



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2D

Britain, 1625–1642: the Failure of Absolutism?

Mark Scheme

2010 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 © 2010 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 2010

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 own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the role of Pym in the Long Parliament in the years 1640 to 1642. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| | Nothing written worthy of credit. | 0 |
| 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. | 1-2 |
| 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Difference

- Source A focuses more on the reaction created by Pym's attempt to reform the prerogative whereas in Source B the focus is more on the 'inflammatory' means by which Pym sought to do this
- Source B is focused around the example of the Grand Remonstrance of November 1641 whereas Source A addresses Pym's actions before this, specifically the 'bridging scheme' of December to May 1641 and his actions in general terms

- Source B raises the issue of 'religious grievances' and some may comment on this in the context of Pym's puritanism
- Source A addresses the scheme for Pym to actually enter royal government and the role of Bedford
- different context December 1640 v November 1641.

Agreement

- Sources A and B both refer to Pym in the context of infringing on the prerogative and this leading to a 'royalist' reaction
- Sources A and B both address the unease among moderates created by the methods used by Pym – although some may also point out the different examples of Pym's actions in the sources
- clearly a central role.

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

How important was division in Parliament in the years 1640 to 1642 as a reason for the outbreak of civil war in England in 1642? (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

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

Source A – Pym’s actions creating division. The death of Bedford leading to the failure of the ‘bridging scheme’. Reference to ‘political nation’.

Source B – The impact of the Grand Remonstrance in focusing division. Appeal to the country; propaganda war in May 1642.

Source C – The religious aspect of the division of Parliament. An element of Constitutional Royalism was as a defence of the Church of England. Feudal ideas: king as guardian of the law and constitution, ‘Junto’.

Candidates clearly need to address the issue of division in Parliament directly. Stronger responses will indicate how vital it was in creating the two sides without which civil war in England would not have been possible. The wording of the question leads candidates to focus on the period 1640 to 1642, and while credit will be given for material prior to 1637 this is not expected to be extensive and must be directly related to explaining the outbreak of civil war in England in 1642. In this context the stronger responses will show an appreciation of the importance of the period from late 1640 when parliament divided and a ‘royalist’ party was created. In explaining this division candidates may examine these issues:

- the attainder of Wentworth
- the Root and Branch Petition
- the Irish Rebellion
- the Militia Bill
- the Grand Remonstrance
- the Militia Ordinance.

Stronger responses will be able to show an appreciation of these divisive set pieces in the broader context of Pym’s ‘junto’ and the perception of them as going too far in encroaching on the royal prerogative. Another aspect of this that may be addressed is the link between their ‘puritanism’ and the attack on the prerogative. Part of the reaction against Pym that led to the formation of a royalist party was the perception that with the undermining of the Church of England and the prerogative there would be an undermining of the social order. This can be seen in Source C and may be addressed in the context of the Root and Branch Petition.

Some candidates may be able to address these events and the creation of the royalist party in the context of Constitutional Royalism and specifically how this relates to division in parliament. Part of this may involve an appreciation of the link between the Irish Rebellion, the Militia Bill, the Grand Remonstrance and the Militia Ordinance. In considering these crucial focal points of parliamentary division candidates may be able to illustrate the vote on the publication of the Grand Remonstrance (159 votes against 148) as illustrative of two sides in parliament.

Some may go further than this. Some may point out that civil war in England, despite these divisions, did not break out until August 1642. Many may stress that despite division in parliament and across the majority of the political nation the majority did not want civil war and did not want to ‘choose sides’. In illustrating this there will be a focus on the role of religion, as part of the process of Constitutional Royalism, but also as the determining factor in making the radical minority seize the initiative and act.

While candidates should clearly stress the importance of the division in Parliament Charles’s role can be focused on through the following events:

- Attainder of Wentworth
- The Incident
- The Irish Rebellion

- 5 Members' Coup

In assessing the role of Charles I, candidates will consider the period 1640 onwards but a key focus should still be on the crucial period of 1641–42 and the development of support for the king. Better responses will indicate that without the development of two sides there would have been no civil war and thus link their consideration of the role of Charles with the division in parliament and the process of constitutional royalism. In this context they may stress Charles's continuing mistakes (the Five Members' Coup) as well as the work of Constitutional Royalists like Hyde and Falkland in constructing a 'royalist' party.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why Charles collected Tonnage and Poundage in 1625 and 1626. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

- 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. **1-2**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates may consider some of the following:

- Charles was granted tonnage and poundage for one year by Parliament at the start of his reign
- Charles considered the 1625 grant an infringement of his prerogative right to be granted tonnage and poundage for his reign and therefore felt he could continue to collect it in 1626
- Charles's financial difficulties, especially in the light of foreign policy and limited subsidies from Parliament meant that he needed tonnage and poundage
- Charles's belief in his rectitude overrode any decisions by Parliament
- Dissolution of Parliament in 1626.

- (b) 'Parliamentary radicalism was the most important reason for the collapse of the relationship 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)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

In answering this question candidates may consider the following key events of the period:

- Foreign Policy – Cadiz and La Rochelle (including Buckingham as Lord High Admiral)
- Buckingham as favourite
- 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.

Central to answers should be some consideration of parliamentary radicalism. This can be considered as a reaction to Charles's kingship or in the context of the aggressive actions of Parliament. These may include: tonnage and poundage, limited funding, attacks on Buckingham, Petition of Right and Three Resolutions. Some may indicate the difference between individuals who may be considered radicals like Eliot and Pym in contrast to the moderate majority. The consideration of a Bill of Rights as opposed to the Petition of Right may be used to illustrate these different approaches. Some may also comment on the role of Puritanism as part of parliamentary radicalism. 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 regard to 'opposition'. Stronger responses will set this in the context of the importance of his personality and style of rule in a time of Personal Monarchy. Charles's inferiority complex led him to overstate his prerogative and this created an impression of absolutism. Candidates may also consider the style of Charles's rule from the viewpoint of his support for Arminianism. Stronger responses will be able to link his Arminianism to concerns at his absolutist tendencies. This consideration of the personality and style of Charles's rule in the context of Personal Monarchy will provide the context for a consideration of Charles's policies, specifically foreign, religious and financial. Parliamentary radicalism can be seen as a reaction to Charles's style of rule and these policies. The deterioration of the relationship between crown and parliament can be illustrated through the Five Knights' Case, the Petition of Right and the Three Resolutions. 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 inter-relation: finance, foreign policy, religion and the constitutional questions these raised in the context of Crown-Parliament relations.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why the Scots rebelled against Charles I in 1637. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**

- 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. **1-2**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates may consider some of the following:

- the imposition of the new Scottish Prayer Book in July 1637
- Charles's unwillingness to compromise
- the perception of Charles's as an English King
- opposition to Hamilton as Charles's Scottish representative
- self interest of the Scottish elite
- Presbyterianism of the Scottish in the context of Charles's Laudianism
- Act of Revocation as an example of alienation of the Scots.

Main reason or immediate reason which candidates should isolate is the rebellion as a reaction to the imposition of the new Scottish Prayer Book, read for the first time in St. Giles Cathedral on 23rd July 1637. Candidates should offer other reasons however and can focus on the aim of the initial pre-planned demonstrations and riots to secure a compromise with Charles. That he was not willing to do so led to rebellion. Candidates can also set the rebellion in the context of

wider concerns about Charles's religious policy, the perception of him as an 'English' king and his alienation of the Scots elite by the Act of Revocation immediately after his succession.

- (b) 'His financial policies were the most important reason for opposition to Charles I in England in the years 1629 to 1640.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view, (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- 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. **1-6**
- 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

Note: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Candidates must address the issue of opposition to the financial policies of Charles's reign directly. In doing so they may explain why the financial policies created discontent but also the nature of that discontent. This could encompass a range of examples of Charles's fiscal feudalism: distraint of knighthood, forest fines, monopolies. Most, however, will focus most attention on Hampden's Case and Ship Money. Stronger answers will appreciate the constitutional importance of Hampden's Case.

Candidates also need to consider examples of religious opposition to Charles I in England. Some may set this in the context of the nature of opposition to Charles's authority. The examples that can be considered include: St. Gregory's Case (1633); Prynne (1634); Prynne, Burton and Bastwick (1637); Lilburne (1638); Bishop Williams (1637). The extent and representative nature of the examples should be used to make judgement. Candidates should also consider the Scottish rebellion as religious opposition and may specifically consider this as the turning point of the period and the key cause of the end of the Personal Rule. Candidates should also set judgement of the religious opposition alongside that of other examples of opposition, notably Hampden's Case of 1637–38.

The Personal Rule did not end until 1640 and it is therefore valid for candidates to comment on the importance of Charles's reaction to the Scottish Rebellion and need for finance from an English Parliament. Candidates may comment on the links between leading Covenanters and 'opposition' figures in England like Pym. Furthermore candidates may also comment on the high levels of emigration as an expression of opposition. 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 was and 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 at some point this was likely to bring the collapse of the Personal Rule.