

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9769 HISTORY

9769/55

Paper 5e (Special Subject: The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result, not all answers fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Question 1 (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

Question 1 (b)

Band 1: 16–20

The answer will treat the documents as a set and will make very effective use of each although, depending upon the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It will be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material will be handled confidently with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge will be demonstrated. The material deployed will be strong in both range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument will be well structured. Historical concepts and vocabulary will be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected. English will be fluent, clear and virtually error-free.

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the band. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected or, especially at the lower end of the band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear, there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated, but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a ‘best-fit’ approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

1 (a) **How far are the views expressed in Document A about the quality of Prince Rupert's generalship corroborated by Document D?** [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use, not only of the text but of headings and attributions.

Similarities – Both agree that Rupert led the cavalry in a charge which was initially successful. Both agree that Rupert pursued the charge further than was wise, eagerly in **A** and almost to Naseby town in **D**. Both agree that the outcome was quite chaotic, scattered in **A** and retreat in great haste in **D**.

Differences – **A** argues that Edgehill was a missed opportunity as victory there could have been decisive in the war and blames Rupert, while **D** implies Rupert was a skilled and brave general. **A** suggests that nightfall was a contributor to the outcome at Edgehill, after Rupert's rashness, while **D** indicates that the royal army was beaten in the fighting at Naseby in part while Rupert was elsewhere.

Provenance – **A** comes from a cavalryman on the Royalist side, although not directly under Rupert, who is surprisingly critical of Rupert for not being content with capturing cannon, and suggests that he was responsible for the loss of the war. **D** is from the opposition but has a similar tale to tell. **D** seems to admire Rupert more, for his initial success and for trying to rescue the situation. **D** might be better evidence as it would be expected to be a hostile view and **A** may reflect some of the divisions and jealousies in the royal armies.

1 (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that disunity, rather than purely military factors, contributed more to the outcome of the First Civil War?** [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

The view that disunity was a factor is found in Documents **A**, **C** and **E**, while Documents **B** and **D** highlight military factors and the other documents have some references to them.

Document **A** suggests that Rupert was a good leader of cavalry but became carried away and advanced rashly, throwing away opportunities. There is evidence of confusion on the Royalist side, and that the writer was critical of Rupert's rashness and failure to maintain the advantage he had gained. He asserts that the war could have been won had things been different.

Document **C** suggests that Manchester was not a strong leader and was not prepared to push for a final victory, making him ineffective in the eyes of Cromwell, and unready to listen

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

to advice he did not want to hear. He seemed to be reluctant to fight. But candidates may suggest that Cromwell was following his own agenda in these criticisms. Cromwell thus, by contrast, emerges as an effective leader desperate to prosecute the war with vigour. This disunity was a factor in Cromwell's eyes in delaying victory.

Document **E** reveals the tensions on the Royalist side and the attitude of Charles himself to his nephew after the surrender of Bristol. With this kind of disunity at the top, it is not surprising that the Royalists were defeated.

Document **B** indicates that the outcome was decided by military factors with the defeat of the Royalists at Marston Moor as a result of Cromwell's intervention.

Document **D** supports this view and shows how Rupert was defeated because of the success of the Roundhead cavalry. This is a Roundhead version, like **B**, but both outline the events of the battles accurately enough.

Documents **A** and **E** also refer to military factors at Edgehill and the surrender of Bristol.

Candidates may refer to other military factors such as the building of the New Model Army by Cromwell and its success at Naseby, or the lost chances from the Royalists in the failure of Charles to advance on London in 1643. Disunity could be seen as a contributor to Royalist defeat, and also to the delayed Roundhead victory for the reasons explained in Document **C**, but military factors are likely to be seen as decisive.

2 How far was the opposition to Charles I's personal rule up to 1640 caused by religious factors?

[30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected. It is the quality of the argument and the evaluation that should be rewarded. Candidates could refer to the reforms of William Laud, fears of Catholicism, the actions taken against Puritans and the Bishops' Wars. Other causes of opposition such as taxation and the disregard of Parliament could be discussed.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates are likely to argue that religious factors were dominant. There was strong opposition to Laud's efforts to instil respect for the clergy and reverence in church buildings, both of which seemed to be versions of Catholicism. The influence of the Queen and her circle was resented and it was feared she planned to convert the King. Bishops were opposed when given secular roles. The power of the Court of High Commission and the prosecution of educated gentlemen like Prynne, Bastwick and Burton were further causes of outrage. Charles' foreign policy was perceived as being pro-Catholic. The attempt to introduce the Prayer Book into Scotland was so strongly opposed that it segued into the series of events leading to the outbreak of war.

Alternatively, the so-called illegal taxes levied by Charles' administration were deeply opposed, especially because if they succeeded there would be no need to call another Parliament. Charles'

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

definition of the divine right of kings implied that he alone was the judge of necessity in the raising of taxes. The role of Strafford in the North and in Ireland was similarly resented because of his success and what it implied. A man who could bring these unruly areas under his control was truly to be feared.

Candidates could point out that for the opposition there was no clear distinction between religious and secular grievances.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

3 How important was the Irish Rebellion in the coming of the First Civil War? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates could refer to the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion and its impact on events in England, to the equivocal responses of Charles I to Parliamentary proposals, to the role of Pym and the London mob, and to the attack on the Church and royal powers which caused a Royalist reaction and the formation of a Royalist party.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that the Irish Rebellion was important in laying bare the tensions between Charles and Parliament in that it opened up the issues of control of the army and the supposed Catholic conspiracy.

The leadership of Pym, who became the key figure after the death of Bedford, was another factor as he became increasingly convinced that Charles was untrustworthy and needed to be restrained by Parliamentary measures. He kept alive rumours of a Catholic plot and used the London mob to back up his demands.

This, in turn, led to the formation of a Royalist party from those alarmed at the execution of Strafford and concerned that Pym would demolish the Church entirely and so emasculate royal powers as to do almost the same to the crown.

Charles I also contributed to the situation as his inconsistency and obstinacy, often at the behest of his wife, made any negotiated settlement problematic.

Events such as the Grand Remonstrance and the Nineteen Propositions and the Militia Ordinance, which all underlined the fears of the Royalists and the attempted arrest of the five

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

MPs, which seemed to justify Pym's allegations, brought the war closer and positions on both sides became entrenched.

Candidates may conclude that the Irish Rebellion had an enabling role to play but that the personalities and the sweep of events were more vital.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

4 What best explains the Royalist defeat in the Second Civil War? [30]

Candidates should:

AO1 – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. Candidates may refer to the actions of Charles I after his escape from custody and the results of his alliance with the Scots, the lack of unity in the Royalist risings and the defeat of the Scots at Preston by Cromwell. The crisis temporarily halted the divisions developing in the Roundhead army.

AO2 – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations, which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative factors and approaches and arriving at a well considered judgement. Attempts to deal with historiography and differing historical interpretations may well enhance answers, but are not required.

Candidates may argue that Charles was much to blame. His policy was misguided after he regained his freedom and he misjudged the prevalent feelings in the country. His engagement with the Scots and his encouragement of risings in England showed he was waging war on his own subjects and led to the suspension of all negotiations. Both Parliament and the army were horrified and their earlier divisions were overcome in their determination to defeat the aggressive monarch. After the failure of his campaign, Charles fled to the Isle of Wight where he was captured, although this was less of a factor for which he could be blamed.

In addition, there was little appetite for a renewal of war. Local risings petered out and were often more about local than national issues. The army was powerful and well led by Cromwell at Preston. Even where there was considerable fighting in England, as at Colchester, the army was able to deal with the opposition. Cromwell had rooted out mutinous movements and Leveller agitation at Burford and Corkbush Field.

Candidates might conclude that Charles provoked the war, when he lacked the forces to prosecute it and his actions enraged Parliament and others so he had little hope of a successful outcome. Cromwell was a determined and talented adversary.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	55

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense of both organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not be explicitly penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.