



Cambridge Pre-U

HISTORY

9769/55

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

For examination from 2022

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Specimen

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **8** pages. Blank pages are indicated.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Introduction

This assessment is designed to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material.

Generic guidance on using levels-based mark schemes

Marking of work should be positive, rewarding achievement where possible, but clearly differentiating across the whole range of marks, where appropriate.

The marker should look at the work and then make a judgement about which level statement is the best fit. In practice, work does not always match one level statement precisely so a judgement may need to be made between two or more level statements.

Once a best-fit level statement has been identified, use the following guidance to decide on a specific mark:

- If the candidate's work **convincingly** meets the level statement, award the highest mark.
- If the candidate's work **adequately** meets the level statement, award the most appropriate mark in the middle of the range.
- If the candidate's work **just** meets the level statement, award the lowest mark.

Assessment Objectives

AO1

Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately.

AO2

Showing understanding of appropriate concepts, investigate and respond to historical questions clearly and persuasively using an appropriate coherent structure to reach a substantiated and sustained judgement.

AO3

Analyse, interpret and evaluate source material and/or interpretations of the historical events studied.

Levels-based mark schemes

The levels-based mark schemes address Assessment Objectives (AOs) 2 and 3, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content for each question in the mark scheme.

Levels-based mark scheme for Question 1

Level	Level description	Mark
3	<p>Analyses both similarities and differences. Compares and contrasts the documents, integrating comments on both documents by content, theme or issue.</p> <p>Makes clear and well-supported comparisons of the content of the documents, and explores their themes and issues.</p> <p>Focuses consistently on the matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Analyses the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, and explains why with reference to their provenance.</p> <p>Demonstrates supported critical evaluation of both documents as historical evidence.</p>	8–10
2	<p>Describes the main similarities or the main differences and includes some reference to the alternative viewpoint.</p> <p>There may be some imbalance between comparison and contrast. At the lower end of the level, may treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes clear and supported comparisons of content, themes and issues.</p> <p>Deals largely with the matter under discussion, but use of the documents in relation to the question may be uneven.</p> <p>Some analysis of how far the documents agree or disagree. At the higher end of the level, there may be some explanation of why they might agree or differ, though the consideration of provenance will not be well developed.</p> <p>At the higher end of the level, demonstrates some critical evaluation of the documents as historical evidence.</p>	4–7
1	<p>Refers to some differences or similarities. May be uneven, for example, differences may be covered but not similarities or vice versa.</p> <p>Makes some comparison or contrast of content, themes or issues, but may be largely description or paraphrase. Likely to treat the documents separately.</p> <p>Makes reference to the wider topic but with limited focus on the specific matter under discussion in the question.</p> <p>Limited analysis of the extent to which the documents agree or disagree, though this may be implicit or asserted. Limited reference to provenance of the documents.</p> <p>At the lower end of the level, there may be simply description or paraphrase of the documents.</p>	1–3
0	No creditable response	0

Levels-based mark scheme for Question 2

Level	Analyse and interpret (AO3) 10 marks	Critically evaluate (AO3) and judgement in response to the question (AO2) 20 marks
5	9–10 marks Full analysis of all the documents as a set, interpreting them in relation to the question.	17–20 marks Well-sustained critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is well explained and supported throughout. Has a precise focus on the question. Coherent and developed judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on clear and persuasive evidence from the documents in their historical context.
4	7–8 marks Analyses all the documents, interpreting them in relation to the question, but some unevenness in depth or coverage of the documents.	13–16 marks Generally sustains a critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Critical evaluation is mostly well explained and supported throughout. Has a broad focus on the question. Coherent judgement on the interpretation in the question, based on evidence from the documents in their historical context which is mostly clear and persuasive, but unevenly developed.
3	5–6 marks Some analysis of all the documents, with some interpretation of them in relation to the question. Uneven in depth of coverage of the documents with some omissions, description or irrelevance.	9–12 marks Some critical evaluation of evidence from the documents, but unevenly supported and explained. Generally coherent and contains some argument applicable to the question. Undeveloped judgement based predominantly on evidence from the documents which is occasionally clear and persuasive.
2	3–4 marks Limited analysis of the documents, with little interpretation of them in relation to the question. The depth of coverage of the documents will be very uneven, with significant omissions or evidence of misinterpretation of some documents, and with much description or irrelevance.	5–8 marks Limited critical evaluation of the evidence from the documents. Generalised critical comments with limited support and uneven explanations. Generally coherent and introduces argument which is mostly relevant to the topic. Attempts a judgement but offers limited supporting evidence from the documents.
1	1–2 marks Describes or paraphrases the documents. Little or no analysis and there may be major omissions of documents and very limited reference to the question. Answers reveal serious misinterpretation of the documents.	1–4 marks Little critical evaluation of evidence from the documents. Has some coherence. Few parts of the response are relevant. It responds to some of the issues raised by the topic. No judgement beyond simple and unsupported assertions or relies on description of the documents.
0	0 marks No creditable response	0 marks No creditable response

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>Compare and contrast the evidence in Documents A and B about the treatment of opponents in the Civil War. You should analyse the content and provenance of both documents.</p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both documents agree that there was much plundering. • Both documents agree that money and goods such as plate and jewels were desirable acquisitions. • Both documents agree that the soldiers set fire to buildings, in the town in Document A and the whole house in Document B. <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document A suggests that women were ill-treated, especially by the French soldiers in the Royalist army who behaved much more like mercenaries, while in Document B the women suffer coarse remarks but no actual harm from the Roundheads. • In Document A there is drunkenness and revelling and no mercy for anyone, while in Document B the goods and supplies are sold off to the locals. • Document A does not give details of casualties but Document B does, and they are considerable. <p>Provenance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document A comes from a pamphlet which was published for propaganda purposes to increase hostility to the Royalist armies. Answers may be aware that the way Birmingham was treated by the Royalist troops was not an isolated example. • Document B is an eye-witness report from a partial witness, as can be seen from his reference to a notorious Papist and a godly Puritan gentleman, but it does not seek to underplay the horrors of the scene, although he clearly feels it was justified. Hugh Peter or Peters had gone to New England from the Netherlands for the opportunity of a more radical religious practice, so he had no sympathy with the Royalist cause. Answers could suggest that he is the more reliable of the writers nevertheless. 	10

Question	Answer	Marks						
2	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that, in the years 1640–1642, England was deeply divided? In evaluating the documents, you should refer to all the documents in this set (C–F).</p> <p>Main issue:</p> <p>Were the divisions which were emerging during this period irreconcilable? The period covered by the documents is the time when the two parties which would fight the Civil War were formed. The outbreak of the war was not inevitable, and the documents explore the depth of the divisions between Crown and parliament.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 685 1326 2022"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 685 818 775">Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)</th> <th data-bbox="818 685 1326 775">Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 775 818 1480"> <p>Document C sees the division as between the Roman Catholics along with Laud and the bishops and the godly Puritans. This is a crucial division which contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War, because the fear of a Catholic plot to undermine the Protestant Church in England was one of the main issues for the Parliamentarians.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="818 775 1326 1480"> <p>Document C is the view of a keen Puritan, who might well exaggerate the extent of the divisions in religion. Looking back with hindsight, after the Restoration and the overthrow of Puritanism, she blames Henrietta Maria for the division, much as Document E blames evil advisers. This could be seen as a mature reflection on her part. She implies that Charles was misled, rather than wilful. This view could be seen as less convincing, because the reasons put forward for the execution of Charles put the blame firmly on the King. The document shows how strongly Mrs Hutchinson felt about the religious issue, but its thrust is supported by Document E and Document F.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1480 818 2022"> <p>Document D suggests that there are no deep-seated divisions because most of the citizens are loyal to Charles. He will do his best to maintain this situation by governing according to the law.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="818 1480 1326 2022"> <p>Document D shows Charles in buoyant mood but expressing himself in vague terms, and not addressing any of the real issues at stake. Therefore, it may seem reliable as evidence for a lack of division, because it comes from Charles at the centre of events, but it is papering over the cracks. Divisions had become apparent after the execution of Strafford, and the second session of the Long Parliament saw a hardening of the positions of the King and his opponents led by Pym.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)	<p>Document C sees the division as between the Roman Catholics along with Laud and the bishops and the godly Puritans. This is a crucial division which contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War, because the fear of a Catholic plot to undermine the Protestant Church in England was one of the main issues for the Parliamentarians.</p>	<p>Document C is the view of a keen Puritan, who might well exaggerate the extent of the divisions in religion. Looking back with hindsight, after the Restoration and the overthrow of Puritanism, she blames Henrietta Maria for the division, much as Document E blames evil advisers. This could be seen as a mature reflection on her part. She implies that Charles was misled, rather than wilful. This view could be seen as less convincing, because the reasons put forward for the execution of Charles put the blame firmly on the King. The document shows how strongly Mrs Hutchinson felt about the religious issue, but its thrust is supported by Document E and Document F.</p>	<p>Document D suggests that there are no deep-seated divisions because most of the citizens are loyal to Charles. He will do his best to maintain this situation by governing according to the law.</p>	<p>Document D shows Charles in buoyant mood but expressing himself in vague terms, and not addressing any of the real issues at stake. Therefore, it may seem reliable as evidence for a lack of division, because it comes from Charles at the centre of events, but it is papering over the cracks. Divisions had become apparent after the execution of Strafford, and the second session of the Long Parliament saw a hardening of the positions of the King and his opponents led by Pym.</p>	30
Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)							
<p>Document C sees the division as between the Roman Catholics along with Laud and the bishops and the godly Puritans. This is a crucial division which contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War, because the fear of a Catholic plot to undermine the Protestant Church in England was one of the main issues for the Parliamentarians.</p>	<p>Document C is the view of a keen Puritan, who might well exaggerate the extent of the divisions in religion. Looking back with hindsight, after the Restoration and the overthrow of Puritanism, she blames Henrietta Maria for the division, much as Document E blames evil advisers. This could be seen as a mature reflection on her part. She implies that Charles was misled, rather than wilful. This view could be seen as less convincing, because the reasons put forward for the execution of Charles put the blame firmly on the King. The document shows how strongly Mrs Hutchinson felt about the religious issue, but its thrust is supported by Document E and Document F.</p>							
<p>Document D suggests that there are no deep-seated divisions because most of the citizens are loyal to Charles. He will do his best to maintain this situation by governing according to the law.</p>	<p>Document D shows Charles in buoyant mood but expressing himself in vague terms, and not addressing any of the real issues at stake. Therefore, it may seem reliable as evidence for a lack of division, because it comes from Charles at the centre of events, but it is papering over the cracks. Divisions had become apparent after the execution of Strafford, and the second session of the Long Parliament saw a hardening of the positions of the King and his opponents led by Pym.</p>							

Question	Answer		Marks	
2	Analysis of interpretation in documents (AO3)	Critical evaluation of documents (AO3)		
	Document E argues that there are divisions caused by evil advisers who have pursued their own agenda and built up distrust between the King and his subjects. The implication is that if these advisers are removed, then divisions will be at an end. But, equally, if they are not, there is a threat of further division, so the document stresses the religious causes of the division as did the Grand Remonstrance itself.	Document E makes it clear that MPs want changes. They are outwardly respecting the forms of addressing the King, but it is clear that concessions will be needed if divisions are to be avoided. As they are the MPs and hold considerable power, this is no idle threat and so shows meaningful evidence that there are divisions. The Grand Remonstrance was passed by a narrow majority, illustrating the divisions between MPs, while nearly 200 MPs abstained. The petition was drawn up by MPs who hoped to avoid a final breach, but who were also determined to gain further concessions from the King.		
	Document F similarly indicates that certain conditions need to be met in order for divisions to be healed. Like the House of Commons in Document E they are worried about Jesuits and Papists. They are also more hopeful than the MPs that there can be a happy outcome.	Document F, as a petition, represents the views of the apprentices and shows their links with MPs. The apprentices were part of the London mob, used by Pym to urge the execution of Strafford. They were radical in both politics and religion, and this document can be seen as evidence of the pressure they could exert if their requests were not met. Alternatively, its tone could be viewed as more conciliatory and so as evidence that divisions could be overcome. The mob had a considerable influence in forcing Charles to consent to reforms as he feared its potential for physical violence.		
<p>Possible judgements (AO2):</p> <p>Answers could conclude from the documents as a set that there were divisions in Church and State in 1640–1642, which would be difficult to heal. Documents C, E and F show the extent of the religious divide and the depth of feeling against Catholics, while Document D illustrates the King's commitment to his beliefs. This suggests that the division is not likely to be mended.</p> <p>Answers could alternatively conclude that the divisions were not so decisive that they could not be resolved with goodwill on both sides. Documents D, E and F show that there was a possibility for reconciliation, but on certain terms.</p>				