

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/55

Paper 5e (Special Subject: The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The Band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result not all answers fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and possibly as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the Band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the Band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

Question (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the Band. Where appropriate an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected, or especially at the lower end of the Band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well-sustained and well-grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The Band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular Band. In such cases a ‘best-fit’ approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a Band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the Band have been demonstrated.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this Band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this Band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this Band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

Nominated topic: The Years of Personal Rule (1629–1640): the Bishops’ Wars and the recall of Parliament in 1640

- 1 (a) How far are the views expressed in Document E about Laud’s intentions challenged by Document C? [10]**

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities – both focus on the issues of bringing in Popery and the reverence shown to the altar. Both agree that there is more ceremony in the church. Differences – E accuses Laud of bringing in superstition and trying to reconcile with Rome while C says there is no such intention. Document E also mentions Popish customs, of which bowing to the altar would be one, while C makes it clear this is not an innovation, using Scripture, usually a Puritan weapon, to prove the point. Document E refers to punishments of Puritans, which Laud does not mention specifically, although he is speaking after the trial of three well-known Puritan critics. Provenance – E reflects the build up of grievances against Laud in the Personal Rule and is likely to find as many accusations whether well-founded or not, as it can. Document C shows Laud at the height of his power and in no mood to compromise as he takes the argument to the Puritans and may be said to have the better of it, given his more moderate language and care to refute the criticisms that were being made of his policies.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that Laud was unjustly criticised by the Puritans?**

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E). [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well-constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate and understanding and evaluation of different historical interpretations is to be expected. The Puritan criticisms are contained in Documents B, D and E. They focus on the extravagant claims of the bishops to be above the law in B and D and Laud's pride in visiting the universities to discipline scholars who resisted his instructions in B. The introduction of ceremonial appears in B and D, while E refers to superstition and idolatry. The bowing to the altar is instanced in B and D. D and E both specifically suggest that attempts were being made to bring in the Mass and to reconcile to Rome. D refers to grievances about Sunday sports and D and E complain about excommunication and unjust punishments. The answer from the archbishops in Documents A and C points out the irreverence with which the altar had been treated and denies specifically in C and by implication in A that there is any idolatrous intention. Laud repeats firmly that there is no wish to reunite with Rome. Candidates may assess how convincing this defence is. They may be aware that reverence towards the altar was not a Puritan priority and that Laud's position could be given Biblical backing. The issue was more one of misunderstanding and suspicion between the two groups and the Puritans were never going to accept that Laud's view had any sound basis. On the matter of the influence of Rome, Laud and Charles I were never likely to convert, but their words did not seem to be upheld by their actions, hence Puritan suspicions. On the power of the bishops, there was, again, no chance of a meeting of minds and so Puritan grievances would not be met by anything Laud argued. The likely conclusion is that Laud had some good arguments and he was not intending to go over to Rome, but the Puritans did not believe him and were not prepared to listen to his assertions.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

2 What best explains why Charles I enjoyed little backing in 1640 yet had sufficient support to put an army in the field in 1642? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates could mention the events of 1640 which made Charles so unpopular, such as the failure in Scotland and the Short Parliament. The reforms of 1641 could be seen as leading to concern among those who would be royalists about their impact, with the Grand Remonstrance, the Militia Ordinance and the Nineteen Propositions as further factors.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates are likely to argue that it was the actions of others rather than Charles which were decisive. Charles displayed remarkable ineptitude in the inconsistency of his policies moving from surrender, as over Strafford, to resistance, as encouraged by his wife. Instances like the attempted arrest of the five members further illustrate his failings. But alternatively it was the radical policies of Pym, his exploitation of the London mob, the untimely death of the moderate Bedford, threats against bishops and the church and the excessive demands of Pym and his associates which caused a Royalist party to be formed of those who feared anarchy.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

3 How far was the failure of the Levellers explained by their narrow base of support? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the nature and leadership of the Leveller movement and its lack of a coherent programme. Other factors might be the loss of support within the army, the hostility of Cromwell and the grandees and the death of Rainborough.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may argue that the Leveller movement was barely even that. They had influence beyond their numerical strength in 1647, but their so-called leader, John Lilburne, played no part in the Putney Debates. Their ideas expressed in pamphlets varied from writer to writer and depended on the literate to read them. Their strength was in London and in the army but little beyond that. However, they were responsible for the *Case of the Army Truly Stated* and the *Agreement of the People*. The other factors causing their failure lay in the radical nature of demands like manhood suffrage, the resistance of Cromwell and Ireton to their views and Ireton's defence of the rights of property owners and the eventual settlement of the army claims for back pay, which took the edge off radical demands. In 1649 Cromwell crushed a Leveller mutiny at Burford. Rainborough, their advocate at Putney, died in 1648, Lilburne was imprisoned and Wildman plotted against Cromwell.

AO3 – [Not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9769	55

- 4 ‘Charles I’s arrogance and stubbornness best explain why, in 1646–47, a political settlement to his conflict with Parliament could not be reached.’ Discuss. [30]**

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays an accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the attitude of Charles I and his misunderstanding of his own situation, the role of the army and its increasing importance and the lack of co-operation on the part of the Presbyterians in Parliament and their feud with the Independents. Some other individuals like Cornet Joyce, Holles, Cromwell and Ireton and Rainborough also had a role.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required. Candidates may argue that Charles was responsible for the breakdown in negotiations because of his conviction that as divine ruler he was not bound to keep any agreements, thus illustrating his arrogance. He played for time over the Newcastle Propositions and the Heads of the Proposals and led the army to believe he was untrustworthy. His escape and alliance with the Scots finally scuppered any chance of a settlement. His stubbornness can be seen in his refusal to consider reasonable proposals. Other explanations could lie in the increasing radicalisation of the army and their seizure of the king by Cornet Joyce. The army was divided between senior officers and the Levellers as the Putney Debates revealed and their views could not be reconciled. In addition the Presbyterian majority in Parliament, urged on by Denzil Holles, was determined on a settlement of their making which led to conflict with the army. Candidates may find it hard to allocate blame solely to any one of these warring groups.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.