

GCE
AS and A Level

History

AS exams 2009 onwards
A2 exams 2010 onwards

Unit 1D

Specimen mark scheme

Version 1.1





General Certificate of Education

AS History

Unit 1: HIS1D

Britain, 1603–1642

Specimen Mark Scheme

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the first operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 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.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

Specimen Mark Scheme**GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation****HIS1D: Britain, 1603–1642****Generic Mark Scheme****Question 1(a), Question 2(a) and Question 3(a)**

- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Question 1(b), Question 2(b) and Question 3(b)

- L1:** Answers may either contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **0-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Question 1

(a) Explain why religion was an important issue for James I in the years 1603 to 1606. **(12 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

Candidates can refer to a range of events from these years to indicate why religion was an important issue for James I. In 1603 James was presented with the Millenary Petition by a group of Puritans calling for reform of the church and this placed religious issues immediately on his agenda. To deal with this and make clear his settlement, James held the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. He then reinforced this by drawing the lines of conformity through the 1604 Bancroft's Canons, most notably Canon 36, which required acceptance of the 39 articles of the 1559 Elizabethan settlement. Religion was also an issue for James because of the Catholic threat, indicated by the Bye, Main and, most notably, the Gunpowder Plot. This last plot was followed by the 1606 Oath of Allegiance, but reference can also be made to the issue of recusancy fines and James's general attitude to the Catholic Church, perhaps best illustrated by his willingness to accept 'outward obedience' and the church itself as the 'Mother Church'. Candidates can also stress that religion was important as an issue generally because of its centrality to seventeenth-century life or to a monarch who was also Supreme Governor. This political dimension of religious issues would also be very clear at the start of a new reign.

(b) How far was James I successful in dealing with the problems presented by Puritanism in the years 1611 to 1625? **(24 marks)**

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should illustrate their argument with a range of evidence from the period. Stronger answers will increasingly make clear judgements with regard to James's success in the context of the examples that they use. Reference can be made to the appointment of a new Archbishop of Canterbury in 1611, George Abbot, and the publication of the Authorised Version, the King James VI Bible. Both of these may lead some to argue that up to 1611 James had dealt with the problem of Puritanism relatively successfully and set the context for judgement on the remainder of his reign. Abbot's appointment can be seen in the context of James's attempts to maintain the 'Jacobethan balance' in the church, i.e. maintain the broad Calvinist church established by Elizabeth. This allowed Puritans to feel that they could conform and thus not

present so great a problem for James. Abbot himself may be commented on as a much more pro-Puritan bishop and thus more likely to be accepted by the Puritans. The Bible of 1611 did much to appease the puritans who regarded the Bible as the word of God and central to their approach to life. The legitimisation of a Bible in English meant that they no longer had to make use of the Geneva Bible. Candidates should indicate the importance of foreign affairs in redefining the nature of Puritanism as a broad protest movement and thus an increased problem for James. MPs like the Puritan Pym were expressing anti-Catholic sentiments shared by many of his fellow MPs and most Protestants across the country, who felt war against Spain was in some ways desirable. Opposition to James's desire for the Spanish Match, his apparent favour to Armenians, increased Puritan and wider Protestant concerns. Coupled with this, candidates can also refer to Puritan concern over the 1618 Book of Sports. Thus Puritanism was a greater problem for James after 1618. Candidates can argue that in this sense James was not successful, whereas others can argue that he maintained his authority, and that as his foreign policy shifted in 1624 Puritan and Protestant opinion became less hostile. Some may even reinforce this with reference to the 1625 Sabbath Act.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why foreign policy was an important issue in the 1621 Parliament. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should outline clearly why foreign policy was an issue in the 1621 Parliament. Reference can be made to the Thirty Years' War, or even more specifically the 1620 Battle of White Mountain and the prospect of a Catholic victory. This context for James's calling of the 1621 Parliament made foreign policy an issue. Candidates should also indicate an appreciation, however, of the sensitivity of the topic as a prerogative issue. It was not until James implied that MPs could discuss the issue that it was brought up. Some may refer to James's tactic in doing this: an attempt to manipulate the Spanish, through their ambassador Gondomar, in completing the Spanish Match in the face of possible English intervention in Europe. Stronger answers may have more specific reference to the Commons' Petition of 3 December 1621 as illustration of foreign policy being a central issue in this Parliament and James's subsequent response leading to the escalation of foreign policy debate into constitutional conflict. With regard to this, candidates can comment on James's assertion of his prerogative and the Commons' response in their Protestation of 18 December 1621. James's resultant dissolution of Parliament can be used to reinforce that foreign policy was of central importance and that its constitutional dimension had led to a real clash of Crown and Parliament.

-
- (b) How far was foreign policy the most important cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1624 to 1629? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates can set this in the context of the different approaches of James and Parliament to the issue of the Thirty Years' War, most notably the idea of a Spanish Match. The significance of the Madrid Trip and the role of Prince Charles and Buckingham in the 1624 Parliament may be used by some to indicate that Parliament was less important than faction, the favourite and the heir in terms of opposition to James over foreign policy. This may be reinforced by reference to the impeachment of Cranfield in 1624 through the influence of Buckingham. Some candidates may refer to the relation between foreign policy and finance and constitutional issues, most notably shown by the Subsidy Act of 1624. Others may use this to indicate that conflict caused by foreign policy was declining as James moved to a more interventionist position.

Initially, given the context of the 1624 Parliament, Charles may be regarded by some as in a stronger position than James, whereas others can outline Charles's and Parliament's different interpretation of foreign policy; Parliament wanted a cheap naval campaign, whereas Charles envisaged a more substantial attack to defend his honour. Foreign policy was thus very much still on the agenda in Charles's first Parliament, but the failure of the Cadiz expedition made it a source of conflict rather than it being immediately a grievance. This was then reinforced by Charles's policy towards the Huguenots, which initially led to attacks on La Rochelle. Foreign policy can also be indicated by candidates as a source of conflict through Parliament's attacks on Buckingham, whom Charles had appointed as Lord High Admiral. Others may indicate the wider aspect of attacks on Buckingham and the agenda of MPs like Eliot. At the higher levels, candidates will indicate that, most notably, in Charles's reign the other issues that were a source of conflict between Crown and Parliament. Finance, which was related to foreign policy, was problematic for James and Charles, indicated by the Subsidy Act of 1624 and the Forced Loan of 1626. Religion, specifically support for Arminianism, was a source of tension for both kings and specific reference can profitably be made to both kings' relationship with Richard Montagu. Whereas James's acceptance of Montagu's *New Gagge for an Old Goose* was less provocative than Charles's acceptance of Apello Caesarum and subsequent promotion of Montagu to royal chaplain. The greater grievance and wider concern caused by Charles may be shown by reference to the Petition of Right of 1628 and the Three Resolutions of 1629.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why discontent with Charles I's rule grew in the years 1637 to 1639. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should outline more open signs of discontent with Charles's rule, with reference to Hampden's Case and the Scottish Rebellion. Candidates can set these in context of the nature of the Personal Rule and the lack of a forum for discontent. The Scottish Rebellion can be seen in the context of concern over Charles's Laudian policies. Candidates can refer to Charles's

imposition of the prayer book and the subsequent reaction with the formation of the National Covenant and Scottish Rebellion. This can be set in the context of his decision to implement this policy when he visited Scotland in 1633 and alienation of the Scottish elite since his Act of Revocation in 1625. Some candidates will comment on the Scottish Rebellion allowing the greater expression of discontent in England, most notably the collapse in the collection rate for Ship Money and may also relate this to Hampden's Case. The other major example of open discontent that candidates are likely to comment on is the protest and subsequent punishment of the Puritans Prynne, Bastwick and Burton. Candidates can refer to examples of discontent before 1636, such as St. Gregory's Case but most will stress that Scottish events and Hampden's case undermined Charles's authority, leading eventually to the calling of Parliament. Some candidates may refer to the evidence of the Kent gentry diaries as indicative of a underlying discontent with Charles's Personal Rule or even the comments of Hyde that the image of 'peace and calm' was deceptive. Other candidates may deploy some of the arguments of the historian Kevin Sharpe to indicate the limits of discontent.

- (b) How important was John Pym in the development of divisions in Parliament in the years 1640 to 1642? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Indicative content

Candidates should outline the importance of John Pym in the period 1640 to 1642 as a leading, if not the leading, figure in Parliament. Reference can be made to the idea of 'King Pym' to illustrate this. As the foremost critic of Charles, reference can be made to Pym's role in working with the Covenanters, stressing the Army Plot and Popish Plot, attacking Strafford, supporting Root and Branch reform and the Grand Remonstrance. More detailed reference could be made to Pym's role in ensuring the Commons put financial pressure on Charles by only giving him tonnage and poundage on a two-monthly basis or his use of committees to shape the policy of the Commons as a whole, notably in the period 9 September to 20 October. Thus, for many, Pym was far too radical in his attacks on Charles's prerogative and appealing outside Parliament to the people. Thus Pym can be seen, and was seen by contemporaries, as a symbol of how Parliament became more of a threat than Charles. Hyde referred to Pym as being 'able to do most hurt', and an outsider, the Venetian ambassador, believed Pym was 'director of the whole machine'. Pym's influence stemmed from his criticism of Charles since 1626, but, more specifically, Pym's chairmanship of the Recess Committee. Stronger answers will set Pym in the context of the development of Constitutional Royalism, commenting on the significance of the Irish Rebellion and the Militia Bill, as well as Charles's own continuing role in fostering division, most notably through the Five Members' Coup. Others at the higher level may even refer to the historiographical debate over the role of Pym. Conrad Russell's judgement that Pym was the most important figure in the Commons can be set against Adamson placing him in the context of the influence of the Lords, Lambert's reference to the 'myth of Pym's leadership', or even Morrill's qualification that Pym was merely prominent as the most visible figure.