



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 1: HIS1D

Britain, 1603–1642

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 1: Change and Consolidation

HIS1D: Britain, 1603–1642

Question 1

- (a) Explain why Puritans presented the Millenary Petition to James I in 1603. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Millenary Petition was presented to James I.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the significance of a new king succeeding in 1603
- issues within the Church which Puritans wished to see addressed
- broader Puritan aims in the Church and for English society

OR candidates may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- they hoped their petition would help to achieve their wider agenda such as encouraging more preaching, enforcing stricter Sundays and securing a better educated clergy
- Puritans felt that they had been treated unsympathetically during Elizabeth I's reign

and some of the following short term/immediate factors:

- Puritans hoped that James being a new king, known to be interested in church matters would give serious consideration to their petition
- with James's Protestant background, having been brought up in Presbyterian Scotland, they hoped he would be particularly favourable to puritan views
- Puritans wanted James to support them by removing 'popish' practices within the Church of England such as vestments, the sign of the cross, the ring in marriage, etc
- Puritans hoped this Petition would encourage James to call a conference to discuss further the nature of the Anglican Church
- Puritans wanted to convince the new king of their influence by alleging the signature of a thousand clergy.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the interrelationship of the reasons given, for example they might comment on Puritan hopes for ensuring that the Church of England was a distinctly Protestant Church.

- (b) How far did James I satisfy the demands of the Puritans in the years 1604 to 1625?
(24 marks)

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

Generic 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 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 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**

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 should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting James I did satisfy at least some Puritan demands might include:

- calling the Hampton Court Conference in 1604
- authorising a new translation of the Bible published in 1611
- replacing Bancroft by the moderate puritan Abbot as Archbishop of Canterbury
- generally appointing worthy men as bishops
- not exploiting the Church as brazenly as Elizabeth had done
- agreeing to tougher anti-Catholic laws after the Gunpowder Plot
- opposing Arminius at the Synod of Dort
- limiting Arminian influence and keeping generally harmonious relations between Puritans and the episcopate
- arranging a marriage between his daughter and Frederick of the Palatinate one of the leaders of the Protestant cause in Europe
- agreeing to war with Spain in 1624.

Factors suggesting that Puritans were disappointed by James I might include:

- no change in Church government or organisation
- some criticisms of 'popish' practices dismissed as trivial
- failure to implement several changes agreed at the Hampton Court Conference
- appointment of Bancroft as Archbishop of Canterbury
- the Canons of Uniformity, the ejection of 90 dissenting ministers and the emigration of some of the more extreme Puritans to North America.
- attempts to 'Anglicise' the Scottish Kirk.
- lack of support for strict sabbatarianism and issuing of the 'Book of Sports'.
- restrictions on unlicensed preaching in 1622.
- little progress in solving the Church's financial problems or shortage of well educated clergy.
- greater sympathy and promotion for Arminians by the end of his reign.
- disappointment that the Penal Laws were not always strictly enforced.
- disappointment with James' pacific attitude towards Spain especially after 1618.

Good answers may show an awareness that in reaching a judgement candidates might distinguish between different types of Puritan with those wanting a Presbyterian form of government and those wanting a looser Church structure being especially disappointed. Candidates might also distinguish between the periods before and after 1618. At the highest level candidates might put James's relationship with the Puritans into a wider perspective by briefly comparing it with that of Elizabeth and/or Charles I; or they might refer to differing interpretations of events such as the Hampton Court Conference.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why James I and Parliament clashed over foreign policy in 1621. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why James I and Parliament clashed over foreign policy in 1621.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the impact of international events
- James's attitudes
- constitutional issues raised by foreign policy concerns

OR candidates may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- James's different attitude towards war with Spain compared with most Englishmen
- James's financial situation as another reason for reluctance to fight Spain

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- international events such as the outbreak of the Thirty Years War and the Spanish invasion of the Palatinate heightened tension in Parliament
- James's reluctance to go to war with Spain even when the latter invaded the Palatinate angered many MPs
- James's continued pursuit of a Spanish marriage for Prince Charles and the alleged influence of the Spanish ambassador, Gondomar aroused both anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic feelings
- foreign policy disagreements led to constitutional clashes over whether the Commons had the right to discuss foreign policy or whether this was entirely a matter for the Royal Prerogative. This caused an open and bitter clash between James and Parliament in late 1621.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might consider the connection between James's high flown view of the Royal Prerogative which appeared to be challenged by the House of Commons' criticisms of his foreign policy and their claim to have the right to discuss foreign affairs.

- (b) How important were disputes over royal finances in worsening relations between Charles I and his parliaments in the years 1625 to 1629? (24 marks)

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

Generic 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 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 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**

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 should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Factors suggesting the importance of disputes over royal finances in worsening relations between Charles I and his parliaments in the years 1625 to 1629 might include:

- inherited royal debt from James I together with the cost of wars against Spain and later France, put intolerable burdens on the royal finances in the mid-1620s leading to demands for a large number of subsidies from Parliament
- Charles's anger over Parliament's failure to vote enough subsidies in 1625 and its refusal to vote tonnage and poundage for life, as was customary, led him to take deeply unpopular measures such as levying non-parliamentary taxation, e.g. forced loans and benevolences as well as levying tonnage and poundage without parliamentary approval.
- these financial measures led to law cases such as that of the Five Knights and to parliamentary petitions and resolutions such as the Petition of Right and the Three Resolutions
- lack of money also led to the use of billeting and the imposition of martial law challenged in the Petition of Right
- disputes over these, and how Charles and Parliament handled them, soured relations further and sowed such mistrust as to lead to a breakdown of Crown-Parliament relations by 1629.

Factors suggesting it was not the finances alone which caused trouble but their connection to constitutional issues and foreign policy might include:

- constitutional and legal questions about whether taxes could be levied without parliamentary consent and whether men could be imprisoned for refusing to pay them were central to the Five Knights Case, Petition of Right and Three Resolutions
- Parliamentary distrust of Buckingham partly led Parliament to refuse the number of subsidies requested
- disputes over how war with Spain should be fought led to Parliament not approving the supply asked for by Charles I in 1625
- loss of faith in the conduct of the wars following Cadiz and La Rochelle further strengthened reluctance to meet royal financial demands.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that that there were various non-financial issues which worsened relations between Charles I and his parliaments in these years, such as:

- disputes over religious matters e.g. promotion of Arminians in the Church.
- suspicion of Henrietta Maria and her influence at Court
- concern about Charles I's views on Monarchy and Parliament.

Candidates, in reaching a judgement, candidates may consider whether the worsening of relations between Charles I and his parliaments in the later 1620s was essentially due to disputes over the level of taxation or whether it was the connection between the finances and other issues which was the fundamental cause.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why there was opposition to ship money during the personal rule of Charles I.
(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Generic 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why ship money became so controversial in the later 1630s.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- constitutional and legal.
- financial.
- political.

OR Candidates may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- Charles I ruling apparently indefinitely without a parliament after 1629
- the king's need to find a substitute for parliamentary subsidies
- suspicion about royal policies in general in the 1630s.

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- ship money was changed from being an occasional tax levied only on the coastal shires to an annual tax levied on the inland shires as well.
- ship money was usually levied only in wartime but now it was being levied regularly when England was at peace.
- its assessment was based on a more up to date and efficient register so it was less easy to underpay or to avoid.
- the tax fell on a wider social range than the old parliamentary subsidy and brought in a lot more money.
- It was seen as a substitute for parliamentary subsidies so enabling the king to rule indefinitely without a parliament
- although declared legal by the judges in Hampden's Case 1637 the decision was by a narrow margin.
- taxpayers increasingly disapproved of the uses to which Charles put the tax i.e. his war against the Scots Presbyterians.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given, for example they might bring out that though ship money was paid regularly concerns about it led to calls for its abolition as soon as a new parliament met in 1640.

- (b) How successful was the Long Parliament in limiting the powers of Charles I in the years 1640 to 1642? (24 marks)

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

Generic 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 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 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**

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 should be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question

Factors suggesting Parliament was successful in the years 1640 to 1642 in limiting Charles I's powers might include:

- the Long Parliament removed most of the ministers and machinery of Charles I's personal rule in early / mid 1641.
- Laud and Strafford along with lesser ministers of the 1630s were arrested, fled or were beheaded.
- the prerogative courts such as Star Chamber and the High Commission were abolished and the supremacy of the Common Law courts asserted.
- regional councils such as the Council of the North were abolished so curbing the administrative power of the king in the outlying regions and kingdoms
- most non-parliamentary taxation such as feudal dues and ship money were declared illegal so making Charles more dependent upon parliamentary subsidies.
- the Triennial Act prevented Charles I and future kings from ruling for long periods without a parliament
- another act prevented Charles I from dissolving the Long Parliament except by its own consent so depriving Charles of the ability to refuse the Long Parliament's reforms as he had done those of earlier parliaments.
- by remaining united for most of 1640-41 the Long Parliament was able to force a reluctant Charles I to agree to all these limitations on his powers.
- The measures passed in 1641, sometimes called 'the Legal Revolution', became a permanent feature of the English constitution.
- evidence might be adduced from Charles' position in 1642 e.g. having to leave London, send abroad for weapons, etc as to his weakened position.

Factors suggesting that attempts to curb Charles I's powers were not always successful might include:

- attempts to reform the Church 'root and branch' and reduce royal control over it divided Parliament and failed to get agreement
- attempts to remove more prerogative powers from the king in 1641-1642 such as control of the militia, appointment of ministers and parliamentary rule by ordinance divided Parliament and failed to get agreement
- proposals in documents such as the Grand Remonstrance, the Militia Ordinance and the Nineteen Propositions served only to divide Parliament, rally support to the king and eventually led to a civil war in 1642 between those who felt that Charles' powers had been curbed sufficiently and those who wished to go further
- though weakened by 1642 Charles was still able to fight a civil war.

Good answers might judge that the Long Parliament was very successful until mid-1641 but its divisions undermined success thereafter. Some candidates may argue that the success of the Long Parliament was essentially negative rather than positive. By 1642 Charles I could no longer rule indefinitely without a parliament but he still possessed many prerogative powers and was able to attract enough support to fight a civil war. Despite the ultimate defeat of the Royalist cause in the civil wars many prerogative powers were returned to his son Charles II after the Restoration.