

# Examiners' Report June 2016

## GCE History 8HI0 1C

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2016

Publications Code 8HI0\_1C\_1606\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see responses of a decent standard from candidates attempting the new AS Paper 1C which covers *Britain, 1625-1701: conflict, revolution and settlement*

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A and Section B contain a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in breadth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change/ continuity, similarity/difference and significance. Section C contains one compulsory question that assesses the ability to analyse and evaluate historical interpretations (AO3) concerning the Glorious Revolution in the years 1688-1701. Candidates have to answer three questions – one from each Section.

Generally speaking, candidates found Section C more challenging mainly because some of them were not entirely clear about how to analyse and evaluate the extracts they were presented with.

Moreover, the detailed knowledge base required in Section C to add contextual material to support/challenge points derived from the extracts was also often absent. Having said this, although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer questions from Sections A, B or C. The ability range was wide, but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. Furthermore, in Sections A and B, few candidates produced wholly descriptive essays which were devoid of analysis and, for the most part, responses were soundly structured. The most common weakness in Section A and B essays was a lack of knowledge. It is important to realise that Section A and Section B questions may be set from any part of any of the four Themes, and, as a result, full coverage of the specification is enormously important.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## **Question 1**

On Question 1, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the failure of Charles I's personal rule (1629-40) and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (causation). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (financial problems) and a range of other factors (e.g. the Laudian church reforms, Catholic influence at court and opposition to Charles's policies in Scotland). Judgements made about the relative importance of financial problems were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for the failure of Charles I's personal rule in the years 1629-40. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far (e.g. one aspect of financial problems such as the unpopular revival of feudal payments). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

## SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number:

Question 1

Question 2

It could be argued that financial problems were the main problem ~~to~~ for Charles I's personal rule as the majority of Charles' disputes with Parliament throughout ~~his~~ his time on the throne were rooted in his finances and often lead to Parliament's dissolution in the first place, which lead to personal rule. However, it could also be argued that more significant factors were religious issues, as religion was strongly linked to politics throughout the period and the cause of much conflict.

Perhaps the most significant evidence for financial problems being the main reason for failure is in the fact that Charles' personal rule only ended because he was in need of money to fight the First Bishop's War with Scotland. Having been refused his customary ~~of~~ 'Tonnage and Poundage' by Parliament, ~~the~~ Charles was in dire need of

(Section A continued) financial aid, and this is likely to be the most significant ~~the~~ reason for him calling Parliament again after 11 ~~the~~ years of personal rule (or 'tyranny'), as previously this is how he had always treated Parliament; calling them in 1625, 1626 and 1628 to request money, and then dissolving ~~the~~ it when ~~the~~ it began posing challenges such as disagreement with his policy of 'ship money' being collected inland, and annually, when it was meant for coastal areas and only when developing the navy.

Another extremely significant factor causing Charles' I's failure was his actions in relation to ~~the~~ religious life of Britain. His appointment of William Laud as Bishop of London, and then ~~the~~ Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, enabled massive changes to the Church of England which angered the Protestant majority, as Laud - like Charles - was an Arminian cleric, who advocated and following his appointment as Archbishop, enforced practices and beliefs more sympathetic to Catholicism than Puritanism. These drastic

(Section A continued) changes are evident in the 'Laudian Reforms' such as the decoration of churches, which offended Puritans who believed that it should be a plain, simple place of worship. This was furthered by increased empowerment of Bishops, which reinforced a sense of hierarchy and discrimination between Christians when was also diametrically opposed to mainstream Protestant beliefs, and therefore created a ~~to~~ great amount of resentment for the rule of Charles I and contributed to its failure and his downfall resulting eventually in his execution in 1649.

In conclusion, I think that although financial problems did contribute to the failure of Charles I's personal rule, a much greater factor was his religious beliefs, and insensitive actions in appointing a Laud as Archbishop and encouraging his 'pro-Catholic' ideas. This can also be evidenced by the fact that the First Bishop's War was after all started by Charles sending an English Prayerbook to Scotland - his financial issues were sparked by his religious insensitivity + personal beliefs.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

Q1 This response was placed at mid-Level 3 because: (1) it offers some analysis of the reasons for the failure of Charles I's personal rule (1629-40) and has a sound focus on causation; (2) reasonable depth of knowledge is used to develop the stated factor (financial problems) and other factors (related to religious issues) although more could be said about opposition to Charles I's policies in Scotland and (3) an overall judgement is reached in the conclusion and the answer is organised.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

When planning your answer to a support / challenge question make sure you have a good balance of key points on either side of the argument, or be prepared to argue support and challenge within each key point.



## **Question 2**

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted the role played by the strength of anti-Catholic sentiment in the difficulties faced by the restored monarchy (1660-88) and included an analysis of the links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge to develop the key factor (strength of anti-Catholic sentiment) and a range of other factors (e.g. parliamentary opposition over finance and taxation, domestic discontent due to the Anglo-Dutch wars) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the relative importance of anti-Catholic sentiment were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the role played by the strength of anti-Catholic sentiment in the difficulties faced by the restored monarchy (1660-88). Low scoring answers also often lacked focus or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. just a limited focus on anti-Catholic sentiment). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

## SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number:

Question 1

Question 2

Restoration Settlement

- Popish plot, exclusion crisis
- Great fire, Black death
- James - many of modern ed.

Divisions, restoration, settlement, Charles II

actions + James & Factions  
Catholicism. - Non-conformity.

After the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, there were large difficulties for the government due to divisions among the political elite, the actions of the king and the threat of non-conformity. However, anti-Catholicism caused much larger rifts between king and Parliament and ultimately led to a difficult, politically unstable time.

Anti-Catholicism had existed for an extensive period of time but it was brought to the forefront of the minds of the English political elite in 1678 with the Popish Plot. This was a fictional plot, created by Titus Oates which stated that Jesuits were planning to murder Charles II and replace him with his brother, James, Duke of York, who had recently stated that he was a Catholic. This plot was hugely influential, leading to serious backlash.

(Section A continued) from Parliament. This plot in turn led to the Exclusion Crisis ~~also~~ which occurred between 1678 and 1681. Parliament, especially the Whig faction, attempted to exclude James from the English Throne due to the fact that he was a Catholic. Charles II disagreed completely with this attack on his divine right to rule and used his powers of veto and delay to prevent the act being passed until ~~late~~ the 1680s when the fear of anti-Catholicism had subsided. This caused huge tensions between King and Parliament who had very different views, which led to significant instability. With these divisions, the government could never hope to run effectively. This plot was a turning point in the period because it brought anti-Catholicism to the forefront of everyone's minds.

The Popish Plot may have been a great turning point for the fear of Catholicism but this fear only continued into the reign of James II who appeared to favour Catholics. In the Godden vs Hales case, James overrode the Parliamentary Act of 1678, the Test Act, to allow a Catholic to hold a position of power in the army. James also issued the Declaration of Indulgence in 1688 to highlight that Catholics would be tolerated.

(Section A continued)

This constant fear of ~~the~~ Catholicism led to the Parliament not trusting the King and after the birth of James's son, thus creating a Catholic dynasty, the letter to invite William of Orange to invade was written. Overall, the fear of Catholicism had led to the downfall of the Stuart monarchy and it stemmed from the Popish Plot.

However, there has to be some blame given to the actions of Charles II and James II. Both kings went above Parliament to release the Declaration of Indulgence which gave religious freedoms. ~~Also~~ This led to a fear of absolutist rule, however, this fear of absolutism was worsened by the anti-Catholicism because ~~the~~ Roman Catholicism is associated strongly with absolutism. Both Charles II and James II ruled without Parliament for several years and Charles II would have for longer had it not been for his bankruptcy. Resolutions increased the tensions in the political elites because of their dislike of Charles II and James II both believed strongly in the Divine Right of Kings, which Parliament was challenging by not allowing the Kings to suspend acts of Parliament as they wished. This constant fear of absolutism stemmed from this belief that the King could ~~rule~~ rule as desired but due to popular perception, this was closely allied with

(Section A continued) Roman Catholicism which was already feared due to theological differences.

Even arguably, Parliament itself added to the political instability after 1660. The Cavalier Parliament gave Charles II a very small financial settlement so that he had to ask for funds from Parliament. Instead, this ~~led~~ led to a treaty being signed with France, in 1670, which gave Charles some secret funding. This, of course, was worsened by anti-Catholicism as France was a Catholic nation. Also, the Clarendon Code, insisted to prevent non-conformity, caused large political tensions because Charles II wanted religious toleration as he highlighted in the Declaration of Breda in ~~the~~ 1660. This division among the political elites festered and was worsened by Parliament's lack of trust for Charles II due to his Catholic mother and French Catholic upbringing.

However, fear of non-conformity ~~was~~ amongst Protestants also ~~caused~~ caused some tensions. The Clarendon Code, especially the Act of Uniformity, forbade non-conformists from holding public office which was disliked by some political elites, especially the Laudians, at the Savoy Conference who believed in toleration. Despite this, fear of non-conformity died out by the late

(Section A continued)

~~The~~ 1660s because the only threat had been the Fifth Monarchist uprising in London in 1660.

But, there was a ~~small~~ so called Plot, the Rye House plot in 1683 which led to a greater fear of non-conformity. It had been a failed attempt on Charles II's life and had made very little political difference in the long term. Overall, fear of non-conformity was small and fixed around a few events unlike the fear of Catholicism which was widespread and long lasting.

In conclusion, the fear of ~~the~~ Catholicism was the most significant reason for the political instability during the 1660s-1680s because it exacerbated fears of absolutism and gave a new light to actions of James II and Charles II such as the Declarations of Indulgence which made them look unsavoury in Parliament's eyes. Overall, this lack of trust led to divisions which led to the ~~base~~ breakdown of good political relations.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it targets the role played by the strength of anti-Catholic sentiment in the difficulties faced by the restored monarchy (1660-88) and has a good focus on consequence; (2) it uses decent own knowledge to develop the stated factor (anti-Catholic sentiment) and other factors (e.g. opposition from Parliament and issues associated with non-conformity) and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Use the key phrases from the question throughout the essay. This will help you to write a relevant analytical response. In this case, focusing on **difficulties faced by the restored monarchy** and **strength of anti-Catholic sentiment** is important.

### **Question 3**

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted how far poverty increased in Britain in the years 1625-88. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. the impact of population growth, price inflation and the Settlement Act (1662), and the increase in 'live-in' servants). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity concerning poverty were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of how far poverty increased in the years 1625-88. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of those in poverty during the 17th century. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. only considering the impact of the Settlement Act of 1662 or the effects of price inflation). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.



## SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number:

Question 3

Question 4

There is no doubt that Britain grew vastly ~~throughout~~ economically ~~the centuries~~ from 1625-88. It became an economic powerhouse with many colonies to ~~it~~ ~~add~~ on its list ~~of~~ from the British Empire. However there is also room to say that there was a potential rise in poverty in Britain as it saw an increase in vagrants and the typical lower class not ~~steadily~~ gaining as much success + wealth like the gentry etc did.

~~It~~ ~~is~~ ~~It~~ It is fair to say that poverty did rise for some individuals in Britain. For example because there was a big rise in migration, there will have been people who didn't benefit from ~~the~~

(Section B continued) everything. Many smaller villages away from London didn't prosper as well as others and in some cases were left off even worse. Farmers also didn't do as well, the farm land owners however did a lot better leaving many farmers in poverty as they reaped up the profits. There was also an increase in vagrants, ~~as~~ many travelled constantly to try to find work. Although there were many genuine vagrants who were desperately poor and tried to find work there were also others who were lazy & caused trouble. This led to Settlement acts trying to make it harder for vagrants to claim for poor relief and in effect made some worse off.

However it is clear that this was only for some,

(Section B continued)

and that the majority prospered from Britain's economic growth. For example, the growth of London grew on a huge scale, it became an economic hub for goldsmiths etc + caused many to migrate to London. This however did cause side effects such as an ~~over~~ overflow of demand for livestock animals in London meaning other places were neglected + in some cases were ~~at~~ without food. ~~It also~~ There was also a huge <sup>development</sup> ~~increase~~ in agricultural techniques which made the yield % to go up and farms to be more efficient. The land owners were making lots more money. In smaller cities there was the development of the cloth trade, this led to a huge increase in jobs available, many were now employed ~~to~~ due to the cloth trade as it also saw the rise of Dutch

(Section B continued) immigrants coming over to work. The rise of the British Empire gave way for people to work in some of the colonies eg. many moved to Virginia to help with the Tobacco trade.

In conclusion, I believe that poverty did not increase on a big scale and there were opportunities available to find work due to the rise of the empire, the growth of London and job opportunities there as well as the development of the cloth trade. There were people who were affected more than others eg. farmers who at times couldn't meet with demand and also did not reap the same benefits as the land owners eg. Gentry



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers (1) it offers limited analysis of the extent to which poverty increased in the years 1625-88; (2) although there is some focus on change/continuity several sections essentially describe poverty during the period and (3) where there is some limited development using relevant knowledge, it lacks range/depth (e.g. impact of the Settlement Act of 1662).



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Higher level responses are often based on brief plans that offer a logical structure for the analysis. They identify three or four themes and points for and against the proposition. Take a minute or two at the beginning to plan before you start writing your response. That way, you are more likely to produce a relevant, logical and well-structured response.

## **Question 4**

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the significance of imperial expansion in the development of British economy in the years 1625-88. These answers included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge to assess the significance of imperial expansion (e.g. tobacco trade, Navigation Acts, triangular trade, East India Company) and a range of other factors (e.g. agricultural developments, commercial expansion of London, growth of textiles) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the relative significance of imperial expansion were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the significance of imperial expansion in the development of the British economy (1625-88). Low scoring answers often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Stuart economy. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the triangular trade or the East India Company). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

## SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number:

Question 3

Question 4

Throughout the 17<sup>th</sup> century, domestic and international economy facilitated each other - the imperial expansion provided a wider, global market for British trade and goods, and whilst other factors such as banking and insurance and the development of the cloth trade contributed to the rise of the empire, the scale and variety of trade leads me to judge ~~as~~ imperial expansion as extremely significant to the development of the British economy in the years 1625 to 1688.

With the establishment of North American colonies towards the beginning of the period came the cultivation of new produce like cash crops that stimulated the British economy as they were ~~stop~~ imported via the city of London - tobacco plantations in Virginia, ~~started~~ run by Catholic and Anglican immigrants being a significant example, along with hemp and flax that developed the British cloth trade. These new cash crops were imported exclusively to England ~~or only~~ on only English ships because of the English imperial policy of mercantilism that was employed most prominently in the republican governments of the Interregnum period in

(Section B continued) order to compete with the Dutch, whose ~~and~~ trading monopoly was weakening ~~at~~ by 1649 to 1660. Mercantilism manifested itself in the form of the Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660, helping England become self-sufficient as a trading state and helping develop the economy in that it allowed British trade to dominate all colonial imports, funnelling all ~~prod~~ produce through London (Staples Act 1662), boosting domestic economy consequentially through subsequent investment in agriculture and new ~~towns~~ industrial towns like Kent and Norwich, suggesting expansion was incredibly significant as it impacted other aspects of the economy.

Dominance extended further and to the East with the East India Company that was crucial to the establishment of English trading posts ~~and~~ in India and triangular trade, ~~whereby~~ English establishment of new ports across the world, all protected by the mercantilist involvement of the state in the economy was ~~ex~~ very significant in that it had a lasting impact on the centres to follow; for example by 1713 ~~English~~ the English controlled half of all ~~trans~~ at the slave trade.

~~There~~ Despite this, there are other ~~factors~~ factors that had a significant impact ~~of~~ on the development of the British economy. ~~The~~ The expansion of banking and insurance facilitated the growth of the empire in that merchants were more willing to make investments in trade when the



(Section B continued) Shipment was insured - this is most seen towards the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century when premiums dropped by 75% and coffee houses like Lloyd's of London were established where bankers and insurers could exchange the latest prices for commodities and weather forecasts, along with advertising in London's City Mercury. When the risks were lower because of marine insurance, trading benefited, expanding rapidly - further ~~but~~ bolstered by the significance of lending from Goldsmith-Bankers and other such firms - of which there was only 3 in London in 1630, but over 30 in 1637.

Another factor that was significant in economic development was the cloth industry and the rapid development felt in that area. Although the domestic putting out system was already well established by the beginning of the period, the introduction of new and worked drapery and techniques like frame knitting machines went on to revolutionise the trade, indicated by the fact that in 1660 92% of all London exports ~~were~~ were cloth, a number that never dipped below 70% ~~throughout~~ by the end of the period. The settlement of Dutch immigrants in towns like Colchester and Norwich helped develop the economy in that these places gained a reputation for the quality usually produced by the Dutch - meaning a wider and more trusting overseas market, suggesting the cloth trade was also significant.

(Section B continued) In conclusion, various aspects of domestic economy like London as a port, cloth and banking facilitated each other, and imperial expansion, in a very symbiotic relationship from which both benefited. Though cloth and banking provided the goods and capital to trade, it was the development of wider markets and the exclusivity of these markets that were influential in the economic prosperity ~~England~~ Britain felt during the period and here for decades afterwards - for this reason, ~~imperial~~ imperial expansion was extremely significant in the development of the British economy in the years 1625-1688.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it targets the significance of imperial expansion in the development of British economy in the years 1625-88; (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of imperial expansion (e.g. north American colonies, Navigation Acts, East India Company) and other factors (e.g. banking and insurance, and the cloth industry) and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Higher level responses tend to offer clear reasoning and justification based on 'consideration of criteria'. This need not be laboriously laid out in generic terms. In this question, candidates justified 'how significant' in terms such as the financial contribution made to the British economy, the ability to open up new markets, and the stimulus given to new forms of economic activity.

## **Question 5**

On Question 5, stronger responses were clearly focused on the extracts, and possessed the confidence and understanding to develop an extract-based analysis of how far the Glorious Revolution established a parliamentary monarchy in Britain in the years to 1701. Higher scoring answers offered some comparative analysis of the two extracts, and used own knowledge effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views presented (e.g. the Bill of Rights undermined the hereditary principle, absolute monarchy was ended, the need for political order overrode the desire for extensive reform, and the Bill of Rights was limited). Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (the establishment of a parliamentary monarchy) rather than the general impact of the Glorious Revolution and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts. Weaker answers tended to show some understanding of the extracts and attempted to focus on how far the Glorious Revolution established a parliamentary monarchy in Britain. Such responses, however, demonstrated limited development by relying on a basic 'parliament dominant versus monarch dominant' approach. At the lower levels, basic points were selected from the extracts for illustration and comparisons made between the two extracts were fairly rudimentary. Weaker candidates sometimes also relied almost exclusively on the extracts as sources of information about parliament and the monarchy in the years 1688-1701. Others made limited use of the two extracts and attempted to answer the question relying largely on their own knowledge. Moreover, in lower scoring responses, the candidate's own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. just tacked on to points from the extracts) or drifted from the main focus of the question. Furthermore, these answers were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

## SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 Historians have different views about how revolutionary, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution was. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your own knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How far do you agree with the view that the Glorious Revolution established a parliamentary monarchy in Britain?

(20)

The Glorious Revolution placed William of Orange and his wife Mary on the throne under the stipulations of the Bill of Rights with the intention of transferring some Royal prerogative power to parliament, ~~and~~ arguably creating a '~~constitutional~~ parliamentary monarchy', though the perceptions of this by historians differ. Extract 1 and Langford argues that the powers of the monarch are fundamentally changed and lessened, a typically Whig view, whilst Coward's extract 2 suggests the changes to government and monarch were not as extensive for fear of disorder, a more revisionist viewpoint. I agree more with the opinion of Coward, because although the role of parliament did transform, I believe the power of the monarchy evolved rather than diminished, meaning ~~for~~ the government could not be considered a 'parliamentary monarchy'.

Langford suggests in extract 1 that the 'Bill of Rights clearly overrode hereditary right', indicating the concept of Divine Right was no longer relevant and that parliament was the decider of the succession which would support

(Section C continued) The idea of a 'parliamentary monarchy'. From my own knowledge I know that William was in fact offered the Crown, ~~with~~ jointly with his wife, by parliament, an elected body that represents the people of Britain, suggesting that William was indeed King at the 'will of the nation'. Moreover, extract 2 discusses 'radical Whigs'. It was with the implementation of a Triennial act in ~~1689~~<sup>1689</sup> that called for elections every 3 years that the parliamentary factions of Whigs and Tories developed in the 'rage of the party', preventing William <sup>from</sup> ~~to~~ maintain<sup>ing</sup> a permanent Crown support base within the House of Commons and leading to his reliance on Whig support to pass legislation. A reliance on parliament to implement policy suggests William was a monarch within a 'parliamentary monarchy' after the Glorious Revolution.

Contrastingly, the ~~the~~ extracts also indicate that this is not the case with Coward stating the Bill of Rights <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ a 'limited document' because of a lack of 'careful planning'. The clause in the Bill of Rights stating the need for free and regular elections ~~was~~ was arguably deliberately vague, as there was no ~~mechanism~~ mechanism to bring an arbitrary ruler to justice (though the Triennial Act solved this issue), a situation that was all too reminiscent of how Charles I had been executed decades before - fears of another period of instability are clear with 'fearful of a collapse of order'. The idea that

(Section C continued) that the Glorious Revolution's purpose was to 're-establish...monarchical authority' is further supported by my own knowledge in that although there were limits to William's power such as the annual Munny Act <sup>of 1694</sup> and Triennial Act, Act of Settlement of 1701 and Civil List Act of 1698, the severity of some of these were lessened as the 1700s progressed; when George II ascended the throne in 1714, he saw the repealment of the 'movement of the monarch' clause in the Act of Settlement and replacement of the Triennial Act with a Septennial Act. This indicates the aspects of ~~power~~ monarchical ~~power~~ that would constitute a 'parliamentary monarchy' were only temporary and applied specifically to William III, and his specific background as a foreign king. Moreover, practically William had access to much more revenue than any previous 17<sup>th</sup> century monarch because of the introduction of the Civil List Act in 1698 that offered the King £700,000 a year in salary for working with <sup>inside</sup> parliament, indicating that although a different 'form of government' as extract 1 suggests was established, this did not limit but instead increase the powers of the monarch, whilst parliament was still technically an advisory body ~~and for them~~.

In conclusion, as the various aspects of the Bills and Settlements passed following the Glorious Revolution did not tie William to parliamentary control fully, only altering the way he functioned as a monarch, expanding it in places, I agree

(Section C continued) more with Coward's revisionist viewpoint that a 'parliamentary monarchy' was not really established; though Divine Right was no longer a fundamental principle of monarchy and succession and parliament itself had grown in influence, ~~the other side~~



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis of the two competing views; (2) it uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views; (3) it is focused on the precise issue (parliamentary government) rather than the rather than general controversy concerning the Glorious Revolution and (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Langford and Coward extracts.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Good responses often use the introduction to set up the debate by identifying the main arguments offered by the two interpretations. This is then followed by an exploration of these arguments in the main analysis.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

### Section A/B responses

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their thinking in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail



## Section C responses

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the extracts, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between extracts, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of the arguments in the extracts
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the extracts
- e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>



Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.