

---

# AS-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS1D: Britain, 1603-1642

Mark scheme

---

1041

June 2015

---

Version 1: Final 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](http://aqa.org.uk)

---

## 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 students. 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 students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students 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. Students 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 students 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 student 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 students 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 students' 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*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student 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 student 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

June 2015

**GCE AS History Unit 1: Change and Consolidation**

**HIS1D: Britain, 1603–1642**

**Question 1**

- 01** Explain why Parliament did not support James I's proposed union with Scotland. **[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 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.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why Parliament did not support James I's proposed union with Scotland.

Students may refer to some of the following long-term or background factors:

- xenophobic views towards the Scots by MPs in the English Parliament
- differences in religion and law
- differences in the two kingdoms as to the role of parliament, the Scots Parliament being more under royal control than the English

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

- fear that James' Scots favourites, e.g. Carr, Hay, would dominate at Court
- disappearance of England into a Greater Britain
- English MP's feared that Scotland being a poorer country would be a financial burden and that its cheaper goods would hurt English business
- legal problems over naturalisation and joint citizenship
- James' willingness to act on Union by Royal Proclamation.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given; for example, they might bring out English fear that union under a Scottish king would mean Scottish favourites taking over the Court and controlling access to the king – and thus to office, lands and titles.

**Question 1**

- 02** How far was opposition to James I in Parliament in the years 1614 to 1625 due to disagreements over finance? **[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 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 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 that disagreements over finance played a major part in creating opposition in all three parliaments might include:

- disputes over the legality of impositions in the 1614 Parliament
- clashes over the number of monopolies and effects of the failed Cockayne Monopoly
- clashes over sale of titles and over-exploitation of feudal dues in the 1621 and 1624 parliaments
- disagreements over the financing of war in the 1624–1625 Parliament
- complaints about levels of royal spending and requests for subsidies.

Factors suggesting the role of other matters might include:

- factional rivalry in 1614 and 1621, e.g. Howards v Pembroke
- opposition to the influence of royal favourites such as Carr and Villiers in 1614, 1621 and 1624–1625
- constitutional issues concerning the royal prerogative and parliamentary privileges, e.g. in 1621 over whether the Commons could debate foreign policy uninvited, revival of impeachment and its use e. g. against Bacon and Cranfield
- foreign affairs especially in regard to proposed royal marriages and James' attitude to the Thirty Years War in Europe and especially to the Palatinate crisis
- religious tensions in the 1620s over sabbatarianism, declaration to preachers and how Puritans saw the European war.

Good answers are likely to/may show an awareness that disagreements over finance were a consistent causal factor throughout the period and often linked to other contentious issues such as foreign policy. However, good answers will also show awareness that there were significant non-financial causes of tension, especially in the 1621 Parliament and there was more co-operation between Court and Parliament in the 1624.Parliament.

**Question 2**

- 03** Explain why the visit of Prince Charles to Madrid in 1623 was unpopular in England. **[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 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.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the visit of Prince Charles to Madrid in 1623 was unpopular in England.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- disapproval in England of a marriage between Charles and the Spanish Infanta for both religious and political reasons
- historic and current reasons why Spain was seen as England's main enemy in Europe
- treatment of Charles in Madrid and rumours of pro-Catholic marriage terms
- suspicion of the motives of George Villiers (Buckingham) who accompanied Charles
- inherent dangers in the way the mission was carried out
- cost.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given; for example, they might link the reasons for fear of Spain in the country and dislike of Villiers in Parliament, or they might place opposition to this marriage in the general context of dismay at James I's foreign policy in the early 1620s.

**Question 2**

- 04** How far was the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament in the years 1625 to 1629 due to the Duke of Buckingham? **[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 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 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 that the Duke of Buckingham was the cause of the deterioration in relations between Crown and Parliament might include:

- envy amongst MPs of Buckingham's closeness to Charles I and his control of patronage
- distrust of Buckingham made Parliament reluctant to vote sufficient Supply, e.g. 1625
- blame for disasters in foreign policy, such as ineffective continental alliances, initial help to Louis XIII against the Huguenots and, by 1627, simultaneous wars with two large powers, Spain and France, who were enemies of each other
- military disasters at Cadiz and La Rochelle with the accompanying loss of money and life and damage to England's reputation, leading to attempted parliamentary impeachment
- his connections with Arminianism, e.g. York House Conference, which annoyed Puritan MPs
- even after his death, Buckingham helped cause worsening relations since Charles blamed opposition in Parliament for his murder.

Factors suggesting other reasons might include:

- an inefficient taxation system, and Crown debt inherited from James I, leaving Charles I desperate for money in the mid-1620s
- Parliament's refusal to recognise the real cost of warfare also led to inadequate Supply, so forcing Charles I into contentious fiscal policies, e.g. the Forced Loan, which gave rise to legal and constitutional conflict, e.g. Petition of Right / Three Resolutions
- Charles' refusal to dismiss Buckingham, together with his aloof manner and Arminian beliefs, turned many MPs against him
- Puritan dislike of his Church appointments, e.g. Laud, and fear of the influence of his French Catholic wife.

Good answers are likely to show an awareness that although Buckingham was the dominant political figure in 1625–1628 and therefore the obvious target for anti-Court criticism, relations continued to worsen after his death, suggesting that there were wider and deeper reasons for Crown – Parliament problems.

**Question 3**

**05** Explain why there was opposition to ship money during Charles I's personal rule.

**[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 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.**

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why there was opposition to ship money during Charles I's personal rule.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- levied when no parliament was meeting in England
- levied in a new way e.g. on inland as well as coastal shires
- levied continuously from 1634, even though there was no war
- based on a more efficient tax register so harder to evade
- hit property owners at all social levels
- led to a major test case (Hampden's) which revealed some division about its legality
- in 1639–1640 was followed by other taxes to pay for the Bishops' Wars.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given; for example, they might bring out that these taxes were seen as against custom and/or that by 1639 they were seen as paying for an unpopular war with the Scots. There was worry that ship money might prove a substitute for parliamentary subsidies so making the calling of future parliaments unnecessary. Some students might also challenge the unpopularity of ship money at least before 1639–1640 by pointing to the high yields of the tax. This latter point may be credited but should not be expected.

**Question 3**

**06** How far were divisions in the Long Parliament due to John Pym? **[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 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 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 that John Pym caused divisions in the Long Parliament might include:

- his attainder of Strafford, spring 1641, which first began to divide the House of Commons
- his Root and Branch Bill, summer 1641, which caused further divisions
- his exploitation of the Irish Rebellion in the autumn of 1641 created fear and distrust radicalising many MPs
- his Grand Remonstrance including its printing split the Commons down the middle and helped create a Royalist Party, so making civil war possible
- his manipulation of Charles I into attempting to arrest MPs sowed further distrust and forced Charles to leave London for York creating two rival centres of authority
- his Militia Ordinance seemed to many MPs revolutionary, undermining traditional government, strengthening Constitutional Royalism and allowing Charles a moral case for fighting radicals like Pym
- Pym's Nineteen Propositions were too extreme for the king and his supporters, further dividing Parliament and justifying force
- Pym's attempt to control the county militias, and the threat of sequestration, forced even reluctant MPs and gentry to take sides.

Factors suggesting that Pym could sometime act as a unifying force:

- Pym kept the Long Parliament united in its first session by focussing on removing the machinery of the Personal Rule
- Pym tried to delay religious divisions e.g. putting the Root and Branch Petition into committee
- Ten Propositions might have been a basis for compromise acceptable to both King and Parliament.

Factors suggesting other reasons for which Pym was not responsible might include:

- Irish Rebellion of 1641 which raised tension and fear at Westminster
- Charles I's actions such as the Army Plot, the Incident in 1641, and the attempted arrest of five MPs in January 1642, frightened radical MPs into more extreme demands which divided Parliament
- Charles' attempt to seize the arsenal at Hull in spring 1642 and sending of Henrietta Maria to France to raise money and arms led, for example, to the divisive Nineteen Propositions
- Charles' flight to York in 1642 created a rival centre of authority to Westminster and divided MPs loyalties
- Charles' issuing of Commissions of Array forced MPs to take sides
- Puritan propaganda intensified fears of a Catholic plot and made compromise harder.

Good answers are likely show an awareness that without Parliament dividing there could not have been a civil war in England and that both Pym and Charles contributed to this division by their actions. Good answers will be aware that Parliament was generally united in early 1641, ensuring that the Personal Rule could not return, but that it became increasingly divided in late 1641/early 1642. This division was due to many factors such as religion and constitutional issues but it was also about distrust, not just of Charles I but also of the radicalism of 'King Pym'.

**Converting marks into UMS marks**

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

**UMS conversion calculator:** [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)