

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version: 1.0

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603–1702

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to Charles I. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

Target: AO3

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historic context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | Either shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only or addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-6 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Note: in responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each extract in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach to individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid and what follows is indicative of the analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

Extract A: In their identification of Coward’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Charles regarded as an ‘inept’ monarch
- limitations of Charles’ character
- Charles’ inability to communicate
- Charles’ perception of criticism
- Charles’ shaping of a more restricted court
- Charles’ focus on order.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the importance of character in a time of Personal Monarchy
- Charles’ inferiority complex led to a stress on Divine Right and his prerogative
- Charles’ harsh actions against opponents
- the separation of court and country
- Charles’ regard for ceremony and limiting of access at court
- Charles’ responsibility for the civil war and regicide
- Charles was dealing with structural problems that would have been problematic for any monarch
- James I’s relationship with the political nation deteriorated post-1618.

Extract B: In their identification of Kishlansky’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- Charles I’s reputation is a result of parliamentary propaganda
- historical reputation of Charles I is bad
- reputation in context of other rulers
- modern view is not based on character faults as there was much that was positive about his personality
- Charles had a number of positive character traits and interests
- he had positive goals.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Charles’ character and shaping of court could be seen as positive for the image of a Divine Right monarch

- Charles' character and shaping of the court could be seen as positive in the context of experience of James I and the later approach of Charles II
- Charles' rule in 1620s and 1630s viewed from the perspective of later conflict
- Charles' intention in many areas could be read as positive
- Charles did cause political tension
- Charles' personality did have negative political consequences
- range of historians have a negative view of Charles.

Extract C: In their identification of Guy and Morrill's argument, students may refer to the following:

- by 1637 there were many positive features of his rule
- Charles' character faults
- Charles' physical limitations were an element of what shaped, what are regarded as, character weaknesses
- Charles' belief in his own rectitude
- Charles' court could be seen as positive

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Charles' physical issues did link to his inferiority complex
- Charles' physical issues did shape perceptions of his leadership
- some contemporaries viewed his reshaping of the court positively
- contemporaries commented on the peace and calm across Charles' kingdoms in 1637
- budget was balanced in 1630s
- emigration removed some of the most problematic of Charles' opponents
- political nation was largely passive pre-1637
- Book of Orders and Militia reform seen as a genuine attempt at needed reform
- underlying discontent belies notion of acceptance by political nation
- budget balanced at the cost of alienating the political nation
- other contemporary views negative
- examples of opposition prior to 1637.

Section B

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 2 | To what extent were the claims of the early Stuarts to rule by Divine Right the most important reason for the breakdown of Crown and Parliament relations by 1629? | [25 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. | 16-20 |
| L3: | Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Arguments that support the proposition that Divine Right had a negative impact on Crown and Parliament relations, might include:

- James' prorogation of Parliament, for example, in 1606 as a means to obstruct opposition to the Union
- James' use of proclamations in relation to the Union
- James' speech of 1610 reinforcing his concept of Divine Right to the political nation
- James' response to the Commons' Protestation of 1621 to reinforce his prerogative over Parliament's attempt to assert its privilege in relation to freedom of speech
- James' dissolutions of Parliaments in 1611, 1614 and 1621 in response to parliamentary opposition
- Charles' dissolutions of Parliaments during the 1620s in response to parliamentary opposition
- Charles' statements emphasising his Divine Right, for example to the 1626 Parliament
- Charles' promotion of Montagu in response to parliamentary attempts to use impeachment
- Charles' approach to the Petition of Right.

Arguments challenging the proposition that Divine Right had a negative impact on Crown and Parliament relations, might include:

- foreign policy, specifically the failures at Cadiz and La Rochelle or the Madrid Trip and the pressures put on James because of his approach as Rex Pacificus
- finance, specifically the impact of James' extravagance, the failure of the Great Contract, the Forced Loan
- religious issues, specifically the growing influence of Arminianism through reference to Andrewes, Montagu and Laud
- favourites, with reference to Carr or Buckingham.

Stronger responses will illustrate the impact of Divine Right but in the context of other factors and their inter-relation. Some may stress the key role of each monarch in shaping the relationship with Parliament in a time of Personal Monarchy and thus comment on Charles' style of rule, making Divine Right a more immediate issue through his escalation of practical issues in comparison to James', ultimately, more pragmatic approach.

0 3 'The rulers of Britain in the period 1649 to 1672 failed to address the financial problems they faced.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Arguments that support the proposition that the rulers of Britain failed to address the financial problems they faced in this period, might include:

- the foreign policy of the Rump, Cromwell and Charles II could be seen as unnecessarily draining of the finances of the state in the context of the problems they faced
- the inability of the Interregnum regimes to deal with the impact of harvest failures 1658-60
- the problematic nature of the relationship between Cromwell, Charles and their parliaments hampered financial settlement
- the lack of systematic reform by any of the regimes of the period limited the financial resources at their disposal.

Arguments challenging the proposition that the rulers of Britain failed to address the financial problems they faced in this period, might include:

- the attempt of the Rump to reduce the establishment of the army which led, in part, to Cromwell's intervention in April 1653
- the Dutch War as an attempt to strengthen the trading influence of England
- Cromwell's attempts to reduce the army establishment as part of the transition during the Protectorate and thereby the tax burden on the political nation
- Cromwell's Treaty of Westminster of 1654 could be seen as shaped by the financial imperative of ending the Dutch War
- Decimation Tax of 1655 was seen as a means by which a militia could be funded by royalists to ease the wider financial burden on the political nation
- 1660 parliamentary grant
- Hearth Tax
- Charles' acceptance of a narrow Church of England in return for subsidies
- 1670 Treaty of Dover negotiated for financial independence from Parliament
- 1672 Stop the Exchequer used by Charles as a means of dealing with financial problems.

Stronger responses will illustrate the impact of finance but in the context of how it linked with other factors, notably relations with the political nation. Some may comment on the nature of the fiscal-military state during the Interregnum, which meant that rulers in that period had greater resources but these had to be deployed for primarily military reasons such as the occupation of Scotland and Ireland rather than as part of fundamental reform. Charles II's resort to pre-1642 financial methods could be regarded as politically successful in avoiding reform that would alienate the political nation.

0 4 'In the years 1678 to 1702 the power of the monarchy was transformed.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students 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.

Arguments that support the proposition that the power of the monarchy was transformed in the years from 1678 to 1702, might include:

- in 1678 the power of the monarchy was directly under threat as part of the Exclusion Crisis
- Charles' successful defeat of the Exclusion Crisis, specifically through his exploitation of his prerogative
- the growth of Stuart absolutism in the period 1681–85 as a result of Charles II's defeat of Exclusion
- James II's assertion of his prerogative in the period 1685–88
- the extent and nature of the revolution of 1688/89
- the financial revolution under William that laid the foundations of a constitutional monarchy
- the Act of Succession.

Arguments challenging the proposition that the power of the monarchy was transformed in the years from 1678 to 1702, might include:

- the continuing influence of the political nation
- the continuing influence of the monarch as the centre of the political system
- William's gradual lessening of the influence of parliament
- the financial limitations on the monarch.

Stronger responses will illustrate that fundamentally the political nation retained control of real power through their control of finance and the localities. This could be reference by a consideration of the power of monarchy in the period 1681–87 being based on the interests of the political nation and specifically a Tory Reaction. It could be illustrated further by reference to 1688 as a revolution of the centre. This process of change for the monarchy also saw power more widely shared during this period as the political nation broadened after 1688 with the development of the financial and commercial world and Parliament took a fuller political role alongside the monarch in directing the affairs of state. It could be argued that, in reality, while on the surface the Divine Right Stuarts held sway through the century in practical terms the political nation held real power throughout and prevented a drift towards absolutism.