



GCE MARK SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

HISTORY - UNIT 2  
DEPTH STUDY 2: ROYALTY, REBELLION AND  
REPUBLIC, c.1625–1660

PART 1: THE PRESSURE ON THE MONARCHY AND  
THE DRIFT TO CIVIL WAR, c.1625–1642

2100U20-1

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at the examiners' conference by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

## UNIT 2

### DEPTH STUDY 2

#### ROYALTY, REBELLION AND REPUBLIC C. 1625–1660

##### Part 1: The pressure on the monarchy and the drift to civil war c.1625–1642

### MARK SCHEME

#### Marking guidance for examiners for Question 1

#### Summary of assessment objectives for Question 1

Question 1 assesses assessment objective 2. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate contemporary source material in its historical context. The mark awarded to Question 1 is 30.

#### The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Question 1 has two parts:

- Advice on the specific question outlining indicative content that can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors must credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- An assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.

#### Deciding on the mark awarded within a band

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Third, a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

## INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 1

*NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors must credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.*

**With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the challenges facing the king in the period from 1626 to 1637.**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the nominated sources. To judge utility, there should be consideration of the content and the authorship of the nominated sources to discuss reliability, bias, purpose and validity, as appropriate.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the challenges facing the king in the period from 1626 to 1637. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include:

**Source A** The general context associated with this source is the criticism of royal favourites. It shows that Eliot had written to a fellow critic of Buckingham, which underlines the challenges facing the Crown from disgruntled MPs. Eliot was a fierce critic of Buckingham, whom he blamed for the failure of English foreign policy, particularly the failed military campaigns against Spain. The source shows that Eliot believed that King Charles had been misled by Buckingham—a man lacking political skill and experience. In the source, Eliot is critical of the king for relying on a man who is suspected of Roman Catholic sympathies. Buckingham is a hated favourite whom the king should dismiss from the government. There is also a snide remark about Buckingham's alleged close relationship with Charles's French consort, Henrietta Maria, who was hated as much as Buckingham. It is apparent from the source that there was a toxic relationship between the Crown, royal favourites and Parliament in the mid-1620s.

**Source B** The general context of the source is the dispute over ship money. In the source, Wogan is expressing his frustration at the Crown's demands for the payment of ship money, including the sum that has been lost through no fault of the taxpayers of Pembrokeshire. Wogan informs the Privy Council of the hostility to the tax and the likelihood of armed insurrection if the king persists in his demand for its collection. Wogan takes the opportunity to link hostility toward ship money to more of the king's hated royal prerogatives: the hatred of one has led to the demand for the abolition of the others. The specific historical context surrounding ship money and opposition to its collection is significant as it was a serious challenge to the authority of the Crown. The king needed to heed this opposition if he wished to avoid conflict. The source clearly highlights the challenges facing the Crown in the mid-1630s.

**Source C** The general context is the worsening situation in Scotland. The report highlights the challenges that faced the king in managing Scotland and the impact of those challenges on royal authority north of the border. Balcanquhall

was a cleric and the king's commissioner in Scotland. He was a loyalist and was one of those entrusted with the task of implementing the religious changes in Scotland. The imposition of Laud's Prayer Book angered the Scots who resented the imposition of English religious reforms. The source highlights the scale of the anger, which soon turned to violence. The specific historical context is the anti-royalist movement, which culminated in the Bishops' Wars of the early 1640s. The report was likely commissioned when the king launched an inquiry into the cause of the Scottish rebellion. The author was an eyewitness to the events and recorded most of his observations soon afterwards.

Overall, candidates will assess the value of the sources to an historian studying the challenges facing the king in the period from 1626 to 1637. They will be able to demonstrate that value through consideration of the content, provenance and tone of the presented sources with appropriate reference to the historical context linked to the sources.

**UNIT 2**  
**MARK SCHEME QUESTION 1**

In general terms the responses will display characteristics of one of the six bands shown below.

The table below gives advice on which band, sub-band and marks should be awarded to answers showing the appropriate characteristics.

<b>Band 6 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the given sources; full understanding shown of the specific historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a full and substantiated judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying the development of a particular issue over the period set.</i>
<b>ASE OVER THE PERIOD SET</b>		
<b>B6S</b>	<b>30</b>	The candidate provides accurate and sustained source evaluation using the content and attributions of each of the three sources, setting the response in the specific historical context and covering all of the period set in the enquiry. There is a substantiated judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying the development of a particular issue over the period set.
<b>B6C</b>	<b>27</b>	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 6

<b>Band 5 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Meaningful analysis and evaluation of the given sources involving valid evaluation of the content and attribution of the sources; understanding shown of the specific historical context associated with the set enquiry; reaches a valid judgement regarding the value of the sources to an historian studying a particular issue.</i>
<b>ASE</b>		
<b>B5S</b>	<b>25</b>	The candidate provides accurate source evaluation using the content and attributions of the three sources, setting the response in the specific historical context and covering most of the period set in the enquiry. There is a valid and supported judgement on the value of all three sources to an historian studying a particular issue.
<b>B5C</b>	<b>23</b>	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 5.
<b>B5L</b>	<b>21</b>	This mark can be used if there is understanding shown of the specific historical context of one source only.

<b>Band 4 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Clearly attempts an analysis and evaluation of the given sources in relation to the general historical context of the set enquiry with some evaluation of the content and attribution; a sound judgement is seen regarding the value to an historian of some or all three sources.</i>	
<b>GCX, V and/or U</b>			
<b>B4H</b>	<b>20</b>		The candidate is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and especially the general historical context. This is used to reach a reasoned judgement on value to an historian of all three sources. Occasional references to utility are acceptable.
<b>B4S</b>	<b>18</b>		The candidate is able to discuss the strengths and limitations of the three sources by focusing on their attributions, content and the general historical context. A judgement on value to an historian is present on some or all of the three sources although some general comments on utility may be seen.
<b>B4C</b>	<b>16</b>	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 4 with the candidate discussing the general historical context. Mainly focused on UTILITY but with a limited reference to value.	

<b>Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content and attributions of the given sources to evaluate their utility and / or value; a limited judgement on the utility and / or value of the sources will be seen. Limited understanding of the historical context.</i>	
<b>Mechanistic V, S&amp;L and U</b>			
<b>B3H</b>	<b>15</b>		The candidate is able to evaluate the three sources by focusing on their attributions and content. Any reference to the historical context will be limited. There is a mechanistic focus on evaluating the UTILITY and / or the VALUE of some or all of the sources. There is a limited judgement on all of the sources.
<b>B3S</b>	<b>13</b>		The candidate is able to evaluate some or all of the three sources by focusing on their attributions and / or content. Any reference to the historical context will be limited. There will be a limited judgement on some of the sources.
<b>B3C</b>	<b>11</b>	The response begins to show some characteristics of Band 3. This can also be used if only one source is attempted.	

<b>Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content and / or attributions of the given sources to show their strengths and / or limitations.</i>
<b>TRAWL</b>		
<b>B2H</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>B2S</b>	<b>6</b>	The candidate discusses the strengths and/or limitations of some of the three sources by focusing mostly on their content.

<b>Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Copies or paraphrases from content or attributions of the given sources.</i>
<b>COPYING / COMPREHENSION</b>		
<b>B1H</b>	<b>5</b>	The candidate paraphrases the three sources and/or attributions or offers plain narrative.
<b>B1S</b>	<b>3</b>	The candidate copies from one or two of the three sources and/or attributions.
	<b>0</b>	Use for incorrect answers



## **Marking guidance for examiners for Question 2**

### **Summary of assessment objectives for Question 2**

Question 2 assesses assessment objective 3. This assessment objective is a single element focused on the ability to analyse and evaluate how and why different historical interpretations have been made. The mark awarded to Question 2 is 30.

### **The structure of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme for Question 2 has two parts:

- Advice on the specific question outlining indicative content that can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors must credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- An assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 3.

### **Deciding on the mark awarded within a band**

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Third, a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

## INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 2

*NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors must credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.*

### **How valid is the view that Charles I's decision to recall Parliament in 1640 was motivated mainly by events in Scotland?**

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Candidates will consider the provided material and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view that Charles I's decision to recall Parliament in 1640 was motivated mainly by events in Scotland.

Candidates are invited to enter into a debate about whether it is fair to say that Charles I's decision to recall Parliament in 1640 was motivated mainly by events in Scotland. They will consider interpretations of this issue within the wider historical debate about the reasons why Parliament was recalled. Some of the issues to consider may include:

**Interpretation 1** This argues that Charles's decision to recall Parliament was largely motivated by events in Scotland. In analysing and evaluating this interpretation, candidates may argue that, given his status as a professional historian who specialised in Scottish political history, Stevenson's opinion of Charles's motives for recalling Parliament is valid. He exudes a degree of confidence in his assertion that Charles I was mainly responsible for the recall of Parliament, albeit as a panic measure because of the violence of the developments in Scotland. The evidence suggests that after years of increasingly arbitrary rule Charles arrogantly believed that he could do as he wished. It is possible that the reason why Charles was panicked into recalling the hated Parliament was because he was taken by surprise by the scale of the anger against his religious policies. Charles needed to raise money to fund an army to confront the Scots: Parliament alone had the funds necessary to do this.

**Interpretation 2** This argues that Charles was not responsible for the recall of Parliament and it was certainly not linked to events in Scotland. In analysing and evaluating this interpretation candidates may argue that Charles was not responsible for recalling Parliament—although it may have been recalled in his name and sanctioned by the power of the Crown—and that the real culprits were his advisers, Laud and Wentworth. This interpretation suggests that the reason why Parliament was recalled was due to events in Ireland. The fact that Parliament was recalled in 1640 before the Irish rebellion in 1641 suggests that the author may be incorrect. However, the extract does focus on the potential for rebellion, which is valid given the rising tension in Ireland since the later 1630s. It should be noted that Perceval-Maxwell is a specialist in Irish political history and is not specifically focused on the political history of seventeenth-century Scotland. Some candidates may suggest that Perceval-Maxwell's opinion is less convincing than that offered by Stevenson.

Candidates may show awareness of the wider historical debate surrounding this issue, such as the nature of the events leading up to the recall of Parliament. The two interpretations represent varying views from national perspectives, but candidates should be aware of other interpretations such as that suggesting that the king's advisers were partially, if not fully, responsible for the pressure to recall Parliament. Indeed, it may be argued that the real reason for Parliament's recall was financial: the king had run out of money and was unable to govern the kingdom effectively. The violent developments in Ireland and Scotland gave him the excuse he needed to persuade Parliament to be compliant in the face of a common enemy.

Overall candidates will analyse both interpretations using their own understanding of the wider historical debate over this issue, offer an evaluation of the validity of the given interpretations and provide a judgement on the issue in the question of whether or not Charles I's primary motivation for recalling Parliament in 1640 was due to events in Scotland.

## UNIT 2 MARK SCHEME QUESTION 2

In general terms the responses will display characteristics of one of the six bands shown below.

The table below gives advice on which band, sub-band and marks should be given to certain types of answer. The published mark scheme for Unit 2 question 2 also gives a similar breakdown and descriptors.

<b>Band 6 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the provided material in its historical context which is used effectively to show how and why different interpretations have been formed in relation to the set enquiry; sustained judgement seen regarding validity.</i>
<b>ACX, WHD, OPI</b>		
B6H	30	The candidate fully integrates discussion of the context, authorship and content of the provided material together with knowledge and understanding of other possible interpretations of the set issue to reach a well-supported and convincing judgement. The candidate shows a convincing understanding of the wider historical debate and of why different interpretations have been formed with discussion of the context and authorship of the provided material.
B6S	27	The candidate discusses the context, authorship and content, of the provided material together with knowledge and understanding of other possible interpretations to offer a substantiated judgement. The candidate explains why differing/different interpretations of the issue have been formed.
<b>Band 5 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Meaningful analysis and evaluation of the provided material in its historical context to show how and why different interpretations have been formed in relation to the set enquiry; clear judgement seen regarding validity.</i>
<b>ACX, WHD, OPI</b>		
B5H	25	The candidate discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a clear judgement on the validity of the given interpretation; they show a clear understanding of other possible interpretations of the issue. The candidate shows a firm grasp of the wider historical debate regarding the issue.
B5S	23	The candidate discusses the content and authorship of both extracts to offer a clear judgement on the validity of the given interpretation; they show clear understanding of other possible interpretations. The candidate indicates how and why interpretations are formed based on the content and especially the authorship of the extracts.

<b>Band 4 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Some valid analysis and evaluation of the provided material with some knowledge of other possible interpretations to reach a judgement on the specific enquiry; needs a reasonable grasp of the other possible interpretations (OPIs) and the context of the developments in the provided material. There may be some mechanistic comments on the authorship but this is not required.</i>
<b>ACX AND GCX OPI</b>		
B4H	20	
B4S	18	
B4C	16	The candidate begins to analyse and evaluate the provided material to offer a judgement on the given interpretation; they show awareness of another possible interpretation.

<b>Band 3 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic focus on the authorship and content of the provided material to identify and compare interpretations; some awareness of the general context; any judgement will be limited. There may be some mechanistic comments on the authorship of the provided material.</i>
<b>AUTH GCX</b>		
B3H	15	
B3S	13	The candidate attempts to consider the content of the provided material to identify different interpretations; they offer a 'bolt-on' judgement on the validity of the interpretation presented in the question.

<b>Band 2 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Mechanistic and formulaic use of the content of the provided material only.</i>
B2H	8	
B2S	6	

<b>Band 1 CHARACTERISTICS</b>		<i>Copies or paraphrases from the content of the provided material.</i>
B1H	5	The candidate offers basic comprehension and paraphrasing of the content of the provided materials.
B1S	3	The candidate offers basic comprehension or copying from the content of one of the provided materials.
	0	Use for incorrect answers