



## **General Certificate of Education**

### **AS History 1041**

**Unit 1: HIS1D**

**Britain, 1603–1642**

## **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](http://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 1: Change and Consolidation

#### HIS1D: Britain, 1603–1642

##### Generic Mark Scheme

###### Question 1(a), Question 2(a) and Question 3(a)

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

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

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

---

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

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

### Question 1

(a) Explain why James I faced financial problems at the start of his reign. **(12 marks)**

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

#### Indicative content

Candidates may partly explain this by considering the inheritance from Elizabeth I. This might include:

- a debt variously estimated at between £100 000 and £400 000
- a run down court
- an expensive war with Spain.

They may also point out that James's need for money was bound to be greater than that of Elizabeth since:

- he had a wife and family to support.

Candidates may well argue that James's financial position was made worse by:

- his natural extravagance
- his move from a relatively poor country, Scotland, to a relatively rich country, England
- the need to reward those who had assisted him in securing a smooth accession to the English throne
- the many Scots courtiers who accompanied him south in 1603 and their expectations of rewards
- his ambition to raise his diplomatic status in Europe.

Higher level answers may well show awareness of broader factors contributing to the financial problems of the Crown with some of these being beyond royal control. Examples of these might include:

- inflation
- various inadequacies in the financial system, e.g. falling rents from crown lands, under-assessment for subsidies
- the reluctance of the landed classes to appreciate the genuine financial needs of government and vote sufficient parliamentary subsidies.

---

Some, probably outstanding, answers might also challenge the statement by pointing out that James's financial position in 1603–1604 was not so bad. He did inherit votes of subsidies from Elizabeth's last parliament, the Spanish war was grinding to a halt and soon ended, whilst there was scope for savings on garrisons in Ireland and on the Anglo-Scottish border. However, such points are to be rewarded but not expected.

- (b) How far was finance the most important cause of conflict between James and his first Parliament (1604–1611)? **(24 marks)**

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

### **Indicative content**

Candidates may argue that disputes over finance were a prominent cause of conflict between James and MPs in the various parliamentary sessions 1604 to 1611. Evidence for this might include:

- bitter debates over impositions following Bate's Case, both in 1606 and 1610 sessions
- complaints about feudal dues, particularly wardship and purveyance, and also about monopolies
- attempts at financial reform, notably the 'Great Contract' in 1610 ending in mutual recrimination
- requests for subsidies being met with criticism about royal extravagance.

Higher level answers may go further and link financial disputes to wider issues about the extent of the royal prerogative and parliamentary privilege. Such constitutional aspects arose in Bate's Case and during debates on impositions/the Great Contract in 1610. Candidates might also link financial disputes to opposition to royal favourites such as Robert Carr.

However, more balanced answers will also consider non-financial issues which were important in the 1604–1611 Parliament. Amongst these might be:

- the issue of a full union with Scotland on which James appears to have set his heart but which Parliament rejected
- non-financial constitutional issues such as the cases of Goodwin v Fortescue and Shirley
- other constitutional disputes leading MPs to draw up, but not present, the Apology and Satisfaction or to force James to ban Dr Cowell's 'Interpreter'
- disputes over foreign policy such as ending the Spanish War and talk of a Spanish marriage for Prince Henry
- religious criticisms about too lenient a treatment of Catholics and too harsh a treatment of those radical puritans ejected from the church by Bancroft's Canons
- conflict between the Cecil and Howard factions.

Judgement might come in deciding whether finance was the main cause of conflict for most or part of the time, linkages to other areas of dispute and its importance to various groups.

**Question 2**

- (a) Explain why James I felt that the royal prerogative was under threat in the 1621 Parliament. *(12 marks)*

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

**Indicative content**

Candidates might define the term royal prerogative and illustrate some of the special powers of the Crown which came under it. They might illustrate James's concern that the prerogative was under threat by:

- his angry reaction to the Protestation document drawn up by the House of Commons
- the relatively short length of the 1621 parliament.

Candidates can refer to several reasons which made James defensive about the royal prerogative in 1621:

- open criticism from MPs about his foreign policy, which James regarded as the Crown's business
- the Commons' response when told by James that foreign policy was a matter for the Crown alone
- criticism in Parliament of James's pursuit of a Spanish marriage for Prince Charles and of James's handling of the Palatinate crisis
- criticism of financial measures used in preceding years e.g. monopolies
- the revival of the ancient procedure of impeachment and its use against two monopolists connected with the royal favourite, George Villiers
- significance of impeachment which though requiring royal assent could be used by parliament against future royal ministers and favourites
- criticism of James's favour towards George Villiers and his family.

Top level answers might indicate the connections between issues of foreign policy, constitutional powers, finance and faction.

- (b) How important was the Duke of Buckingham to the breakdown in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629? *(24 marks)*

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

**Indicative content**

Candidates might refer to various evidence of a breakdown in Crown–Parliament relations in the later 1620s. Such evidence might include:

- refusal to vote the customs for life as was traditional
- the attempted impeachment of the royal favourite and chief minister
- the Petition of Right 1628
- the passing of the Three Resolutions 1629
- Charles's decision in 1629 to rule without a Parliament for an indefinite period.

In arguing that Buckingham was an important cause of the breakdown, candidates could refer to:

- the jealousy and envy that Buckingham's position at Court and wealth aroused
- his foreign policy, being blamed for an unnecessary war with France at the same time as war with Spain
- mistakes in these wars, notably the disasters at Cadiz and La Rochelle
- his monopoly of office for relatives and friends
- his alleged support for Arminianism.

In higher level answers candidates may point to indirect ways in which Buckingham helped to cause breakdown. They may refer to:

- Charles's premature dissolution of the 1626 parliament in order to protect Buckingham from impeachment
- Charles blaming the parliamentary opposition for the murder of Buckingham in 1628.

However, candidates could also point to a range of other factors to partly offset the importance of Buckingham in explaining the breakdown. Amongst these might be:

- financial problems/disputes both immediate and deep rooted
- religious issues including both Arminianism and fear of Henrietta Maria's influence
- differences over the conduct of the Spanish War and the general direction of foreign policy
- worry about Habsburg successes in the Thirty Years' War
- Charles's anger at the sustained attacks in Parliament from MPs such as Sir John Eliot
- Charles himself, his personality, beliefs, attitudes and policies.

In making an overall judgement some candidates might argue that the real breakdown came from a combination of inherited debt and an inadequate financial system, combined with two expensive and unsuccessful wars, rather than opposition to any one individual. Others might argue that Charles was ultimately responsible for the decisions taken in these years and/or that Buckingham's influence was so great that even future loyal ministers, for example, Thomas Wentworth, felt unable to serve the King until Buckingham was removed.

**Question 3**

(a) Explain why Charles I faced rebellion in Scotland in 1639. (12 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)***Indicative content**

Candidates may refer to the immediate factors leading up to the First Bishops' War. Amongst these would be:

- the introduction of a new Prayer Book in 1637
- its imposition on Scots Presbyterians without the consent of the General Assembly of the Kirk or the Scottish Parliament and the reaction this produced
- the perceived influence of Archbishop Laud
- the mishandling by Charles and Hamilton of the General Assembly
- Charles's slowness in appreciating the significance of the National Covenant.

Higher level answers might go further pointing to:

- religious concerns about Charles I's beliefs and those of his wife, Henrietta Maria
- political concerns about Charles's attitudes to kingship
- the association in Scotland of episcopacy with royal attempts to weaken the independence of the Presbyterian Kirk
- Charles's slowness in coming to Scotland to be crowned and the nature of the coronation service held.

There may also be references in higher level answers to events further back in Charles's reign such as the Act of Revocation. Some, possibly top level answers, may put Scottish events in the broader context of the Stuart kings trying to bring a greater degree of unity between England and Scotland.

(b) How important was the Irish Rebellion of 1641 in causing divisions in the Long Parliament? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)***Indicative content**

Candidates might argue that the Catholic Irish Rebellion in October 1641 was crucial to radicalising events at Westminster and beginning the divisions within Parliament that made a civil war possible. They may point to some of the following in support of this view:

- the Irish revolt created panic in Parliament and the country generally with rumours of massacres of Protestants in Ireland and of rebel plans to invade England
- it provided John Pym with the opportunity to intensify such fears and use them to unite Parliament against the king
- the rebels claimed to be acting in the King's name and this deepened still further distrust of Charles I as well as belief in a 'popish plot'

- it brought to the fore the need for an army to suppress the rebellion but also the issue of whether Charles could be trusted with its use or whether Parliament should control the militia
- this in turn connected with the Grand Remonstrance in November 1641 and the division in the Commons between those who felt that the royal prerogative must be further reduced and those who felt that this was too extreme.

Higher level answers will also give some consideration on the role of other factors. These might include Charles's mistakes between 1640 and 1642 such as:

- the disasters in Scotland which led to the Long Parliament
- not appointing Pym and his followers to important office
- the Army Plot and the Incident
- the attempted arrest of the 5 MPs
- leaving London for York
- issuing Commissions of Array.

Balance might also be achieved by reference to the role of Pym and his associates and their methods in pushing constitutional issues beyond the point which most MPs could support them. Some of the following might be mentioned:

- the use of Attainder to remove Strafford
- the use of the mob
- the Root and Branch bill
- the content and publishing of the Grand Remonstrance
- the Militia Ordinance
- the Nineteen Propositions.

Top level answers may make reference to various interpretations of the causes of the outbreak of the English Civil War but this is not required. Judgement will come in assessing whether the divisions emerging within parliament in late 1641 / early 1642 were created by the Irish Revolt or simply exacerbated and focused by it.