



A-level HISTORY

Paper 2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Mark scheme

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 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2E The English Revolution, 1625–1660

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the regicide of 1649. | [30 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------|
| L5: | Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 25-30 |
| L4: | Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 19-24 |
| L3: | Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 13-18 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 7-12 |
| L1: | The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. 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.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Students are asked to analyse and evaluate these sources and assess their usefulness as evidence of the regicide in 1649.

Source A:

Provenance

- it is a contemporary source from a deeply religious soldier of the New Model Army
- it is a speech made in the context of the army's failure to negotiate with the King, which had promoted much anger among some members of the New Model Army.

Content and argument

- it clearly suggests that by negotiating with the King, the New Model Army had departed from their commitments to God, that 'it had been based on our wisdoms and not the word of the Lord'
- the source suggests that the New Model Army reunited around the conviction that should the opportunity present itself, then the King had to be held to account as 'that man of blood'
- students may consider these points through reference to contextual knowledge
- some may comment that the source indicates the moral paradigm of the New Model Army allowed for regicide.

Tone and emphasis

- the language and tone is emotional, e.g. 'man of blood'
- there is a clear element of the justification for the extreme action to be taken against the King.

Source B:

Provenance

- it is a contemporary transcript of the trial which adds immediacy, colour and drama.

Content and argument

- it reveals the gulf between the King and his opponents, suggesting that a negotiated

- settlement was now impossible
- the King clearly challenges the legitimacy of the court and claims to stand for the liberties of the people
- students may deploy contextual knowledge to confirm that this is an accurate representation of the impasse that existed, leaving regicide as the only option.

Tone and emphasis

- the King's tone is measured
- Bradshaw's tone is hectoring and inquisitorial.

Source C:**Provenance**

- this is a memoir which allows for reflection of events some time after the events themselves, as such, it may be influenced by hindsight. Lucy Hutchinson was the wife of a regicide.

Content and argument

- she believes the cause was just and men were influenced by religious conviction and imperative
- she denies the suggestion that either the Army or Cromwell acted to coerce the King's judges but notes that this has been suggested
- students will deploy knowledge of context to evaluate just how much men were influenced by conviction, and how much by coercion.

Tone and emphasis

- there is a clear measured argument designed to defend her husband's actions
- the tone emphasises the seriousness of Colonel Hutchinson, e.g. 'serious debate with his own conscience'
- it shows her admiration for her husband.

Section B

0	2	'Religion was the main reason for conflict between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629.'
----------	----------	---

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.

Students should address the role of religion directly as the cause of conflict between Crown and Parliament. In doing so they may comment on:

- the role of views of Montagu
- the York House Conference
- Charles' imposition of Arminianism in general
- the influence of Puritanism amongst some MPs.

Other factors that could be seen as more significant before 1628 could be cited to balance the argument:

- foreign policy and the failure as seen by MPs, to pursue a Protestant foreign policy
- finance and what seemed to be a resort to arbitrary taxation and Forced Loan
- the role of individuals such as Buckingham and Eliot.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that while a failure of communication was an important factor in the tension between Crown and Parliament it was part of an inter-related range of factors that increasingly saw the relationship deteriorate. At the heart of the growing tension was the nature of Charles' kingship which provoked parliamentary radicalism. The practical issues of religion, finance and foreign policy escalated into more serious constitutional concerns because of the lack of effective communication and, in particular, Charles' stress on his prerogative.

0 3 'Charles I's Personal Rule was a financial success.'

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 idea that Charles' Personal Rule was a financial success:

- Fiscal feudalism raised monies for the Crown which had become somewhat dormant as sources of revenue
- Ship Money, in particular, was an efficient and effective measure until it was challenged by Hampden
- more traditional methods of raising money, such as Monopolies and income from Tunnage and Poundage, were exploited successfully.

Arguments that dispute the idea that Charles' Personal Rule was a financial success:

- some of the measures for raising money were short-term and did not provide for a long-term solution to the financial weaknesses of the Crown
- whilst levies such as Ship Money raised significant sums, their success was qualified by the increasing opposition to them.

Students may argue that there was some success to the financial policies of the Crown and that Charles was able to 'live of his own' for a period of time. However, the degree of success was qualified by the fact that the Crown could not respond to abnormal circumstances, such as the Bishops' Wars, without recourse to Parliament and that many of the financially expedient measures were directed against the Political Nation which the Crown had to rule in partnership with.

0 4 'Cromwell's personality was the main reason for the political instability of the years 1649 to 1658.'

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.

Students should address how far Cromwell's personality created political instability but also acted as a source of some stability. In doing so they may consider:

- the negative impact of Cromwell's personality as an 'ideological schizophrenic': the removal of the Rump; the instigation of the Nominated Assembly; the Protectorate.
- Cromwell's irresolution being, apparently not committed to any particular form of government, but his refusal to take the Crown destabilised the protectorate.

Against this, students should assess how far Cromwell's personality contributed to stability:

- his increasing conservatism after 1653 restored much stability
- his willingness to use the army to enforce stability, such as the Major Generals.

Students may also indicate that some of the governments of the period were inherently unstable anyway and that by removing them, Cromwell was seeking and promoting stability:

- the Rump became increasingly self-seeking and unpopular
- the Parliament of Saints became dysfunctional of its own accord.

In summary, students may conclude that Cromwell's irresolution over form of government gave way to a more conservative pragmatism which created stability.

