



A-LEVEL History

7042/1D

Component 1D Stuart Britain and the Crisis of Monarchy, 1603-1702
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

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

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the influence of the Crown after 1688. **[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 historical 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.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

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

- the changes that followed the Glorious Revolution led to a significant transformation in the power and influence of the monarchy in favour of Parliament
- the monarchy had less influence to control Parliament as much after 1688
- Parliament had more influence over Crown policy, especially through taxation
- monarchs needed to have support within Parliament to be able to influence it.

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

- there were limited actual constitutional changes as a result of 1688
- the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694 was significant as part of the ‘financial revolution’, which could be argued was the main factor in changing the power of monarchy
- the influence of Parliament did derive from their powers over taxation in the context of William’s need to finance his wars against Louis XIV
- scrutiny of government policy can be seen through the 1690 Commission of Public Accounts.

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

- the power of monarchy after 1688 remained significant
- the Lords was the key influence over the monarchy after 1688 through their economic and political influence
- Parliament’s influence, particularly the Commons, after 1688 was limited
- parliamentary controls on the monarchy depended on the co-operation of the monarch.

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

- after 1688 William III was clearly directing policy through his focus on his European strategy
- chaotic elements of the Parliament can be seen through the further development of parties
- William did have at his disposal more military might than previous Stuart monarchs but was dependent on parliamentary finance throughout his reign and hence, despite the Triennial Act, Parliament became annual or ‘institutionalised’
- key elements of the aristocracy could be seen to have carried out a political coup with William in 1688 and then consolidated their influence during his reign
- the 1701 Act of Settlement was a key element in the process of a changing monarchy.

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

- the influence of the monarchy after 1688 declined
- William’s character and approach to monarchy was part of the reasons for the decline in influence of the institution of monarchy
- the negative impact of heavy taxes also made the monarchy less popular
- William was unpopular as a foreign usurper and because of his approach to the Church
- Parliament became more a centre of power than the monarchy with the development of the state.

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

- William was accompanied by 40,000 troops and London was an occupied city at first and therefore the regime was regarded with suspicion
- William did not approach personal monarchy in the same style as Charles II, for example, foregoing the ceremony of ‘touching for the king’s evil’ and therefore being less popular
- William’s Calvinist latitudinarianism was unpopular with Tory Anglicans who dominated the political nation
- William’s foreign advisors were unpopular
- William’s taxes were unpopular but many in the political nation benefited from the creation of a fiscal-military state.

Section B

- 02** 'The personalities of the early Stuart monarchs were responsible for a breakdown in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1604 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.

Arguments supporting the view that the personalities of the early Stuart monarchs were responsible for a breakdown in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1604 to 1629 might include:

- James' relationship with favourites, such as Carr or Buckingham, led to tension with Parliament in 1606–14 or 1621–25
- James' occasional anger brought tension with Parliament, as over the Union in 1606, the Great Contract in 1610 or the Protestation in 1621
- Charles' belief in the Divine Right of Kings and interpretation of his prerogative, which could be argued derived from his inferiority complex, was at the root of his provocative approach to Parliament and was reflected in his dislike of communication, seen in the closed nature of his court no longer acting as a point of contact, or poor communication with Parliament as in his 1626 speech or Declaration of March 1629
- Charles' conviction in his own rectitude could be seen as the root of his poor working relationship with parliament and was illustrated in his handling of Montagu, the Five Knights' Case or the Petition of Right.

Arguments challenging the view that the personalities of the early Stuart monarchs were responsible for a breakdown in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1604 to 1629 might include:

- James' pragmatic approach enabled him to ensure that his relations with Parliament never reached breaking point and was exemplified in his speech of March 1610 reflecting on the nature of the Crown-Parliament relationship
- practical issues under James, such as the Union, finance or foreign policy were more significant in shaping the relationship between Crown and Parliament than his character
- Charles' approach to foreign policy, favourites and finance were the source of tension in his parliaments
- parliamentary radicalism was also a source of tension in the Crown-Parliament relationship, particularly in 1628–29, and this may be related to the development of Arminianism as an underlying issue of the period.

The characters of both monarchs was an element in the tension between Crown and Parliament in the years 1604–1629. In a time of Personal Monarchy the characters of the monarchs shaped their approach to policy. Whereas James' predominant pragmatism allowed him to generally successfully negotiate the balance of prerogative and privilege in his interaction with Parliament to avoid a breakdown in relations Charles' provocative reinforcement of his prerogative at the heart of his style of rule escalated practical differences over policy in to more serious constitutional matters.

- 03** How significant were religious divisions to political instability in the years 1640 to 1660? **[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 supporting the view that religious divisions were significant to political instability in the years 1640 to 1660 might include:

- the political division of 1640–49 can be seen as rooted in the religious division of Puritans from the more moderate conservative Anglicans who increasingly became constitutional royalists over the period
- the English Revolution of 1646 to 1649 was driven by millenarians, such as Harrison and Ireton, and the failure of settlement in these years can also be seen in the differences over potential religious terms by Charles, the Presbyterian Covenanters and the New Model independents as well as within Parliament between Political Presbyterians and Political Independents
- the apparent explosion of religious radicalism, from the breakdown of authority and the impetus of revolution, created political instability across the Rump, Barebones and Protectorate Parliaments, as seen in the Blasphemy Act of 1650, the Biddle (1654) and Nayler (1657) cases
- the political tensions between the New Model Army and Parliaments was linked to their differing perceptions of religious toleration
- the developing Quaker threat led to a consequent conservative reaction of the years 1658–1660 and underpinned the political instability after the death of Cromwell.

Arguments challenging the view that religious divisions were significant to political instability in the years 1640 to 1660 might include:

- the political instability of 1640 to 1642 focused on constitutional elements of Charles' use of his prerogative, such as the Militia
- the failure of settlement in the years 1646 to 1649 was linked to political division between the different groups and increasingly between Parliament and the New Model. Radical groups like the Levellers or Diggers developed predominantly political agendas that created some political instability
- instability in 1646 to 1653 was rooted in the balance between Parliament as a legitimate form of representative power and the reality of the political power held by the New Model illustrated most vividly in December 1648, April 1653 and December 1653
- tensions between military and civilian Cromwellians centred on the political direction of settlement and came to head in the kingship crisis
- social and economic factors also led to political instability, most notably with the bad harvests of 1658–59 and the consequent fear of anarchy by the conservative elite who accepted the Restoration as a means of restoring order.

Religious division was a significant source of political instability across the period. There were also political, social and economic tensions that created instability. At the heart of most instability was, however, a combination of political and religious themes as in the seventeenth century these were essentially interchangeable and the disputes over political settlement in this period always had to have a religious element as this was seen as a central part of the role of the state in governing the lives of the people.

04 ‘The Restoration Settlement was a failure.’

Assess the validity of this view of the years 1660 to 1685.

[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 supporting the view that the Restoration Settlement was a failure in the years 1660 to 1685 might include:

- the fundamental failure to address the ‘crisis of state’, particularly with regard to a reform of fiscal feudalism and this may be linked to financial weakness across the period in war or 1672 Stop the Exchequer
- the failure to provide a religious settlement to recognise the developing diversity of opinion or the apparent Catholic nature of the court
- the practical failures of the regime that became more apparent after 1665 through to the pressure on the Crown during the Exclusion crisis and this may be linked to anti-Catholicism as a continuing theme
- the limited constitutional arrangement at the Restoration that meant a continued tension in the Crown-Parliament relationship
- the lack of reconciliation with the defeated and radicals from the Interregnum
- real power was held by the political nation, not Charles, as shown in the Cavalier Parliament and through the Tory Reaction of 1681–85.

Arguments challenging the view that the Restoration Settlement was a failure in the years 1660 to 1685 might include:

- Charles’ pragmatic dealing with the immediate issues he faced at the Restoration
- Charles’ handling of the potential threat from opposition
- Charles’ pragmatic response of accepting the Clarendon Code to appease the majority of the Political Nation who held real power
- by his own priority of staying on the throne Charles achieved his principle aim and his success in dealing with Exclusion saw him emerge, on the surface, as arguably the most powerful Stuart monarch
- no previous monarch had resolved the crisis of state by reforming the system.

The Restoration Settlement was a success by Charles II’s own criteria of remaining on the throne. It was also a short-term success in dealing with the immediate issues of the Interregnum. Charles also successfully used Clarendon and members of the Cabal as scapegoats to relieve pressure on his monarchy when needed. Charles failed, however, to resolve the underlying issues of finance and religion which were at the heart of instability across his reign as seen with his declaration of bankruptcy in 1672 or the religious tensions of the Exclusion Crisis. It could also be argued that Charles remained constrained in the scope of what he could achieve by the wishes of the essentially conservative Anglican political nation who held real power through parliamentary taxation.