckingham was hated among those in parliament as he was seen as influencing the king too much, and also perhaps some jealousy and frustration in that he was the only one Charles really communicated with, yet seemed to share his plans with no one else. Here is a very definite aspect of Charles arguably absolutist tendencies demonstrated. Buckingham also caused tensions between Charles and parliament not only because of this but because of his role in foreign policy – as Lord High Admiral. Many of the defeats were blamed

on him, yet Charles continued to appoint him to do this job, against much opposition. Charles also felt deep resentment towards parliament in 1628 at the time of Buckingham's assassination on 23 March, as he felt that parliament was responsible for spreading the opinion that Buckingham was an 'evil counsellor'. Another huge issue that caused conflict between Crown and Parliament was that of religion. In 1626, for example, Charles showed obvious contempt and unwillingness to listen to anyone on the matters of Arminianism when he refused to even attend the York House Conference on the writings of the anti-Calvinist Montage. Religion was very important as generally, Puritans regarded anti-Calvinism as Catholicism, which in turn was equated by many of the people with absolutism.

Also William Laud's provocative sermons, bearing of holiness and order within the church → Charles personality.

Finance – forced loan, shipmoney, introduction / beginning of fiscal feudalism

Conc: many causes of concern, of which foreign policy was a main one, however, overall it was Charles handling of the situation that caused the conflict to be aggravated instead of resolved, which had resulted in the personal rule and as a Whig would argue, even the civil war.

Principal Examiner's Comments

An excellent introduction. The candidate addresses the specific question directly but also links foreign policy clearly to the other factors of the period. They also make a clear and valid judgement about the importance of the role of Charles I in relation to these factors. This introduction illustrates a real grasp of the period and an appreciation of the inter-relation of the themes.

The first paragraph deals directly with the specified factor of foreign policy clearly and with support. They are able to provide valid evidence in relation to Spain and France and finish the paragraph with a directed judgement on the specific question. In a similar vein the next paragraph opens with a direct set up sentence introducing the theme of the paragraph in relation to the specific question. Furthermore dealing with Buckingham following on from foreign policy provides a fluency to the essay from his role as Lord High Admiral.

The candidate again sets up their paragraph on religion directly and provides sound evidence of two key aspects of this issue which caused tension in this period.

From this point onwards the candidate is clearly just trying to round their essay off before the end of the exam. The notes they provide on finance indicate some understanding of that as an issue. The conclusion makes a valid reference again to the role of Charles as the key factor.

The essay, while unfinished, does enough to warrant the top of Level 4, a mark of 21. It clearly shows explicit understanding of the demands of the specific question, most notably through an impressive introduction and the reinforcement of the argument in the conclusion. This understanding of the question is reinforced by the directed comment on the paragraphs and the way they are introduced. Even within what is produced there is a range of precisely selected support. Furthermore the essay is very well organised and written. Indeed the essay has many of the hallmarks of a Level 5 response but the candidate being unable to deal with 1628

and 1629 directly enough, specifically the role of Parliament, illustrated through the Petition of Right and the Three Resolutions, limits the answer to Level 4 – 21 marks..