



HISTORY

9769/55

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

May/June 2019

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Section A

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>To what extent is the attitude to the monarchy as expressed in Document A corroborated by the view in Document B?</p> <p><i>Similarities</i> Both documents agree the king should govern under the law: ‘the wisdom and advice of Parliament’ in Document A, and ‘according to the law’ in Document B. Both agree the king made promises: ‘solemnly professed’ in Document A and ‘bound himself by oath’ in Document B. Both documents agree the king broke his word: ‘secret treaties’ in Document A and ‘used military force’ in Document B. Both documents agree they could manage without the king: ‘without further recourse’ in Document A and ‘the establishment of an equal commonwealth’ in Document B.</p> <p><i>Differences</i> Document A says Charles was ‘a man of great understanding’ and implies some faith in monarchy as an institution. Document B says the monarchy was not ‘good in itself’. Document A wants to settle the issues in Parliament, but Document B wants to call the king to account. Document A does not suggest abolishing the monarchy, just bypassing the king, while Document B wants an equal commonwealth.</p> <p>Explanation: these documents show how rapidly opinion moved in these months. The lack of a successful outcome in the negotiations with the king and the continuing high levels of taxation, as well as the fear of further war, led to some radical solutions being proposed.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the main reason that opponents were against the king was that they wished to obey the will of God? In making your evaluation you should refer to contextual knowledge, as well as to all the documents in this set (A–E).</p> <p>Documents B, C and D express the view that God’s will was very important. Document B states that the Bible says monarchy is a bad idea. Document C holds the most decisive view that God directed the steps of the officers and their conclusions were drawn after prayer to call Charles to account. Document D argues that Charles was trying to overthrow the righteous, therefore, they would be responsible to God if they did not punish him and even more blood was shed. They acted according to their conscience, which is much the same as the will of God in this context.</p> <p>The other documents have some different motives. In Document A, it is Charles’ untrustworthiness, saying one thing and doing another, as well as his trying to destroy Parliament and embroil the country in another war. Document B agrees that he caused bloodshed, ruled against the national interest and broke his oath. Document E is very firm that his main crime was to cause bloodshed and all kinds of evils by levying war and being an enemy to the Commonwealth. But he is also accused of trying to set himself up as a despot, which agrees with Document A and Document B.</p> <p>All the documents very much reflect the mood of the time and even Clarendon, who went into exile with Charles II in the end, recognised that Cromwell had some justification for his fury at the betrayal of Charles in making the Engagement with the Scots and causing the Second Civil War.</p>	20

Section B

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Who was more significant in causing opposition to the personal rule of Charles I: William Laud or Thomas Wentworth?</p> <p>AO1 – Answers may refer to the religious reforms introduced by William Laud and to the work of Wentworth as President of the Council of the North and as Lord Deputy in Ireland. They could also mention the policy known as 'Thorough'.</p> <p>AO2 – Answers could argue that the religious reforms introduced by Laud led to opposition to the personal rule because they seemed too close to Roman Catholicism, which led Puritans to fear there was a Popish conspiracy to take over England. His attacks on Puritan protesters through the court of the Star Chamber caused further alarm, as he was using a prerogative court and enforcing demeaning punishments on gentlemen, a challenge to the established order. His role in government was similarly disliked. The centrality of religion to life at the time helps to show why this was so important.</p> <p>Alternatively, answers could suggest that Wentworth caused more opposition as his firm methods of government indicated that Charles might be planning absolute rule. His previous support of the reforming group in Parliament led to him being denounced as a traitor to the cause. In Ireland, his rule worried the opposition because: he raised taxes arbitrarily, which if extended to England could lead to indefinite rule without a Parliament; he disregarded the traditional rights of the ruling classes; and, he held out the possibility of raising an army which could keep Charles in power by force.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>What best explains why it was so difficult to reach a political settlement in the years 1646–1647?</p> <p>AO1 – Answers could refer to the differences between the Presbyterian Parliament and the Independent army, and to the role of Charles I.</p> <p>AO2 – Answers could argue that once Parliament had the king in their possession, they began to negotiate with him to return him to power and to set up a Presbyterian Church; this was opposed by the New Model Army who wanted religious toleration and their back pay, so they then seized control of the king and put forward the <i>Heads of the Proposals</i>. But even the Army was riven by factionalism, and the rank and file presented their alternative, the <i>Agreement of the People</i>, and defended their views in the Putney Debates. These divisions gave the king some hope for his restoration and, once he had escaped to the Isle of Wight, began to follow his own policy of alliance with the Scots. With so many contending parties, a settlement was not easy to secure.</p> <p>Charles undoubtedly made the situation worse with his underhand behaviour and the <i>Engagement</i> with the Scots, but in the end, this proved counter-productive and led into the Second Civil War which reunited the Parliamentarians against the king.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Why did so many different radical groups emerge in the 1640s?</p> <p>AO1 – Answers could refer to groups such as the Levellers, Diggers, Fifth Monarchy Men, Ranters and others.</p> <p>AO2 – Answers could argue that the unsettled times, ‘The World Turned Upside Down’ was a prime factor. The ending of much state censorship initially encouraged groups to emerge. There were many varied radical ideas and so groups developed with different priorities. Cromwell favoured religious toleration and the New Model Army was full of religious and political radicals. Many of them were articulate critics of the establishment with their Bibles in their hands. Answers could also suggest that the war and the execution of the king had provided an opportunity for hitherto down-trodden people, such as women, to find a voice in radical groups, as so much of what had been accepted came under question.</p> <p>The downfall of the Church of England was another factor. Groups like the Baptists who had been driven underground by Laud, were able to exist openly. The astonishing events of the day gave rise to groups who favoured millenarianism and expected the Last Days any moment.</p>	30