



---

# **GCE AS MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2022**

**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 2022 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences 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.

## **Marking guidance for examiners**

### **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:

- An assessment grid advising the bands and marks that should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.
- Advice on the specific question that outlines indicative content which may 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.

#### **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 band are displayed. Thirdly, a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

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

Question 2 assesses assessment objective 3. This assessment objective is a single element focussed 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:

- An assessment grid advising the bands and marks that should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2
- Advice on the specific question outlining indicative content which 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 should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.

#### **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. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

**AO2:** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

		<b>Value of the sources</b>	<b>Analysis and evaluation of the sources in their historical context</b>	<b>Focus on the question set</b>
<b>Band 6</b>	<b>26–30 marks</b>	The learner shows clear understanding of the strengths and limitations of the sources.	The sources are clearly analysed and evaluated in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner will make a sustained and developed attempt to utilise the sources to directly answer the question set.
<b>Band 5</b>	<b>21–25 marks</b>	The learner considers the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources appropriately to support the judgement reached about the question set.
<b>Band 4</b>	<b>16–20 marks</b>	The learner develops a response which begins to discuss the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources with an awareness of the wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources to support the judgement reached about the question set.
<b>Band 3</b>	<b>11–15 marks</b>	The learner uses most of the source material to develop a response.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources.	The learner begins to discuss the sources' use in the context of the question set.
<b>Band 2</b>	<b>6–10 marks</b>	The learner uses some of the source material to develop a response.	The learner begins to analyse and evaluate the sources but it is largely mechanical.	The learner attempts to comment on the sources' use but lacks context.
<b>Band 1</b>	<b>1–5 marks</b>	There is limited evidence of the use of the sources.	Sources are used for their content only.	
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.				

**Using your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the impact of Personal Rule in the period from 1637 to 1641.**

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the impact of Personal Rule in the period from 1637 to 1641. 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 the following.

**Source A** The general context of the source is a courtier's response to Personal Rule while the specific context is the limited impact made by personal rule. It is a private letter written by a courtier to the English ambassador to France. Burgh is among the lesser known and least important of the courtiers but he is ambitious and is well connected as his letter to a member of the aristocracy shows. Burgh may be Scudamore's eyes and ears at Court. As a courtier, it is expected that he is a supporter of the king, which may make the source biased. He is clearly of the opinion that all is well, the people are content with the king's personal rule and there is general acceptance of the tax known as Ship Money. The Personal Rule appears to have made little if any impact.

**Source B** The general context of the source is an MP's response to Personal Rule while the specific context is the significant impact made by Personal Rule. It is a speech delivered in the Commons by a disgruntled MP concerned with religious and financial grievances. The fact that the author of the source is a member of the newly returned Parliament, the first for eleven years, suggests that he may be among those MPs whose criticism of the king led to its swift closure. The Short Parliament marked the end of the Personal Rule of which the author of the source is especially critical. This implies he is critical of the king. In his—likely biased—opinion, the Personal Rule had negatively affected religious and financial affairs. However, the tone suggests he is trying to steer a middle path, neither too critical nor too supportive.

**Source C** The general context of the source is the Commons' response to Personal Rule while the specific context is the impact made by Personal Rule. An extract from the Grand Remonstrance, a written report on the king's rule thus far accompanied by a list of grievances presented in parliament by the king's arch-critic John Pym, the source is scathing in its assessment of the impact of the Personal Rule, but is careful not to criticize the king directly. Pym was in no doubt that the king was at fault for the problems facing the kingdom, but he is representing the views of the majority of MPs who would prefer to blame royal advisers for the failures in government. It is a last-ditch attempt to bring the king to the negotiating table in respect of MPs' rights and privileges and the conduct of government.

**AO3:** Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

		<b>Focus on the question set</b>	<b>Analysis of the interpretation</b>
<b>Band 6</b>	<b>26–30 marks</b>	The learner discusses clearly the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner considers the validity of the interpretations in the development of the historiographical context. They demonstrate an understanding of how and why this issue has been interpreted in different ways. They discuss <b>why</b> a particular historian or school of history would form an interpretation based on the evidence available to the historian.
<b>Band 5</b>	<b>21–25 marks</b>	The learner discusses the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner discusses the work of different historians and/or schools of history to show an understanding of the development of the historical debate. The learner analyses and explains the key issues in the question set when considering the interpretation in the question.
<b>Band 4</b>	<b>16–20 marks</b>	The learner discusses the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is some attempt to explain <b>why</b> different interpretations have been formed. The learner considers a counterargument to that presented in the question.
<b>Band 3</b>	<b>11–15 marks</b>	The learner attempts to discuss the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is a limited attempt to explain <b>why</b> different interpretations have been formed.
<b>Band 2</b>	<b>6–10 marks</b>	The learner is able to show understanding of the question set. There is an attempt to reach a judgement but it is not firmly supported or balanced.	The learner's discussion of the interpretation is valid, with reference to alternate interpretations.
<b>Band 1</b>	<b>1–5 marks</b>	Any judgement reached is limited and unsupported.	The learner attempts to discuss the interpretation by tending to agree or disagree with it.
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.			

**How valid is the view that the King was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1642?**

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 the king was mainly responsible for the outbreak of war in 1642. Some of the issues to consider may include the following.

**Interpretation 1**

This argues that the king was not responsible for the outbreak of war in 1642. In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 1, candidates may argue that the king was not responsible for the war. The extract believes that extreme elements in Parliament were responsible for the conflict. The main driving force was religion and the belief that the king was a catholic sympathiser, a puppet in the hands of his wife. Referring to him as the antichrist is evidence of their extreme views. Although the strict religious Puritan element did not command a majority in parliament they did wield considerable influence. For them, war against the king was justified, it was a holy crusade and right was on their side.

**Interpretation 2**

This argues that the king was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1642. In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 2, candidates may argue that, given Coward's rational explanation, it is clear that the king was responsible for the war. He exudes a degree of confidence in his assertion that Charles I was mainly responsible for the conflict because of this track record of guile and deceit. The king could not be trusted to keep his word. His attitude to, and treatment of, Parliament and its MPs was aggressive and pushed them into opposition. The king had none to blame but himself. The evidence suggests that after years of increasingly arbitrary rule Charles arrogantly believed that he could do as he wished.

**Wider debate**

Candidates may show awareness of the Marxist interpretation of history regarding this issue. Marxists believe that the war was inevitable because of the social and economic tension that boiled to the surface to cause the conflict between the lower and upper classes.