

## **General Certificate of Education**

**History 1041** 

Specification

**Unit HIS2D** 

# Report on the Examination

2010 examination – June series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: <a href="www.aqa.org.uk">www.aqa.org.uk</a>
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.
The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

## Unit HIS2D

### Unit 2D: Britain, 1625–1642: The Failure of Absolutism?

#### Question 1

- O1 Candidates coped well with this question. The vast majority understood the argument of both sources and were able to offer a direct comparison of the sources that featured similarities and differences. Stronger answers were able to focus on the difference in emphasis and interpretation with Source B being more negative in tone and its view of Charles I. In making their comparisons between the sources most candidates ably supported this with directed use of appropriate specific parts of the sources. A key area that limited marks for some students was the failure to support their comparison of the sources with appropriate directed own knowledge. Such directed own knowledge does not have to be extensive but it does have to be used. The best answers selected very precise own knowledge that linked directly to the argument of the sources.
- O2 There were many excellent responses to this question. It is clear that the majority of centres and candidates are aware of the demands of a 1625 to 1629 question focusing on the deterioration of the relationship between Crown and Parliament. Most developed an argument around a range of factors appropriate to the period and address the factor specified in the question.

Some candidates did not, unfortunately, use any of the sources as part of their answers. These answers have to be limited to a maximum mark of Level 2/11. The most common issue for candidates was not really addressing events in the years 1628 and 1629. This, in some cases, was also linked by a limited treatment of the role of Parliament. As the question focused on finance many answers addressed the limited vote of tonnage and poundage in 1625 as an example of parliamentary radicalism and some also addressed the attempts to impeach Buckingham but fewer used or commented on the Petition of Right of 1628 or the Three Resolutions of 1629.

The strongest responses addressed finance but also structured their answers around the other key factors/themes of this period, religion, foreign policy, parliament and Buckingham. These were also linked together and stronger responses also linked these factors through the Charles's personality and style of rule which magnified the tensions caused by these issues.

#### Question 2

This was the most popular of the optional questions. Even weaker responses had some appreciation of some reasons. The best answers focused on key individuals, the culture of the court and the limited access to the court. The better answers that focused on these examples shaped the material into explicit explanations to the specific focus of the question. An issue with some responses was their limited shaping of general religious material to focus on the court. Unfortunately some candidates simply wrote in general terms about Charles's religious policies.

04 It was clear that most candidates had a sound general grasp of the Personal Rule. This was particularly the case with regard to Charles's and Laud's religious policies. Most were able to convey some useful information about the importance of the Scottish rebellion as a reaction to the religious policies and a key event in bringing about the end of the Personal Rule. Clearly moving into Level 4 candidates were more secure with their use of precise support in shaping an argument. Answers were less convincing when dealing with finance. While many candidates linked the Scottish rebellion to the need to recall Parliament for finance and touched upon Hampden's Case as part of this many needed to be more secure on the details of 1637 to 1640. Hampden's Case was initiated by Charles in the light of Scottish Rebellion. Charles did not call Parliament until 1640 because of the escalation of the Scottish Rebellion from 1637 because of his response to it and, ultimately, his failure in the Bishops' Wars. Very good responses also set the collapse of the Personal Rule from 1637 onwards in the context of examples of opposition in England, the nature of that opposition and the links of that opposition to the Covenanters or the stance of MPs in 1640.

#### Question 3

- O5 Some candidates struggled in providing a range of explanations for this question. Good on linking the calling of the Long Parliament to the Scottish rebellion there were fewer answers that looked at the failure of the Short Parliament, the Council of Peers or the advice Charles received from others. Some provided excellent explanations of how the nature of opposition in England in the 1630s shaped the calling of the Long Parliament in the light of the crisis of 1637 to 1640.
- Most who attempted this question grasped the significance of the role of parliamentary radicalism and John Pym in the development of a royalist party. Most in doing so focused on the key period of 1641–1642. Good responses supported this with précised examples of the issues that worried moderates, the Root and Branch Petition, fear of the 'London mob', iconoclasm, the Bill of attainder, the Militia Bill, the Exclusion Bill, the Grand Remonstrance and the Militia Ordinance. It was the stronger answers, however, who set the developing parliamentary radicalism in the context of Charles's actions and more importantly as a result of the impact and questions raised by the Irish Rebellion. Such candidates were invariably sound in defining Constitutional Royalism.

The Irish Rebellion raised the question of command of the army (the Militia Bill) and in response to the need to get this through Parliament, Pym was instrumental in the Grand Remonstrance which parliament voted on in terms of publication. It was this which really did show a division in parliament and the two sides needed for a civil war.

#### Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the **Results statistics** page of the AQA Website.