



HISTORY

9769/55

Paper 5e Special Subject: The Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649

May/June 2016

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Special Subject: Source-based Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

- (a) This question is designed 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.
- (b) Examiners will 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.
- (c) 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (d) In marking an answer examiners will 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 demonstrated.

Question (a)

Band 3: 8–10 marks

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 marks

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the focus 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.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Band 1: 1–3 marks

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.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Question (b)

Band 4: 16–20 marks

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 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.

Band 3: 11–15 marks

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 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.

Band 2: 6–10 marks

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 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.

Band 1: 1–5 marks

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 be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Special Subject: Essay Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question. Information about AOs can be found in the 2016–18 Cambridge Pre-U History syllabus.

Introduction

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

Examiners will 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 will be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit will be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners will use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It goes without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners will also bear in mind 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 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 4 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 will be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners will 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 demonstrated.

Band 5: 25–30 marks

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.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to 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 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Band 4: 19–24 marks

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.

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 marks

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

Band 2: 7–12 marks

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 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.

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

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Band 1: 1–6 marks

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; the answer is likely to include unsupported generalisations, and there will be some vagueness and irrelevance. 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 are not to be expected. The answer may be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Band 0: 0 marks

No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Section A

- 1 (a) **How far does Document C corroborate the views expressed by Charles I in Document A about his relationship with the people of London?** [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 the relationship is one of mutual respect and trust.

Both are optimistic about the future peace and prosperity of the city.

Both express support for the Protestant faith.

Charles says disorders have arisen from the meaner sort of people and the apprentices who are challenging him in some ways are from that class.

Charles says he will follow the rule of law as the city wants and C agrees the advice of Parliament to be followed.

Differences

In A, Charles is ready to show Londoners his love and affection, but in C, though respectful, they are challenging his methods of government.

In A, Charles stresses his loyalty to Protestantism, but in C, there is clearly some doubt expressed about how firm his defence is and the continuing good relationship depends on accession to the requests of the apprentices.

Provenance

In A, Charles has just returned from Scotland. He paid a brief visit there after the execution of Strafford. He has been welcomed into London and clearly feels that he has support there again and blames the mob for Strafford's death. C makes it clear that the feeling among the lower classes is that there is still much that needs to be done before peace and prosperity can return. But they do not rule out a happy conclusion. Thus both contain some optimism and both also have hints that things could go wrong. Given the final outcome, C seems to be a better assessment of the relationship.

- (b) **How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that, by early 1642, England was deeply divided? In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).** [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 different historical interpretations is to be expected.

AO2 – Document A gives the best impression of unity but both C and D suggest some degree of unity. Documents B and E make it clear how there was religious tension. Documents C and D partly support this. Document D adds the issue of the attempted arrest of the five MPs and Document E refers to the malign influence of Henrietta Maria.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Document A suggests that Charles has settled outstanding issues and he asserts he will rule according to law and safeguard the Protestant faith, the two matters about which there was most concern, so his assessment is an accurate one. Document D agrees that there was general rejoicing at this point and Document C expects outstanding matters to be settled and the city to return to making money.

But Document B suggests there are divisions, although they do not blame Charles. The Jesuits and Papists have been stirring up trouble and penetrated to the Privy Council and even to the royal household. The influence on the children, the next generation of the ruling family, is seen as especially threatening. Document C reiterates the hostility to the Jesuits and adds the bishops. Document D takes up this point and shows popular hostility to the bishops. Document D shows the impact of the attempted arrest of the five MPs. Document E also partly excuses Charles who has come under the influence of the distaff, but goes further than the other documents in asserting a plot to reconcile England with Rome, only thwarted by divine mercy. Document E stresses the divisions between the Papists and their allies and the 'godly'.

The provenance of the documents affects their reliability. In A, Charles' stress on reconciliation is borne out by D and by events. After the legislation of 1641 and the execution of Strafford, there were good grounds for expecting there could be a settlement. But the religious question needed solving and all the other documents have their own view on this. The House of Commons, the Apprentices and Lucy Hutchinson all believed there was a Popish plot and the Irish Rebellion seemed to support this belief. Hence they are reliable as evidence for views at the time, if less reliable about the religious threat. Laud in Document D sees how unpopular the bishops were and quite accurately reflects events. He was virtually under house arrest and could only be an onlooker.

Candidates could argue that there was division where there had been unity and that the Grand Remonstrance polarised it, allowing a Royalist party, which had not previously existed, to emerge. They can discuss how great the division really was.

AO4 – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of 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.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

Section B

2 How great, in the period 1629–1640, was the opposition to Charles I's Personal Rule? [30]

AO1 – The question is concerned with the extent to which the Personal Rule was unpopular and candidates are expected to reach a conclusion. They could refer to the ending of the wars, the general level of prosperity and the lack of a Parliament to express opposition. They could also suggest that the Puritans continued to meet together and opposition festered, and refer to Prynne, Bastwick and Burton and the resistance to ship money after 1637 and Hampden's Case.

AO2 – Evidence that the country was well governed during this period could be used to show there was little opposition. In the north, Wentworth took on the powerful flouters of the law. Some agreed with Laud that there should be more reverence in church. There were no continental adventures to waste money and men. Books of Orders were used to encourage care for the poor in the localities. Taxes, even those lacking Parliamentary sanction, were mostly paid up to 1637.

Alternatively, the Puritan groups made the most of opportunities like the meetings of the Providence Island Company and so were in contact with one another which ensured their opposition did not die down. They also feared that if the government continued to be able to manage without Parliamentary supplies, then Parliament might never meet again and this stirred up opposition. Once ship money was extended inland, Hampden challenged the latter and nearly won his case. The punishments of Prynne, Bastwick and Burton could be mentioned as causing opposition as their status as gentlemen was impinged, apart from their religious views being supported by some. The outbreak of the Bishops' Wars allowed the different groups opposing the King's rule to coalesce, but had they not occurred, the outcome could have been very different.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

- 3 'The failure of the Royalists to win in 1643 ensured their defeat in the First Civil War.'
Do you agree? [30]

AO1 – The question is concerned with the reasons for the Royalist defeat. It implies that their best chances of winning were in 1643 and that after that they were likely to be defeated. Candidates could discuss why the Royalists were unable to capture London in 1643 and why possession of the capital was so vital. The ways in which the Parliamentarians improved their army and their management of the war after 1643 also contributed. Circumstantial explanations arise from the nature of the resources available to each party.

AO2 – The factor given in the question needs to be considered. The Royalists had a good chance of success in 1643 with their three-fold advance on London. The city was important as the seat of government and as a port and centre of finance and administration. Taxation was levied on trade through the city. The King had left somewhat ignominiously in 1642 and needed to win his capital back. The advance petered out when Charles delayed at Gloucester and Newcastle and Hull, both being reluctant to advance and leave enemy strongholds in their rear.

The Royalists were not well prepared for a lengthy conflict as their resources in land, plate and money tended to be finite, while Parliament could levy taxation and fine Royalists. The south and east, held by Parliament, were the more prosperous parts of the country. But even more troublesome to the Royalists were the emergence of Oliver Cromwell as a very determined leader and the subsequent formation of the New Model Army. The Self-Denying Ordinance removed the less committed Parliamentarian generals. The alliance made with the Scots, part of the diplomacy of John Pym, was another contributor. The Royalists had some assets and many loyal supporters, but they did not have as good a chance of success again as they had in 1643. The defeats at Marston Moor and Naseby made their defeat complete.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9769	55

4 Was Parliament or the Army more to blame for the tensions between them in 1647–1648?
[30]

AO1 – The question is concerned with the reasons for the breakdown in the unity of the Parliamentarians in 1648–1649. Factors could include the frustration felt by the Army at the slow pace of negotiations, the growth of Radicalism in the Army and the innate conservatism of MPs.

AO2 – The Army had possession of the King’s person which strengthened their hand and hardened their position. Their demands were embodied in a series of suggestions such as the Heads of the Proposals, The Case of the Army Truly Stated and the Agreement of the People. When Parliament seemed to be moving to a more moderate settlement, the Army occupied London. Here they held the Putney Debates, which showed how radical the rank and file had become. But the opposition of the grandees to such views limited the impact of the Army.

Parliament had aroused suspicion from the Army by their reluctance to meet the back pay it was owed and only offering 6 weeks’ pay and insisting on the reduction of the Army to 6000 men. This was the background reason for the intransigence of the Army. The Presbyterians in Parliament were intent on a religious settlement which would favour them and outlaw the Independents.

The situation was complicated by the double-dealing of Charles I. The outbreak of the Second Civil War led to a brief rapprochement between Parliament and Army. Charles’ defeat opened up the breach again. Parliament wanted a settlement to maintain the monarchy and prohibit religious toleration, while the Army insisted on bringing the ‘man of blood’ to trial. Pride’s Purge ensured the Army would triumph.