



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2D

Britain 1625–1642: the Failure of Absolutism?

Mark Scheme

2009 examination – January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

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

Copyright © 2009 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

January 2009

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2D: Britain, 1625–1642: the failure of Absolutism?

Question 1

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

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the reasons for the development of support for the king. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

- L1:** Answers will **either** briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources **or** identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak. **0-2**
- L2:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed. **3-6**
- L3:** Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences **and** similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed. **7-9**
- L4** Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication. **10-12**

Indicative content

Difference

Source A focuses on religion in context of Scots or religious groups.

Source B does not address the issue of religion.

Source B focuses on constitutional concerns as most important and the issue of order.

Source A does not address the issue of order.

Source B addresses the use of propaganda by the king.

Source A does not address this issue.

Agreement

Both sources refer to 'novel' actions of parliament.

Source A places stress on religion, both in terms of the Covenanter Scots, but more clearly the reaction by conservatives to the growth of religious radicalism in London. As a result many

came to regard the Anglican Church with its bishops as worth protecting. Source B does not address religion but candidates from their own knowledge may comment on religion in the context of unrest, with the established church seen by moderates as a prop to social order.

Source B refers to concern at the breakdown of order as a reason for supporting the king which is not directly referred to in Source A, but candidates may see an implied link by Source A's concentration on religious radicalism. Some candidates may comment on the church as an institution of order that can be inferred from Source A and linked to fears of breakdown on authority addressed more explicitly in Source B.

Source A refers to distrust of the Scots as a reason for division in Parliament and therefore consideration of supporting the king. This is not addressed at all in Source B. Candidates may also comment on the inclusion of the Scots in Source A as part of that source's focus on religion. Some of the distrust of the alliance with the Scots was fear of the impact of Presbyterian influence as well as traditional antipathy.

Source B, unlike Source A, also indicates that one of the reasons for the development of support for the king was the production of propaganda, the example given is the Answer to the Nineteen Propositions, which played upon conservative fears and presented the monarch as the bulwark of order and the church.

Both sources agree however on the concern generated by the increasing powers of Parliament. Source A refers to the fact that 'many feared the novel extensions of Parliament's power'. Source B also refers to the increasing powers of Parliament as 'novel'. Source B comments on the fear produced by the 'novel parliamentary claims to choose the king's advisors, control the army, and enact legislation without the king'. These were 'unacceptable constitutional innovations'. Source B, however, places much more emphasis on these constitutional concerns than Source A, partly as a reflection of the fact that it is addressing 'constitutional royalism'.

Candidates can support the material from the sources with reference to the role of Pym in Parliamentary assertiveness, comment on the nature of constitutional Royalism or evidence of religious radicalism like London's 'Root and Branch' Petition.

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

How important was religion as a reason for the outbreak of civil war in England in 1642?
(24 marks)

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

- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may 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 may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, 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 using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. 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 from the sources and own knowledge, 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 from the sources and own knowledge, 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**

Indicative content

All three sources can be used directly in response to the question.

Source A – divisive impact of religion and how the reaction to religious radicalism led to support for monarchy.

Source B – the nature of the development of support for monarchy, constitutional royalism, and thus the two sides necessary for civil war.

Source C – the apparent differing religious differences of the two sides.

The following aspects of religion may be addressed.

Religion

- Laudianism
- Scottish Rebellion
- Root and Branch Petition
- Irish Rebellion
- Actions of radicals in late 1641, early 1642

Candidates may touch upon the following issues from the period 1637 to 1642, but a key focus should be on the crucial period of 1641–42 and the development of support for the king.

Pre-1640 issues

- Charles I, Personal Rule and Laudianism
- Scottish Rebellion

1640–42 Issues

- Failure of the Short Parliament
- Long Parliament – unity to division; Root and Branch; Stafford; Bedford
- The incident
- Irish Rebellion
- Grand Remonstrance
- 5 Members
- Militia Ordinance

Candidates need to address religion, but stronger responses will also consider other factors and relate the factors to each other. For example, as well as religion, candidates can examine the actions of Charles. More developed responses will increasingly offer a judgement of religion in the context of other factors. A consideration of religion and Charles can also be built on further by consideration of the role of Parliament and their interrelation for example, how Parliament driven by Puritans like Pym, became more radical in reaction to the actions of Charles I and in turn how support for Charles I grew as a reaction to parliamentary radicalism.

In considering the actions of Charles I, candidates can refer to the imposition of the Laudian Prayer Book on Scotland in 1637, his apparent role in ‘the Incident’ and the Irish rebellion.

These can also be considered from a religious perspective. The role of Parliamentary radicals in causing division should also be addressed and candidates can pick up on this from Source A and Source B, as well as linking it to religion through the role of Pym. For the assertiveness of Parliament candidates may refer to the Triennial Act but especially, as in Source B, the Militia Ordinance. Candidates may well argue that without the fear generated by the actions of Parliament there would have been no reaction that led to the development of support for the king in the form of Constitutional Royalism and thus no chance of civil war. The period 1641 to 1642 can be isolated as crucial in relation to this, specifically as a result of the Irish Rebellion when the question of control of the army forced a decision with regard to allegiance.

Even when allegiance was becoming more defined in response to the Militia Ordinance and the king’s Commissions of Array candidates may comment that radicals motivated by religion were the first to act in 1642.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Arminian influence over the Church of England grew in the years 1625 to 1628. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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**

Indicative content

- 1625 Charles I's sanctioning of Richard Montagu's *Appello Caesarum*
- Montagu's appointment as royal chaplain
- 1626 York House Conference
- 1628 appointment of William Laud as Bishop of London

Charles was the main reason for the growing influence of Arminianism in the period 1625 to 1628. Charles was more inclined to Arminianism as a prop to his prerogative as well as seeing it as more in tune with his ceremonial approach to kingship. Reference should be made to examples of the growing influence of Arminianism, specifically Charles's support for Richard Montagu and William Laud. Charles sanctioned the publication of Montagu's Arminian tract, *Apello Caesarum*, in 1625. In 1626 the Duke of Buckingham at the York House Conference made clear Charles's support for Arminianism. The appointment of William Laud as Bishop of London in 1628 was symptomatic of the increasing grip the Arminians were exerting on the Church of England.

- (b) 'Buckingham was the main reason for conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(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 limited part of the period 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 demands 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**

Indicative content

- Charles I
- Buckingham as favourite
- Foreign policy – Cadiz and La Rochelle (including Buckingham as Lord High Admiral)
- Religion – Arminianism (including Buckingham's role at York House Conference)
- Finance – Tonnage and Poundage; the Forced Loan
- Five Knights' Case
- Petition of Right
- Three Resolutions

Candidates need to assess the role of Buckingham as well as considering this in the context of the other key factors of the period: religion, foreign policy, finance and Charles I. Buckingham's position as favourite, his role in foreign policy and the attacks on him by Parliament may all be considered. Stronger responses will indicate the link between the factors. For example, religion can be linked to Buckingham's position as Lord High Admiral. A consideration of religion will also comment on the domestic problems created by Charles's support for Arminianism,

specifically Montagu and Laud. Answers at Level 4 and above will consider the deterioration of the relationship between Crown and Parliament across the period in the context of the major themes and their interrelation: finance, foreign policy and religion.

Charles's approach to kingship also needs examination, specifically his stress on his prerogative. Candidates may consider his lack of communication, reshaping of the court and conspiracy mentality with regards to 'opposition'. A consideration of Charles's policies can support this and answers and focus can be on foreign policy, religion and finance. Answers at Level 3 will set these policies in the context of the deterioration of Charles relationship with parliament most notably through comment on the Five Knights' case, Petition of Right and Three Resolutions to lead to comment on mistrust. Buckingham as a source of mistrust may also be prominent especially in relation to the foreign policy of the period or York House Conference. There should also be comment on Parliament's role. This may come through tonnage and poundage, financing of foreign policy, reaction to Montagu and Buckingham, and the Three Resolutions.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why Charles I's methods of raising income caused concern in the years 1629 to 1634. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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**

Indicative content

- Forest fines
- Wardship
- Distrain of Knighthood
- Tonnage and poundage
- Monopolies
- New Book of Rates

- Ship Money

Candidates should consider a range of examples of Charles's methods on raising income and explain the concerns these methods raised. Candidates can explain that the central concern was that Charles's methods were based on his prerogative and potentially gave him the scope to be absolute. The methods that could be considered include; forest fines; wardship; distraint of knighthood; tonnage and poundage; monopolies; new book of rates; ship money.

Forest fines were a matter of concern due to the manipulation of ancient and obscure maps indicating encroachment on crown land. This was a particular issue for the landowning classes. Wardship was also an issue for the gentry class as the crown's right to control the estate of a minor was an economic threat. Distraint of knighthood was another cost for a vast range of gentry that, due to inflation, came within the £40pa threshold. Charles's continued collection of tonnage and poundage was a source of grievance since 1625 when parliament had only granted it to him for one year rather than the customary period of the reign. The 'Popish soap' monopoly was not only a concern because of the grant to Catholics but as an example of how Charles circumvented the 1625 Monopolies Act by granting monopolies to corporations rather than individuals. Ship Money was a concern as there appeared to be no obvious emergency although in 1634 it was still only levied, as tradition, on coastal areas.

- (b) 'Charles I's authority was never seriously threatened in England in the years 1629 to 1638.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(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 limited part of the period 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 demands 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**

Indicative content

Candidates need to consider examples of opposition to Charles I in England. Some may set this in the context of the nature of opposition to Charles's authority. The example that can be considered include: St Gregory's Case (1633); Prynne (1634); Prynne, Burton and Bastwick (1637); Lilburne (1638); Bishop Williams (1637); John Hampden (1637–38). The extent and representative nature of the examples should be used to make judgement. Candidates can also comment on the difference between religious and financial/political opposition. Stronger answers will comment on the inter-relation between opposition in Scotland, specifically the Prayer Book rebellion and its link to Hampden's Case and the collapse of Charles's authority as a result of the Bishops' wars. Candidates can argue that without the Scottish rebellion the opposition in England would not have been a serious threat. It could also be stated however, that the nature of Charles's rule meant that at some point he was likely to provoke serious opposition and that the kingdoms need to be considered as a whole. Furthermore candidates may also comment on the high levels of emigration as an expression of opposition.