



Pearson

Examiners' Report
June 2017

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 or 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.



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. 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.

June 2017

Publications Code 8HI0_1C_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of the reformed AS Level Paper 1 Option 1C: Britain, 1625-170: conflict, revolution and settlement.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections, in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where Section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the Section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses targeted the reasons for the outbreak of civil war in 1642 and included an analysis of the relationships between the key issues and concepts required by the question. Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (the actions of Charles I from 1629) and a range of other factors (e.g. Pym's increasingly radical agenda, the impact of the Irish revolt of 1641, and Scottish demands for the abolition of the episcopacy in England). Judgements made about the relative importance of Charles I's actions from 1629 were reasoned and based on clear criteria. High 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 outbreak of the civil war in 1642. 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 or offered only on one narrow aspect of the question (e.g. of the stated factor – Charles I's actions). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

I agree that the actions of Charles I from 1629 are the main reason for the outbreak of the civil war in 1642 as there are multiple reasons suggesting this. Charles had multiple financial issues that are a reason for the outbreak of the civil war. This includes him implementing multiple taxes to pay for the navy that he could not afford, placing the whole of Britain into a massive debt. Another terrible action made by Charles I from 1629 was the introduction of the prayer book as well as marrying a French ~~royalist~~ royalist that was a Catholic. On the other hand had choice over the bad harvest that have had been occurring, so new ~~new~~ agricultural techniques were needed to be invented. The factors are the ones that are suggesting that Charles's time ~~Charles I from the day in power~~ is known more as 11 years of tyranny than personal ^{rule} as he strongly believed in God and felt that all power should go

(Section A continued)

to the monarch rather than ~~splitting~~ power sharing power with the parliament. This significant because it suggest that he is to blame for the outbreak of the civil war as had full control. Charles I was the only one ~~making~~ taking actions.

First of all I have to start with the financial issues, his actions have caused in Britain Charles knew that to remain in power he needed full support of the army. This ~~was~~ seemed quite simple however it was not the case. So for Charles to have support from the ~~of~~ army he needed to pay them. The funds allocated for them was not enough, which led him to starting taxes like tonnage and portage as well as the most significant of them all which is ship money tax. The reason why this is the more significant tax is, because Charles decided to change the way it worked. Ship money tax was around for a long time ~~but~~ and at first it had to be paid by people living in the coastal areas of the Kingdom. This was not enough to pay for so, Charles decided he will make nation it ~~through~~ ^{for} everyone. This still did not work as it was not enough to pay for. This significant because what essentially Charles done was that he made the situation worse than before, in other words he added flames to the fire he started.

(Section A continued) His second mistake is involved around Religion, which played a massive role in everyone's life in the 17th century. Everyone was very religious, mostly protestant. Charles was very tolerant towards other faiths and this is proven as he married a Catholic. People were very confused at the beginning because Catholics were not that welcomed by Protestants due to persecution of Protestants by the Catholics in the past. This is significant as ~~people~~^{it} could have had caused the civil war to outbreak as people were worried about if history was to repeat itself again. This taught as ~~there~~ in Charles' wife allowed to freely practise Catholicism. The second religious choice made by Charles was to introduce a new prayer book into Scotland. This caused outrage as Scotland invaded England as with the massive debt he created, England became an easy target. This is also important because people knew that England must have been an easy target therefore knew change was needed.

In conclusion, I believe it is because of personal rule Charles is to be blamed for the outbreak of the civil war as he decided to take full responsibility on himself, without the help of the ~~government~~ parliament as he felt they had



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response was placed at low Level 3 because: (1) it offers some analysis of the reasons for the outbreak of the civil war in 1642 and has a sound focus on causation, (2) reasonable depth of knowledge is used to develop the stated factor (Charles I's actions from 1629) although more could be said about other causal factors, and (3) a 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 reasons for the instability of republican government in the years 1649-60 and included an analysis of relationships between the key issues and concepts required by the question. Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (the actions of Oliver Cromwell) and a range of other factors (e.g. the development of radical religious groups provoked a conservative reaction against republican government, and the financial strains imposed on the government by wars in Ireland, Scotland and against the Dutch). Judgements made about the relative importance of Oliver Cromwell's actions were reasoned and based on clear criteria. High 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 instability of republican government in the years 1649-60. 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 or offered only on one narrow aspect of the question (e.g. just the stated factor – Oliver Cromwell's actions). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The actions of ~~Charles~~ Oliver Cromwell in the years 1649 to 1660 undoubtedly played an important role in the instability of ~~the~~ republican government established ~~in~~ following the civil war. Cromwell had always taken issue with the ever increasing presence of Roman Catholicism in the hierarchy of England. While the very concept of a united England was born with the view of ~~the~~ creating a catholic nation by King Alfred of Wessex, the ~~corros~~ following millenium ~~was~~ endured much change and by the 17th century England was under a new Protestant Faith. Charles I had a close relationship with Catholicism throughout his reign, married to a Spanish woman many were concerned by ~~the~~ his

Catholic leanings.

Oliver Cromwell was a Protestant puritan, he held a disdain for the excess and indulgence of the Catholic church. Cromwell had emerged in these years as the most powerful individual in England following

(Section A continued) the dethroning of Charles I and had established himself as in practice a dictator. Cromwell directly interfered with the republican government. Cromwell both set up and forcibly dissolved governments to the point where it took away from the legitimacy of the republic as a



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 1 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers: (1) it makes generalised statements about Cromwell and religion without really engaging with the issue of the instability of republican rule, (2) it lacks range and depth and does not offer a clear judgement, and (3) there is little attempt to structure the answer appropriately.



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 3

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted how far the status of women changed 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. impact of the civil war, the spread of Puritanism, the effects of the Marriage Act of 1653, and the enduring strength of patriarchal attitudes). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity concerning the status of women 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 the status of women changed in the years 1625-88. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of women's lives during the 17th century. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. just the impact of the spread of Puritanism or the Marriage Act of 1653). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Plan: women → took on male roles
during Civil Wars
→ learnt to read + write to
do house records
→ took part in political events
↳ despite not being listened
↳ baker - Leveller
HOWEVER: weren't listened too
Libburne
Depended a lot on social class

Between the years 1625-88, the status of women could be argued to have changed dramatically, through new roles they took on. However, it's argued that there were still many restrictions preventing a large change in the status of women.

A large reason that women's status developed was due to the Civil Wars. With the men away fighting, it gave women a chance to take on ~~the~~ traditionally male roles and jobs. This didn't only

(Section B continued) give them new skills but also it presented some women with a higher role of authority. This presented them with a higher status as they were no longer seen to all necessarily belong at home.

As well as this, with men away and the new 'Parish records' around, women had to keep the house records. For many, this meant becoming educated to read and write. This development was revolutionary as previously women were unlikely to have the privilege of becoming educated unless they were extremely rich. Therefore, this was allowing a whole new class of women to be educated and therefore take part in activities originally off limits.

Along with this, it helped women to pass on their status as they were able to teach their children how to read and write.

Another, ~~other~~ drastic change in the status of women was that many women started to become politicised which ~~was~~ had never been before. This may have been due to the increase in educated women.

(Section B continued) Many women started to take part in political events and protests. For example, many followed the radical Quaker leader, Catherine Richardson when 100,000 women signed a petition which was handed to government. Despite ~~it~~ ^{them} largely being ignored, this still showed a large change into the status of women as before this time, only men were permitted to even discuss politics, so this shows a sign of equality for women.

Despite these changes for the role and status of women, many argued it still hadn't changed a lot. A key reason this was believed is because the majority of women were still ignored and so in fact, them becoming 'politicised' was not the case, it was merely a ~~group~~ ^{women} attempting to get involved yet being ineffective. Another argument against the change

in status of women was the fact that many believed it depended a lot on your social class. This meant that only those who had money were able to become educated and

(Section B continued) politicised and only those from a cultural background would understand the importance of politics and the ^{potential} role women could offer.

Though women were presented with a large number of new opportunities, many were still restricted through social class or lack of ~~actual~~ acknowledgement by others. Therefore, it could be argued that the status of women change to a certain extent, however, they still faced many limitations through things such as rights.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers: (1) it offers limited analysis of change/continuity regarding the status of women in the years 1625-88, (2) the candidate's own knowledge lacks range and depth (e.g. very little is offered on women's roles during the civil war), and (3) an overall judgement is given but because of the limitations noted above it lacks proper substantiation.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

You will be expected to offer detailed knowledge to support your arguments. Check the specification so you know what is required.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the significance of the growth of London in the development of the 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 the stated factor - growth of London - (e.g. population growth, role as a port, encouraged improvements in transport and communications, stimulated growth of banking and insurance) and a range of other factors (e.g. agricultural developments, imperial expansion, growth of textiles) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the relative significance of the growth of London 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 the growth of London in the development of the British economy (1625-88). Low scoring answers often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of the 17th century Stuart economy. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. just a focus on the growth of London's population or London's importance as a port). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The growth of London was a significant reason for the development of the British economy from 1625-88 due to it being the most highly populated city in Europe and being a hub of trade and services, but it is not the most significant factor. The most ~~important~~^{significant} factor was the expanding cloth trade, and the development of imperial expansion also played a key role.

The growth of London was a significant reason for the development of the British economy from 1625-88 because it was the largest ~~popul~~ city in Europe by 1688 - it was larger than the next 50 ~~largest~~ largest British towns put together, and over 50% of all

people in Britain lived there. This allowed the economy to develop as due to the huge population, there was consequently a huge market to sell to. More goods and services were sold to more people, meaning more money was being generated for the economy - thus allowing it to develop. Leading on from this, London soon became the

(Section B continued) national hub for the banking and insurance industries. After Charles II's botched banking reforms in the early period of 1672, people began to invest more in private banking, allowing banks to invest in economically profitable ventures such as buying shares in the East India Company. This new, unprecedented level of financial investment triggered by the huge potential market of London helped develop the economy enormously. The richest people in British society, the nobility and landed gentry, moved to London due to its lucrative business opportunities and the fact that parliament relocated to London from Oxford. This influx of rich people into London also helped boost the economy because of the luxurious spending habits of the nobility, they kept the demand high for exotic goods from abroad such as tobacco and sugar which is what allowed that sector of the

Trade Industry to increase. Despite its significance, the growth of London's industry was significant as the growing cloth trade because the cloth trade eventually dominated all British industry and allowed for more economic growth than London did.

(Section B continued) The development of the cloth trade was essential in developing the economy from 1625-88 and is the most significant factor in doing so. This is because it accounted for over 70% of British industry in the 1660s, highlighting its immense importance. The growing cloth trade encouraged immigration from areas such as the Low Countries, who brought new skills and innovations to allow the cloth trade to expand further. For example, these Dutch migrants established guild towns such as Norwich, and offered 7 year apprenticeships to British weavers. This gave them a chance to learn new, efficient skills to manufacture more profitable, higher quality materials such as the "new draperies" that were so popular in Europe at the time. This increased level of skill amongst British weavers allowed the economy to develop as they were able to

make better products, sell them on for more, and grow the economy at a quite rate. However, this is highly limited as 7 year apprenticeships were not widely available until later in the period. The Dutch previously had a widely respected reputation for producing

(Section B continued) high quality materials, so their influence in Britain gave the British cloth industry a much greater access to the European market as foreign buyers trusted the Dutch's competence, so that trusted their British trained weavers also - many buyers didn't even ask for samples before purchasing cloth. This helped develop the British economy as it gave Britain more people to sell to, the European market was the biggest in the world, meaning there was greater profits made and that a great boost to the economy. This is why the expanding cloth trade was the most significant reason in allowing the development of the economy, as it became Britain's largest industry by far and kept a consistent rate of growth. This was the problem with the growth of London, it was inconsistent and patchy, leading to economic uncertainty, whereas the cloth trade was arguably more consistent and grew exponentially.

at an incomparable rate.

Imperial expansion also played a significant role in developing the economy as it helped develop Britain's trade overseas, where the cloth trade was largely centered in Britain and

(Section B continued) Europe only. Imperial expansion gave the British access to "cash crops" in North America and the Caribbean such as tobacco, tea and sugar, which sold for a huge profit back in Britain. This helped boost and develop the economy as Britain was one of only two global powers who was able to offer these products (the other one being the United Provinces/Holland). They were able to sell these exotic goods to the wealthiest in society, whose demand for these goods was very high, which helped the economy to develop due to the high price of the goods. However, the nobility only made up around 2% of the population and no one else in society, apart from the wealthier members of the gentry, could afford these goods - limiting the market for them and therefore how much money could be made and the impact it had on the economy's development. Imperial expansion also helped the economy to develop through the

British dominance of the triangular trade, helped by the establishment of the Royal Africa Company in 1672. The triangular trade was a process whereby British traders would sail to Africa, take slaves, sail to the Americas and exchange these slaves for aforementioned "cash crops"

(Section B continued), return to Britain with the goods and sell them on. The Navigation Act of 1651 limited the influence of the Dutch on this industry by stating all goods must be transported on British ships, making Britain the dominant force in the Transatlantic triangular slave trade. This obviously boosted the economy as Britain was the exclusive power in this industry, potential buyers and investors could only turn to Britain. In addition, imperial expansion allowed for the establishment of American colonies such as Maryland and Virginia, which became farming and fishing communities in their own right - enabling the British access to even more goods to be sold, developing the economy even more. Overall imperial expansion is very significant as it allowed ^{the} British to develop their economic assets and trade routes overseas, making it very significant with regards to economic development. However, the cloth trade is still more important as it accounted for the highest

preparation of British industry and there was more of a demand for cloth and textiles in the cabinet than anything else.

Overall, the cloth trade is more significant than the growth of London in allowing the economy

(Section B continued) to develop in the years 1625-88 as it gave Britain access to international markets in Europe and had a consistent increase whereas the growth of London was patchy. Also, despite London's large size and large market, it was minimal in comparison to the whole of the European continent. The significance of imperial expansion cannot be overlooked however, as it was arguably this which allowed London to grow in the first place, but overall the cloth trade is still the most significant factor.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely: (1) it targets the significance of the growth of London in the development of the British economy in the years 1625-88, (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of the growth of London (e.g. London as a market and centre for banking and insurance) and other factors (e.g. development of the cloth trade and imperial expansion), 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 the view that William III's wars brought about a financial revolution. 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. overhauling the taxation system, greater financial role for Parliament, and resistance of taxpayers/gentry). Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (William III's wars brought about a financial revolution) 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 the extent to which William III's wars brought about a financial revolution but were likely to contain misunderstandings, particularly on Extract 2 (Williams). Such responses sometimes demonstrated limited development by relying on a basic 'parliament versus monarch' 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 the issue in the question. 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.

Many changes were made during the Glorious Revolution including those made to finance. Extract 1 shows the belief that William's wars did bring about a financial revolution which could be influenced by the Whig view of progression. Extract 2 however shows the belief that there wasn't a financial revolution which could be influenced by revisionists such as John Morrill who believe that there was limited change.

Extract 1 says that the war brought about a 'new approach to government borrowing' suggesting that there were new ways for the crown to raise money for wars. This could be referring to the setting up of the Bank of England in 1694 from which the king could borrow

money which brought about the National debt. This shows that there was a financial revolution as the Bank of England was only brought about by investors coming together to finance the loan to William for the war. This was previously not in place. Extract 2 however mentions the 'tax-paying nation' as having to pay for the war and makes no reference to the borrowing scheme set up for the king.

(Section C continued) By tax payers paying for the war it suggests that there was no change in the financial situation of the country because of William's war. Overall, Extract 1 gives a stronger argument that there was a financial revolution brought about by the William's war as it refers to the newly set up scheme for borrowing.

Extract 1 mentions the war creating a new era of finance in which parliament was 'a regular and necessary part of the administration' suggesting that parliament now had complete control over the money that was used in government. This can be seen in the ~~commissioners~~ Civil List Act that granted William with £700,000 per year to spend on government spending outlined in the Civil List. Parliament had to be called regularly to grant this civil list showing parliament as being in control of the finance. This was brought about because of the huge amounts of money granted to William to spend on the war, showing

how the war brought about a financial revolution. However, the source doesn't mention that before the revolution parliament still had to be called to grant taxes for the King and so the civil list shows limited change in the finances of government. Extract 2 says that the war was 'prayed for' 'reluctantly' as was done with previous wars, thus showing that finance hadn't changed because of the war.

(Section C continued) However, it fails to mention that William had support from the Whigs and Whig Junto in parliament for the war and so the war would have been funded without opposition. Overall it can be said that ~~source~~ ^{extract} 1 shows a ~~more~~ stronger argument that William's war brought about a financial revolution as it can be shown that parliament's involvement and control of the finance has increased.

Extract 1 says that because of the war it was 'clear that a thorough ~~new~~ restructuring of government finances was essential' suggesting that the spending of government was to be looked into and changed. This was done through commissions to investigate the government's spending in 1694. These enquiries found financial irregularities in government and court. These caused impeachments and changes to how money was spent showing a financial revolution. However, many of these investigations were blocked and so ~~as a result~~ ~~source~~ the commissions were ended in 1697, showing

Little change in the structure of government financing. Extract 2 shows little change as it mentions the funding of the war to be 'to preserve the Protestant succession' which has been the motive for funding in England throughout its Protestant faith. ~~However~~ However, this extract fails to mention that the fact that the confessional state was no longer a ruling part of society and the country was in a period

(Section C continued) of religious toleration. Therefore, religion wouldn't have been the key motive for the entire country to fund the war. Overall this shows extract 1 to have a stronger argument as it was mentions the idea that was seen throughout government of the need to change finance. Therefore William's wars did bring about a financial revolution.

In conclusion, it can be said that William III's war did bring about a financial revolution in Britain. This is because of the view in extract 1 referencing to key changes such as the Bank of England, the investigations set up in government and the civil list Act. Together these show a huge change in the way money was handled ~~now~~ being as the control of money was now set in stone instead of the previous arguments ~~of~~ over the control of money.



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 (William III's wars brought about a financial revolution in Britain) rather than the general controversy concerning the Glorious Revolution, and (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Anderson and Williams 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 Paper 1 Option 1C, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses

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

- 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.
- Explaining their judgements fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but rather a demonstration of their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements.
- A careful focus on the second-order concept targeted in the question.
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable them 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 were:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting 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.
- Answering 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.
- A judgement was not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail.

Section C responses

Features commonly found in candidates' 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 sources, 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 sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments.

Common issues which hindered performance on Section C were:

- 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.
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered.
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources.
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, 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>

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

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

