

## **History A**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F961/01**: British History Period Studies.  
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1035–1642

# **Mark Scheme for June 2013**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2013

**Annotations**

V	view
A	assert
DET	Description
AN	analysis
J	Judgement
F	Factor
DEV	Developed or supported point
LNK	Link
EXP	Explains
NAQ	Not answering the Question
IRRL	Irrelevant
SC	Simple comment (where attempt at analysis is not convincing)
U	Unconvincing

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

**Distribution of marks for each level that reflects the Unit's AOs and corresponds to the UMS  
2 answers: each maximum mark 50.**

	<b>A01a</b>	<b>A01b</b>
<b>IA</b>	21-24	24-26
<b>IB</b>	18-20	22-23
<b>II</b>	16-17	19-21
<b>III</b>	14-15	16-18
<b>IV</b>	12-13	13-15
<b>V</b>	9-11	11-12
<b>VI</b>	4-8	6-10
<b>VII</b>	0-3	0-5

Notes:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO.
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found.
- (iii) Many answers will not fall at the same level for each AO.
- (iv) Analysis refers to developed explanations; evaluation refers to the argued weighing up/assessment of factors in relation to their significance in explaining an issue or in explaining linkages between different factors.

<b>AOs</b>	<b>AO1a</b>	<b>AO1b</b>
<b>Total mark for each question = 50</b>	Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.	Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of: - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied
<b>Level IA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of accurate, detailed and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate and confident use of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and coherent; communicates accurately and legibly</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>21-24</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Answer is consistently and relevantly analytical with developed and substantiated explanations, some of which may be unexpected</li> <li>• The argument evaluates a range of relevant factors and reaches clearly substantiated judgements about relative importance and/or links.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>24-26</b></p>
<b>Level IB</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate, detailed and relevant evidence</li> <li>• Accurate use of a range of appropriate historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is clearly structured and mostly coherent; writes accurately and legibly</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>18-20</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and accurate understanding of most key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Answer is mostly consistently and relevantly analytical with mostly developed and substantiated explanations</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Substantiated judgements about relative importance of and/or links between factors will be made but quality of explanation in support may not be consistently high.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>22-23</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level II</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses mostly accurate, detailed and relevant evidence which demonstrates a competent command of the topic</li> <li>• Generally accurate use of historical terminology</li> <li>• Answer is structured and mostly coherent; writing is legible and communication is generally clear</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16-17</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly clear and accurate understanding of many key concepts relevant to analysis and to the topic</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Much of the answer is relevantly analytical and substantiated with detailed evidence but there may be some description</li> <li>• The analysis of factors and/ or issues provides some judgements about relative importance and/or linkages.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>19-21</b></p>
<b>Level III</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses accurate and relevant evidence which demonstrates some command of the topic but there may be some inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer includes relevant historical terminology but this may not be extensive or always accurately used</li> <li>• Most of the answer is organised and structured; the answer is mostly legible and clearly communicated</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>14-15</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some/uneven understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to their historical context</li> <li>• Answers may be a mixture of analysis and explanation but also simple description of relevant material and narrative of relevant events <b>OR</b> answers may provide more consistent analysis but the quality will be uneven and its support often general or thin.</li> <li>• Answer considers a number of factors but with very little evaluation of importance or linkages between factors/issues</li> <li>• Points made about importance or about developments in the context of the period will often be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>16-18</b></p>
<b>Level IV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is deployment of relevant knowledge but level/accuracy of detail will vary; there may be some evidence that is tangential or irrelevant.</li> <li>• Some unclear and/or under-developed and/or disorganised sections; mostly satisfactory level of communication.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>12-13</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and the topic is variable but in general is satisfactory.</li> <li>• Limited and patchy understanding of a few relevant issues in their historical context.</li> <li>• Answer may be largely descriptive/ narratives of events and links between this and analytical comments will typically be weak or unexplained <b>OR</b> answers will mix passages of descriptive material with occasional explained analysis.</li> <li>• Limited points made about importance/links or about developments in the context of the period will be little more than assertions and descriptions</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-15</b></p>

AOs	AO1a	AO1b
<b>Level V</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some relevant accurate historical knowledge deployed: this may be generalised and patchy. There may be inaccuracies and irrelevant material also</li> <li>• Some accurate use of relevant historical terminology but often inaccurate/ inappropriate use</li> <li>• Often unclear and disorganised sections; writing will often be clear if basic but there may be some illegibility and weak prose where the sense is not clear or obvious</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>9-11</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General and sometimes inaccurate understanding of key concepts relevant to analysis and of concepts relevant to the topic</li> <li>• General or weak understanding of the significance of most relevant issues in their historical context</li> <li>• Attempts at analysis will be weak or generalised, based on plausible but unsubstantiated points or points with very general or inappropriate substantiation <b>OR</b> there may be a relevant but patchy description of events/developments coupled with judgements that are no more than assertions</li> <li>• There will be some understanding of the question but answers may focus on the topic not address the focus of the question</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>11-12</b></p>
<b>Level VI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of relevant evidence will be limited; there will be much irrelevance and inaccuracy</li> <li>• Answer may have little organisation or structure; weak use of English and poor organisation</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>4-8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little understanding of key concepts</li> <li>• Very limited understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements</li> <li>• Limited explanation will be very brief/ fragmentary</li> <li>• The answer will be characterised by generalised assertion and/or description/ narratives, often brief</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6-10</b></p>
<b>Level VII</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of the topic or of the question's requirements; little relevant and accurate knowledge</li> <li>• Very fragmentary and disorganised response; very poor use of English and some incoherence</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-3</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No understanding of key concepts or historical developments.</li> <li>• No valid explanations</li> <li>• Typically very brief and very descriptive answer</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>0-5</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Candidates at the higher levels will need to focus on the issue of 'how important' and not simply describe the role of the Godwins. Candidates might consider both the positive and negative influence of the family. Earls occupied an important role in Anglo- Saxon society and the Godwins were the most powerful family in this period. They had a power base in Wessex, at the heart of the country. Earl Godwin probably played a crucial role in the accession of Edward the Confessor. The strength of his position meant that he could pose problems for the King, for example over the influence of Normans in England. Harold succeeded to his position and the role of the family became even more important when he emerged as the strongest Anglo-Saxon claimant to the throne. It might also be argued that because Edward was not a dominant figure, more of a cipher, that the Godwins were able to play such a dominant role. There might also be consideration of the Godwins as a destabilising influence, with reference to the events of 1051.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
2	<p>The question requires candidates to weigh up the relative strength of William's claim and candidates need to balance his claim against those of others if they are to achieve the higher levels. Harold had been widely accepted as king when Edward died and there might be discussion of whether Edward nominated Harold on his death bed, as well as the role of the Witan. Harold's family also represented the most important Anglo-Saxon group during the reign of Edward. Candidates might also examine whether Edward had nominated William as his successor and whether Harold had sworn to accept this on sacred bones. There might also be discussion of the role of the Pope and how far it strengthened the claim of William. There might be some discussion of events in Normandy when Edward was in exile and whether he wanted a Norman succession and this might be further developed by a discussion as to whether Edward wanted to limit the power of the Godwin family, hence the lack of an heir to Edith, suggesting that he favoured a Norman succession. On the other hand some might argue that his claim was not strong and that it was simply based on military force, although a detailed description of events of Hastings is not required.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Examiners should note that historiography is not a requirement of AS and should not expect a discussion of the different views about the nature of feudalism. However, candidates should show a basic understanding of the nature of feudalism. Candidates should consider how feudal England was in late Anglo-Saxon England, some may agree with the statement, others disagree, but what matters is the quality of the analysis. Some may argue it was feudal because the King held most of the land with tenants-in-chief, secular barons and great churchmen, holding their land directly from him in return for the provision of knights. The pattern was replicated among the lower orders of society. However, not all England was feudalised by the end of the century. Some groups– eg townsmen and the population of remoter regions – were outside the system. Some may produce a more balanced response and suggest that William was willing to adapt as necessary, and that a number of Norman practices were used because they were useful, not because they fitted into the feudal pattern. Indeed the king took care to emphasise the element of continuity in his government and this may be used to suggest England was not feudal. Land and tenure were pre-eminently important. The latter was linked to military service. Answers should be able to consider a variety of factors in relation to the question, such as social relationships, obedience and protection, the role of the nobility and peasantry and knight service. Some may also make mention of the feudal characteristics before the Conquest, such as the link between thegns and land which was useful when the Normans took over.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
4	<p>The specified period is important and credit will be given only for discussions of the period to 1470. Edward IV was a vigorous ruler, but he faced considerable problems from important nobles such as Clarence and Warwick. Disorder continued and the Lancastrians remained a threat as was seen at the end of the period. There were also attempts by different groups to secure support from abroad. Candidates might also discuss Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville as it caused enmity with Warwick and did not help restore royal authority, but created bitterness with many of the nobility because of their domination. Candidates may argue that Edward was not very successful as he failed to prevent the outbreak of civil war in 1470 and the restoration of Henry VI.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>At the higher levels candidates will need to focus on 'how' successful. Sound finances were important to Henry VII. They would allow him to be independent and strong. He also needed to repay the debts that had been incurred in his bid for the throne. Parliamentary grants were a useful addition to normal revenues as he was granted taxes to cover action against the Pretenders and wars against France and Scotland. However, kings mainly relied on their own incomes. He was able to raise money from crown lands, customs, justice fines and feudal dues. Efforts were made to increase income from each of these sources and candidates might discuss the success of each. Candidates might consider aspects of foreign policy and discuss trade agreements with Spain (Medina del Campo) and the Magnus Intercursus, with the Netherlands. Feudal dues also included knighthood fee for Arthur and a dowry for his daughter Margaret. Henry was also successful in seizing lands from Yorkist supporters and from others who fell from favour, such as the Stanleys. There might also be consideration of his use of financial methods to control the nobility. Candidates might consider the financial situation at the end of his reign in order to make an overall judgement about his success.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
6	<p>'How far' should lead candidates to assess his achievements in foreign policy. Candidates might establish criteria against which to judge his foreign policy achievements. They might establish his aims and assess whether they were achieved, or they might consider whether the successes brought long or only short term success. Some might argue that he was successful in securing the dynasty and point to marriage agreements with Spain and Scotland, which brought recognition and also helped in the defeat of other claimants to the throne. There might also be consideration as to how far trade agreements brought benefits and the fact that they were readily abandoned for other concerns. There might be discussion of the financial gains that his policy brought, particularly through the French pension. However, this might be balanced against the loss of an independent Brittany. There might be a discussion as to how successful he was in separating Yorkist claimants from potential assistance from abroad. Candidates might conclude that foreign states did not undermine his kingship and that was a major achievement and that he was able to use foreign policy to ensure the future stability of the dynasty.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Wolsey sought to serve the interests of the King and this may be used to argue that 1514 was the most important moment as it brought Henry the military success, expansion and glory he craved. There might be some consideration whether Wolsey was able to achieve a position whereby England played a decisive role in European affairs, thus allowing England to appear important. There might be consideration of whether his diplomatic achievements were of greater importance, although this might be balanced against Henry's desire for war. This may lead to a discussion of events such as the Treaty of London or the Field of the Cloth of Gold. Some may argue that it was Wolsey's ability to satisfy Henry's desire for glory on the battlefield that explains why the campaign was important. Others might argue that it was Wolsey's willingness to undertake routine administrative jobs that Henry disliked that allowed his promotion. Candidates might argue that Wolsey's personality appealed to Henry; Wolsey's background meant that he was dependent on the king. The focus of the answer should be on his rise to power.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
8	<p>At the higher levels candidates will need to cover the whole period and address both France and Scotland, although the alliance between the two countries means that they cannot always be clearly differentiated. Policy was sometimes dictated by aggression, as was the case with Henry's wish to show himself as a military leader, and defence. Henry's desire to rule France might also be discussed as an explanation for war in 1543-6. War was sometimes used as another element of diplomacy, whilst some may also argue that the issue of Scotland dominated Henry's foreign policy. It might also be argued that war was used as a way of distracting the nobility.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to address the question set.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Many may agree with the statement, but at the higher levels there needs to be a discussion of both sides. Mary's accession was well-received especially after the abortive attempt to replace her with Lady Jane Grey. Her reign was not long, but she did escape the violent ends of Somerset and Northumberland. The significance of Wyatt's rebellion and its failure may also be assessed. She got on reasonably well with Parliament, although there were some problems which might be discussed. She tried to introduce some modest economic and financial reforms which might also be considered. Her marriage to Philip is relevant and its significance might be assessed as it proved unpopular when it involved England in a war against France. Although religion is not part of the key issues for study, those who do consider it, provided it does not dominate the answer should receive credit. There might be some discussion of her failure to produce an heir and her failure to secure a catholic succession. There may also be consideration of the social and economic problems that were caused by disease, such as the sweating sickness and harvest failures, which were not the fault of the government, but have done much to blight the image of her rule.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
10	<p>At AS level candidates are not expected to show knowledge of the historiographical debate on this topic, although those who use the views of historians to support their argument should be credited, but examiners should not over-reward those who simply describe the different views of historians. Candidates might argue that the Church had many positive features on the eve of the Reformation. Candidates might consider the evidence that people still volunteered money to the church. Lutheranism and Lollardy had few supporters, although both were significant in their different ways. Candidates might assess the condition of the clergy, although examiners should be aware of sweeping generalisations, or conclusion based solely on the example of Wolsey. It might be argued that there was evidence of major problems or that the situation was no worse than in the past. Anti-clericalism was a problem for the Church but it was not a new phenomenon, nor were anti-papal feelings, and again candidates might discuss how strong these were. Reference might be made to the Hunne case or to Simon Fish, or other individuals such as Colet. The significance of Wolsey as a leading figure is likely to focus in many answers.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
11	Candidates can explain the demands of the Puritans and may explain how these changed over time, and to some extent, became, more radical. They are not expected to have knowledge of historians' views of the early settlement but higher level answers might examine how far Elizabeth had to concede to puritan pressure in the Prayer Book, Act of Uniformity and Act of Supremacy. Candidates might discuss the different 'types' of Puritanism and how Elizabeth managed each. Especially in the 1570s, the Puritans became more determined under the influence of men such as Cartwright. Grindal was equivocal in his dealings with them. Candidates might consider puritan demands in Parliament and the pressures they exerted in the shaping of policy. Separatist groups developed to challenge the hegemony of Elizabeth's church. Some may argue that Elizabeth was able to contain the Puritan demands and that as a result many remained within the Church.	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
12	Candidates might consider a variety of reasons including Elizabeth's wish not to pursue religious policies that would divide the country. Reference might be made to the Religious Settlement of 1559 which retained some conservative features, especially in the communion service and vestments. However, firmer actions were also taken, including measures against recusants although these were enforced unevenly. It might be argued that the loss of priests removed a central requirement for practising Catholics and that the missionary priests from the 1580s had little effect in spite of government alarm at the threat which they posed. Persecution tended to be directed at a minority of Catholic enthusiasts and most could continue quietly in their beliefs. The Church of England was increasingly seen as the national church and could accommodate conservatives, there might also be consideration of the need to conform in order to achieve patronage. Specific developments such as the papal bull of 1570 and the Armada might have lessened support as might the lack of papal leadership in the early years.	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	<p>Candidates should consider more than one minister in their answer, as the question specifically refers to 'ministers'. Examiners should take a broad view of who was a minister as there was no definition in the sixteenth century. Elizabeth chose her ministers and she used her considerable personality to control them. She was careful to maintain a balance between factions, although some may discuss how successful she was in this aspect and point to the domination of the Cecils, which may have finally caused the Essex rebellion. There might also be consideration of whether ministers were able to force Elizabeth to pursue policies that she did not want, such as the execution of Mary Queen of Scots. There might also be consideration of Walsingham, who was more Puritan and anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish than the Queen. Some might also comment on whether ministers were able to use Parliament to bring in legislation that they knew might displease the monarch. Elizabeth usually chose ministers well, although the issue of Essex may draw some comment.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
14	<p>Candidates should consider both the issue of marriage and succession and at the higher levels there should be a reasonable balance. Elizabeth I was expected to marry on her accession, but the problem was – whom to marry? There was no shortage of suitors, Philip of Spain, Charles IX of France, then Alencon/Anjou, the imperial Archduke Charles and Eric of Sweden. Each of these possibilities posed insuperable difficulties of religion, age or, in the case of Eric – mental stability. But Philip and Charles in particular meant that matters had to be handled carefully because of the power of their countries and Elizabeth's foreign policy had therefore to be correspondingly careful. However, it might also be argued that she could play off one country against another. There were English suitors, such as Leicester, but if candidates discuss these they must ensure that they tie them into foreign policy. Succession was important, especially because of the claims of Mary Queen of Scots. Her French links proved a threat whilst she was also a possible centre of opposition for other continental Catholics, although Philip was reluctant to back her claims because they might result in an England that was allied to France. At the higher levels candidates must focus on 'how far' and some might weigh marriage and succession up against other factors that influenced foreign policy, although this is not essential at any level.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	<p>The question does not specify a beginning point, but the end of her reign is likely to be taken as the 1590s, although mention of the Armada would be valid. Candidates might assess the situation in 1603, with reference back to earlier events in order to produce a good answer. At the higher levels candidates are likely to focus on the word 'powerful'. Elizabeth retained most of her prerogative powers. She seemed to concede to Parliament over monopolies in 1601, but in reality she did not surrender these powers. There were severe financial problems because of the Irish revolt and the war against Spain but these did not significantly limit her power except that it was necessary to call Parliament. She retained her hold over the Church. Anglicanism was well established and both Catholicism and Puritanism that might have challenged were in retreat. Elizabeth was also easily able to defeat the challenges that she did face from the Oxfordshire rising and the Essex rebellion. She could also bask in the glory from the Armada. On the other hand some might argue that MPs were restive. The execution of Essex left Cecil unchallenged, whereas she preferred to balance and divide her ministers to rule them more effectively. Her courtiers were waiting for her Scottish successor.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
16	<p>James inherited a difficult financial situation from Elizabeth I. However, the courts of the Stuarts were expensive. Some might argue that James was extravagant and spent large amounts on his favourites. It might also be suggested that James, after the relative poverty of Scotland, thought England was a land of milk and honey and therefore spent lavishly on the court. However, this might be balanced against the need, unlike Elizabeth, to provide for a family. James I's attempts to revise customs duties, through the Book of Rates, were unpopular, but against this argument it might be suggested that Parliament was unwilling to grant enough supplies to overcome his difficulties. There might be some who argue that both the King and Parliament were responsible for the difficulties; James I, who insisted on his right to rule by Divine Right which would inhibit the role of Parliament, and members who were more eager to defend what they saw as just privileges to influence royal policy. The Great Contract, 1610, failed and there might be discussion as to who was to blame. James' later Parliaments were affected by controversies over monopolies and foreign policy and candidates might discuss the relative responsibility and its impact on finances. There might be some consideration of issues such as inflation which increased the pressure on royal finances.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	<p>The question should guide candidates away from the view that the end of Charles' personal rule was inevitable. Answers at the higher levels will focus on the key phrase 'sudden and unexpected'. Candidates do not have to agree with the claim, but at the higher levels there should be balance and consideration of why it might be considered a valid claim. Arbitrary taxes were unpopular, but money was still being collected. The outcome of legal cases, eg Hampden and Ship Money, favoured Charles I but made him unpopular. Laud's religious policies provoked opposition but this was impotent to 1639. 1639 saw the war with the Scots following the disastrous attempt to impose an Anglican Prayer Book. This exposed the King's financial problems that led to the Short and Long Parliaments.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.
18	<p>Examiners should reward highly those candidates who are able to explain how, and how far, the aims changed during these years. In 1640, Pym and others sought to prevent a recurrence of the long period of Personal Rule. The Short Parliament refused to grant the funds that the King needed so badly before they had received guarantees or satisfaction for their grievances. It will be relevant to explain the King's growing unpopularity from 1629 to 1640 but candidates should not spend too much time on this; the key issue is about the period 1640-2. By 1642, the aims and demands of the more radical group had become more extreme. Charles' decision to summon the Long Parliament was a sign of weakness; he had no alternative. Members were generally united in their aim to remove unpopular ministers such as Strafford and Laud. They sought to remove the means by which Charles had ruled 'arbitrarily', for example by ending unparliamentary taxation such as Ship Money, Forest fines and Knighthood Fines. Prerogative Courts were abolished: Star Chamber and the courts of the Council of Wales and the Marches and the North. There were attacks on the Church. For example the Root and Branch Bill which showed the aims in religion. However, this also revealed growing splits in Parliament between the moderates and more extreme members. This was underlined in the Grand Remonstrance. The Irish Rebellion led to the dispute about control of the militia where again the radicals demonstrated their more extreme aims. By now, more moderate members were willing to make a settlement with a King whose freedom of action had been limited.</p>	50	No set answer is looked for but candidates will need to answer the question.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2013

