



Pearson

Examiners' Report  
June 2017

GCE History 9HI0 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 2017

Publications Code 9HI0\_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 first year of the reformed Advanced Level Paper 1C which deals with Britain, 1625-1701: conflict, revolution and settlement.

The paper is divided into three sections. Both Sections A and B comprised of a choice of essays – from two in each – that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting 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 handwriting. 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(s) that was being targeted by the question. A minority of often knowledgeable candidates 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 depth of knowledge required: Section A questions targeted a shorter period and Section B questions covered a broader time span.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counterargument 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. Higher-scoring responses explored the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and the candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, e.g. 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 offered an analysis of the similarities and differences between republican (1649-60) and Charles I's personal rule (1629-40) and included an analysis of the relationships between the key issues and concepts required by the question. Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the similarities/differences between the two forms of rule (e.g. monarchy overthrown, House of Lords abolished, Lord Protector more or less a 'king', no fundamental restructuring of society etc.) with a consistent focus on similarity/difference. Judgements made about the differences and similarities were reasoned and based on clear criteria. High scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge of republican and personal rule, or largely narrative accounts of the years 1629-40 and 1649-60 with little focus on similarity/difference. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or was offered only on one narrow aspect of the question (e.g. the powers of the Lord Protector were similar to those of Charles I). 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 ☒

Personal rule: 1629-40

Wt. appoints Laud + Westworth after impeaching Parliament

• Treaty of Madrid 1630, Spending down

• 1636, Puritan dissenters, John Bunton, Silk Knives

• Slip money

Republican rule

Barbarous Parliament,

Cromwell's protectorate.

Failure of Rump

From a historical standpoint, in the republican rule that was in place from 1649-60 ~~has~~ ~~is~~ ~~has~~ ~~become~~ ~~a~~ ~~topic~~ is assimilated by various historians from a range of opposing ideological perspectives, ~~to~~ ~~in~~ ~~demonstrate~~ ~~a~~ ~~contrast~~ that the events within that time period in regards to the organisation ~~contrasted~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ of the Government contrasted to that of Charles' I personal rule that was occurred from 1629-40. ~~The~~ ~~nature~~ ~~of~~ ~~to~~ However this view the view that the republican rule differed from Charles' I ~~has~~ ~~been~~ is limited to an extent due to an inevitable factor such as the civil war, that essentially

(Section A continued) Shaped ~~the~~ the rule of future Governments, due to its consequences.

I agree to extent because.

Firstly, one key aspect that supports the view, that in fact the two styles of government, differed, was the fact that during Charles I personal rule, the both backbone <sup>of</sup> ~~to~~ the his Government were led by Laud and Wentworth, their significance during his Charles' personal rule ~~was~~ was that, they organised Charles' strategies and policies that were to be carried out. ~~This task~~ Notably an important bill that was signed was in fact the treaty of Madrid, an act that was passed in 1630. The key impact of the treaty of Madrid was that it had significantly reduced the Charles' spending, as a result, ~~as this~~ the spending cuts appeared to be a positive aspect of his personal rule due to the fact it reaffirmed his political dominance and divine right to ~~be~~ lead the country.

However, it is notable that within Charles' I personal rule, his <sup>Government's</sup> downfall can be said to be have been inevitable due to religious instability and overseas conflict <sup>that occurred</sup> such as the failures ~~as~~ in the port of Cadiz in Spain that essentially was the main factor as to why the Charles' impeached parliament and began his personal rule. This contrasts to the republican' rule as the protectorate Government led under by Cromwell had ~~opposed~~ an opposed religious ideology in comparison to Charles' I personal rule, this

(Section A continued) due to the fact that in 1636, Charles I, published the Book of Canon and later in 1637, he introduced the English Book of Common Prayer. As a result of this, his personal rule came under scrutiny from the Puritan gentry and nobility. Key figures such as Pym and John Hampden were included within this group, as a result of the scrutiny that was endured by ~~Charles I~~ during Charles I's personal rule, a controversial topic later to be known as the 'Ship Money' case. The Ship Money case was presented to parliament by Charles, who unsurprisingly voted in favour of the king. The result of the Ship Money case led to the proposition of Habeas Corpus that granted the person summoned by the court for questioning, moreover this grant was limited as Charles used the Star Chamber and prerogative courts to limit this policy. Furthermore the main aspect as to why Charles I was interested in Hampden's case was due to aspects of the Ship Money case.

Furthermore another factor that defined as to why the republican rule had contrasted to Charles I's personal rule is due to the failures of Pym but was a trigger in regards to the dissolution of Cromwell's Protectorate Government that transitioned into an 'barebones parliament' due to the consequences of war that had

(Section A continued) damaged the economy. In addition it is significant to point out that Charles I's personal rule had deteriorated due to failures to direct or Charles' Government to direct their attention to the war effort, as this had a heavy toll in regards to the support that Charles had from the people in Britain as it demonstrated that the opposition were dominant and that the change in government was inevitable. The lack of support that Charles had was representative in the outcome of the civil war as it resulted in Charles I being defeated in Newcastle in which he had to pay the Scots £850 per day in which they were in control.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 1 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers (1) It makes generalised statements about Charles I's personal rule without really engaging with the question and second order concept set; (the differences/similarities between Charles I's personal rule and republican rule) (2) It lacks range and depth on the republican period and does not offer a clear judgement (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 2

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted the view that religious nonconformity survived persecution during the Restoration (1660-88) mainly due to the actions and attitudes of Charles II and James II, and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (consequence). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop a range of factors (e.g. the actions and attitudes of Charles II and James II, the commitment of dissenters to their beliefs, nonconformist sects well established by 1660, support given to dissenters by the Whigs and influential families etc.) assisting the survival of religious nonconformity.

Such responses were also likely to explore how the attitudes/actions of the monarch led to persecution (e.g. renewed attack on dissent from 1683 to 1686). Judgements made about the consequences of the actions/attitudes of Charles II and James II were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge of religious nonconformity during the Restoration (1660-88), limited analysis of how its survival was due to the actions and attitudes of Charles II and James II, or a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or only offered one narrow aspect related to the demands of the question (e.g. Charles II's attempt to suspend the Act of Uniformity in 1662). Furthermore, such responses were often 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

Throughout the Restoration & 1660-88 there was many non-conformist religious groups who were often radical. These groups flourished under persecution, as they have throughout history, ~~for~~ to a certain extent. They survived due to views of those in power and their more tolerant beliefs, also due to their influence on those around them. However, they were also suppressed and often controlled through

acts of law set by parliament and some struggled as they couldn't spread their views very far.

In some ways it is very true to say that due to the actions of Charles II and James II, religious non-conformity was able to survive. Both Charles and James had a toleration and leaning towards Catholicism. Charles' wife, Catherine of Braganza, and his cousin Louis XIV were strong influences on his beliefs; ~~particularly~~

**(Section A continued)**

particularly Louis XIV as he was the absolute French Catholic monarch, whom of which he had spent his time with during his exile. His brother, James II was also a large influence to his tolerancy of Catholics as James himself announced his conversion to Catholicism in the early 1660s. There was a clear Catholic influence at court, with crypto-Catholics working in parliament ~~and~~ but also Charles' mother, Henrietta Maria, being a Catholic also.

Both Charles and James issued several

acts and attempted to pass several laws to also help reduce the persecution of religious non-conformity. ~~the~~ Charles would issue two Declaration of Indulgences during his reign in an attempt to lessen the strict laws towards Catholics, and to help secure his brother's right hereditary right to the throne. James II also issue two declarations of Indulgences, the first of which being in 1672. ~~For~~ For both Charles and James, these declarations

~~however~~ however was met with strong reactions in Parliament and they were forced to ~~take~~ withdraw the declarations. Charles was forced to accept the 1673 Test Act, after attempting his 1672 Declaration of Indulgence, which disallowed Catholics from holding public office or being in high up positions. It would be because of this act that James had to resign as admiral of the army.

Religious non-conformity was also ~~the~~ aided in its survival due to the reactions and actions of people such as JPs, Magistrates, MPs and ~~also~~ local officials. Local officials and

Other powerful people found it hard to view their family and friends as evil plotters that propoganda made them out to be. They were not going to persecute people they were close to for quietly following their own group and beliefs. The Church also did not have the power to enforce strong, rigid conformity, and often groups would attend their own meetings, as well as the set meetings that made them seem to be conforming.

However, laws were put in place that attempted to enforce conformity and put an end to all non-conformity. The Clarendon Code was a series of acts/laws <sup>that</sup> set out to push out non-conformists. Five Acts were put together through the years 1661-65 to make ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Clarendon Code. For example, the Corporation Act of 1661 which aimed to stop non-conformists from holding public office. The 1663, Five-Mile Act ~~set out~~ forbade non-conformists bishops of living within 5 miles of their churches and also forbade them from being teachers. Other acts under the Clarendon Code such as the Quaker Act, Conventicle Act and the 1662 Act of Uniformity all in part

attempted and in some way succeeded in pushing out non-conformists.

Anti-catholic sentiment was fuelled by the Great Plague in 1665 and the Great Fire of 1666, but was also fuelled by the history of Catholicism in Britain, with Queen Mary burning protestants, Charles I high influence on Catholics at court and of Cromwell's toleration during the interregnum. The fears of other non-conformist groups after events such as Venners rising, the fifth Monarchist rising led by Thomas Vener, were still prominent despite these groups being largely, in part, small in numbers. The Quakers were the only group to really generate a decent size following. While the Levellers, Diggers, Fifth Monarchists and Baptists all were largely under wraps by the end of the restoration.

Whilst it is ~~true~~ true to state that religious non-conformist groups survived the restoration, ~~largely~~ ~~a part~~ ~~of~~ largely due to the actions of Charles II and James II, ~~they~~ I think it is more accurate to say that religious

non-conformity ultimately was largely suppressed by ~~the year~~ 1688 due to acts of government and the ~~lack of power~~ lack of groups gaining widespread support.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This Level 3 response offers (1) Some analysis of the actions and attitudes of Charles II and James II in the survival of religious nonconformity during the Restoration but there is scope to develop this section (2) Limited consideration of the role played by other factors – more could be discussed here too (3) The criteria for judgement are mostly implicit and the conclusion at the end needs further development.



**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 3

On Question 3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of changes to the social structure across the period 1625-88. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. These responses demonstrated a solid grasp of relevant issues regarding change/continuity (e.g. some improvements in the status of women, the rise of the merchant class, the enduring dominance of the aristocracy, rural society remained largely unchanged etc.). Judgements made about the extent to which the social structure in Britain was transformed 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 limited analysis of the extent to which the social structure in Britain was transformed in the years 1625-88. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of aspects of British society during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. narrowly focusing on the growth of the professional classes or developments during the civil war). Furthermore, such responses were often 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**

The years 1625 - 1688 there was change in the social structure. However transformed means a change in how the social structure was in 1625, to how different it is in 1688.

In 1601 ~~there~~ ~~was~~ when Elizabeth ruled she introduced the poor Relief Act. When Charles came to power in 1625, there was still an increasing number of poor. In Britain poverty was increasing as inflation was rising and therefore people couldn't find jobs. vagrants appeared between his time period, they were poor people that

were wandering from town to town in search for employment. However many people didn't like vagrants, as they didn't like men coming to their town and wanting to take the jobs available. This led to parishes being given money to try look after the vagrant as aid. Each one was registered with a certain parish. If the vagrant wandered to a different town, then they wouldn't receive their money. This was set up to stop the vagrants. This could be seen as a transformation as vagrant weren't always an issue before and had started to increase, increase causing a change in society.

Another Transformation of Britain's social structure was the rise of the Gentry. Before in 1628 there was the Nobility, who were the few wealthy people in Britain, they owned a lot of land and therefore had a lot of power in Britain. The Nobility were still high in the social structure of Britain, however there was a rising of the Gentry which was also an upper class ~~to~~ members of society. They were mainly young rich members, many were from wealthy nobility families. The

Geny was known to meet as a group and were quite influential on the economy in Britain.

Due to poverty in certain areas there was a lot of migration, people were moving out of the country side to bigger cities looking for jobs. This meant that the cities were beginning to become more populated, with the economy

(Section B continued) growing it meant it effected society as well. More people were needed in places where there was more trade. Agriculture was still big in Britain however near the end of the time period there was less people working in agriculture than there was in 1625. This was due to transformation in the trade in Britain, many goods were being imported, which meant that people were needed in that line of work.

Social structure did transform between the years 1625 - 1688, this was due to society ~~constantly~~ constantly changing. In 1625 everything was a lot of agriculture, which meant there was a lot of poverty. There was also high death rates due to illness

and the plague. This meant the population was always fluctuating. After the great fire of London in 1666, much of the plague disappeared which meant that birth rates were now increasing and the population of Britain was increasing.

**(Section B continued)** Overall, there was a transformation in the social structure between 1625 - 1688. Although it wasn't a huge transformation as many of the social classes stayed the same. There was a decrease in poverty and unemployment around the 1680s, as before in 1625 there was a huge number of unemployed which led to poverty increasing at that time.



### 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 the social structure in Britain was transformed in the years 1625-88 (2) The candidate's own knowledge lacks range and depth (e.g. little of substance is offered on the gentry and nobility) (3) Although there is some focus on 'transformed' several sections are essentially descriptive and (4) An overall judgement is given but because of the limitations noted above it lacks proper substantiation.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant, analytical response.

## Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the significance of the East India Company in the expansion of overseas trade in the years 1625-88 and weighed this factor (e.g. the East India Company became Britain's largest joint stock company and opened up the Indian west coast and Persian markets) against others (e.g. the development of the lucrative tobacco trade in the early 17th century, the impact of the Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660, British control of the triangular trade and the importance of the Caribbean sugar trade between 1655 and 1688). These responses included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question.

Judgements made about the relative significance of the East India Company were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to describe aspects of overseas trade in the years 1625-88 with limited focus on significance, or else offered a limited analysis of the East India Company's significance in the years 1625-88. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the East India Company's trading activities in India). Furthermore, such responses were often 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

The British economy saw a large transformation throughout the years 1625-88. One of the largest reasons for this transformation was due to the growth and expansion of British overseas trade. Several factors contributed to this expansion, the East India Company, Navigation Acts and Staple Act, the British Merchant fleet, ~~the~~ the acquisition of new places and our growing involvement in trading and the ~~Regat Africa~~ Slave trade.

~~After~~ In 1660 the East India Company was founded, but in 1620 was when the company began to import goods. In 1620, the East India company brought in many different goods, such as, Saltpetre, Pepper, Sugar and others. Indian textiles was also in huge demand leading to a ~~signat~~ significant rise in textile importation which rose from under 10,000 to 1.25 million.

The East India company opened up trade across Europe and Asia in response to the growing demand for tea and coffee and sugar. By the end of the century, the importation of sugar had ~~esse~~ doubled due to its popularity. Cloth exports now accounted for 50% less of exports than it had in the 1500s - an unthinkable number at the ~~same~~ time. The success and demand of the East India company shaped the development of British economy and the desire for foreign consumer goods, which due to this, led to increased expansion of trade to keep up with demand.

However, the creation and success of the East India company ~~cannot~~ is not the ~~only~~ only

reason in which British overseas trade expanded and grew. Without the <sup>significant</sup> acts made in ~~the~~ <sup>throughout the</sup> years 1625-88, trade would have been limited or not as influential as it was.

In 1651 the Navigation Act was brought into effect. This act was ~~enacted~~ ~~in~~ an attempt to try and limit/control Dutch trade. Together with the 1660 Navigation Act, they made trading with English colonies only possible for the Dutch if it was on English ships. The 1651 and 1660 Navigation Acts were followed by the 1663 Staple Act. These three acts together ultimately looked and succeeded in uniting and pushing Dutch traders out. The acts made it clear that goods could only be transported on British ships, unless the goods in which they are trading came from their own country. It also stated that all goods must be imported to England where it would later be re-exported at profit by England. ~~These acts ensured Britain's dominance over trade and created~~

These acts ~~ensured~~ Britain's dominance over trade and created entrepôts across Britain in which ~~g~~ ships would arrive at

from overseas. By dominating a large part of the trading in Europe, the growth and expansion of British Trade was able to spread further as everything was done either through Britain or on British ships. By 1650,  $\frac{2}{3}$  of Tobacco and Calicoes were re-exported through Britain, and  $\frac{1}{3}$  of Sugar was also re-exported. There was also an 110% merchant fleet increase as British ships were in high demand due to the Navigation and Staple Acts.

Overseas expansion was also aided by the British capture of Jamaica from the Spanish in 1655 and also the acquisition and colonisation of England's North Americas, such as New York and New Jersey. By ~~the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century~~ 1688 there were over 250,000 colonists in the North Americas, and by the end of the century that number had raised to ~~450,000~~ 450,000. The acquisition of the Carolinas and New Jersey made it easier for Britain to spread its influence and establish more overseas trade. This would be ~~an~~ evident with the creation of triangular

trade. Triangular trade was the sending of cheap goods to Africa which would then lead to Africa sending slaves over to Jamaica and the USA, which would send sugar back to the UK, for the UK to re-export at a profit. The establishment of overseas colonies and triangular trade greatly aided the British economy and growth of trade.

Whilst the East India company did play a significant role in the growth and expansion of British overseas trade as it helped create demand for foreign goods and aided that demand, it can't be credited as the biggest factor. Without the acts, 1651 and 1660 Navigation Acts and the 1663 Staple Act, British influence on trade would not have been as powerful as it was. It was because of these acts that the British were able to expand their influence and dominate and expand trade overseas.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several strengths, namely (1) It targets the significance of the East India Company in the growth of overseas trade in the years 1625-88 (2) Sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of the East India Company (e.g. impact of importing goods and opening up trade overseas) and other factors (e.g. the Navigation Acts, trade with America) and (3) A reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



### 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 5

On Question 5, stronger responses developed a clear extract-based analysis of the extent to which the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects'. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts (e.g. William would have resisted radical change, for most of the political class the restoration of order was the top priority, power was increasingly vested in parliament, the emergence of a limited constitutional monarchy). Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views put forward in the extracts (e.g. William's well-known dislike of constitutional constraints, he remained head of the Church of England, the king's power was limited by the 1689 Bill of Rights, parliament's role was strengthened by the Act of Settlement (1701) and the financial reforms from 1689). Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects'), rather than the more general 'parliament versus monarch' debate, and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts.

Weaker responses showed some understanding of the extracts but tended to select quotations, paraphrase or describe, without proper reasoning. At this level, material from the extracts were used simply to illustrate (e.g. William against sweeping change (Extract 1), or power was now vested in parliament (Extract 2)). Such responses often revealed limited recognition of the differences between the two extracts and sometimes drifted from the specific question to the wider controversy surrounding the Glorious Revolution and the monarch-parliament relationship. Low-scoring candidates also relied heavily on the extracts as sources of information. Alternatively they made limited use of the sources, attempting instead to answer the question relying almost exclusively on their own knowledge. Here, too, candidates' own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. 'tacked on' to points from sources) or drifted on to less relevant points. Furthermore, such responses were often 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 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects' (Extract 1, line 2)?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)  
As Conrad suggests in extract 1, the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects'. ~~Then~~ The Declaration of Rights in 1689 was very vague, it highlighted the errors of James and his predecessors but did not question the royal prerogative itself. Their last hope after removing James from the throne was William and Mary,

and as Coward suggests, William would have been 'extremely unlikely' to agree to any major 'sweeping changes' and so the first agreement was quite vague and William was not asked to sign anything.

In the Bill of Rights 1689, politicians were 'determined to restore old liberties' and kept much of the king's powers the same. It was still a royal prerogative to agree on war, peace and treaties of alliance, as well as the appointment of judges and officers in the army. As Coward rightly suggests, the politicians were also determined to prevent 'a recurrence of the violence and radicalism' and made hardly any changes in the religion settlement.

The king remained the head of the Anglican Church and could use his power to influence decisions, such as allowing a degree of toleration to non-conformists. However this created tension amongst the Convocation as they saw it as a ~~enck~~ encroachment on the Anglican monopoly of the Church. William then suspended the Convocation until 1701 to end religious wrangling, ~~showing~~ reflecting the amount of power he still had over the Church and religion.

William was still able to influence parliament as well, as his predecessor had done before him, as

many MPs saw gaining the King's favour as a way to gain a higher position. This allowed the King to establish a 'court party' and influence parliament's decisions. He could still exercise his veto power, as he did when he vetoed a bill to restrict his power to dismiss judges in 1698, as well as vetoing Triennial Bills in 1693<sup>2</sup> and 1694. This shows that the King's powers were not limited.

However, ~~and~~ Buchholz and Key suggest in extract 2, the ~~Revolution~~ Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 provided a 'rational and forward-looking answer' to the question of the

monarchy and its powers. Although the Bill of Rights was vague, it did restrict some of the King's powers. For example as extract 2 suggests 'the days when the monarch could dissolve parliament ... were over'. Under the Bill of Rights 1689, the King's suspending power was prohibited and the dispensing power was severely restricted. By the Triennial Act 1694, the parliament had to be called every 3 years, and could not last longer than 3 years. However it ~~might be the~~ ~~Monarchy~~ could be argued that the Mutiny Act 1689 and the financial Revolution of the 1690s necessitated

The need for parliament to be called regularly more than the Triennial Act.

The Mutiny Act 1689 ~~made the~~ saw a shift in power of the control of the army from the king to parliament. It meant that military courts could be used in peacetime to ensure a loyal army, but it was parliament who oversaw the amount of supply the army would get and thus determined how large the army could be. The act also had to be reenacted annually which ~~made~~ parliament was regularly in ~~its~~ session.

The Financial Revolution also ~~made~~ saw a shift in power from the monarchy to the parliament as by the creation of National Debt after the Tonnage Act ~~1694~~ 1694, the need for taxation by parliament ~~was~~ brought all of finance under parliament's control. It also necessitated the need for regular parliamentary sessions.

The Civil List act in 1698 also brought ~~the~~ military expenditure under parliamentary control as it granted the king £700,000 per annum for civil expenditure like the royal household expenses, ~~and~~ and civil servants. In effect,

parliament took control of military expenditure which meant that the control of the army had now shifted to parliamentary control.

In addition to this, as extract 2 suggests, ~~the~~ by the Act of Settlement 1701, parliament had 'redrawn the succession'. Under the act, the succession line was to be ~~the~~ Princess Sophia and the Protestant House of Hanover. This meant that the line of succession was now determined by parliament rather than hereditary succession. The Bill of Rights 1689 had also attempted to do this by laying down that succession would lie only with the Protestant

heirs of Mary or her sister Anne.

Furthermore, the Act of Settlement 1701 was very revolutionary as there were many restrictions on future foreign monarchs such as no placemen were eligible to sit on the Privy Council, no monarch was allowed to leave the British Isles without parliament's permission, and no foreign monarch could enter Britain into a war to defend their own country without parliament's permission. This saw the ~~British~~ British monarchy's power 'limited and constitutional' as Bucholz and Key suggest.

In addition to this, by although foreign policy had remained a royal prerogative under the Bill of Rights, by the end of the century William realised that he would still have to ask parliament's permission, ~~for example~~ after the partition Treaties. Parliament was not happy that a foreign king and a foreign advisor made foreign policy decisions for England and impeached Somers, the Lord Chancellor who had approved it. This made it clear to William that he would have to be more cautious when making foreign ~~policy~~ policy decisions and did so when he agreed to the Grand Treaty of Alliance in 1701.

Overall, the view that the ~~17th~~ Glorious Revolution was 'did not have revolutionary effects' is not convincing as although some of the king's powers by the end of the century ~~had been~~ were still intact, like his influence in religion and the appointment of officers and judges, most of his powers had been restricted. By 1701, the British monarchy had become very limited and the Glorious Revolution marked a shift from 'a monarch's parliament to a parliament as a separate institution'. The Act of

Settlement 1701 was determined to restrict any future monarchs, from laying down the law of succession to foreign policy decisions. The Financial Revolution and the Civil List Act meant that all financial decisions were now under parliamentary control, as was the ~~army~~ army, which the king had always been in control of. The ~~new~~ regular parliamentary sessions caused by the financial revolution restricted the monarchy the most, as it made sure that the king relied on parliament for everything. The Glorious Revolution ~~was~~ did ~~definitely~~ have revolutionary effects and limited the power of the crown so much compared to ~~old~~ predecessor William predecessors.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) It offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on 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 (the Glorious Revolution 'did not have revolutionary effects') rather than the general controversy concerning 1688-89 and (4) It offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Coward and Bucholz/Key extracts.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Good responses often used 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 being given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors.
- Candidates explaining their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements.
- Focusing carefully on the second-order concept(s) targeted in the question.
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each response.
- 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.
- With regards to the level and quality of knowledge, candidates and centres should recognise the expectation of Advanced Level. In short, it is a combination of the knowledge candidates are able to bring to the essay, married with their ability to effectively marshal this material towards the analytical demands of the question. It is fair to say that on Paper 1, where candidates study a range of themes across a broad chronological period, the expectations regarding depth of knowledge will not necessarily be as great as in the more in-depth periods studied. As well as offering more depth of knowledge, candidates who have engaged in wider reading tend to be more successful as they are able to select and deploy the most appropriate examples to support analysis and evaluation.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Paying 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.
- 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 the issue, factor etc. 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.
- Failure to consider the date range as specified in the question e.g. when a candidate discusses the correct issue, but for a time span which differs from that in the question.
- Assertion of change, causation etc. often with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, relating to the issue within the question.

- Judgement not being reached or explained.
- A lack of detail.
- Across the units, there was some evidence to suggest that, as might be expected, candidates were somewhat less confident when dealing with topics that were new to the reformed Advanced Level.

### **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 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 them 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 an attempt to reconcile their arguments.
- Confident handling of the extracts, seemingly from experience in reading and examining excerpts (and no doubt whole books), allied to a sharp focus on the arguments given, recognising the distinct skills demanded by A03.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited or uneven use of the extracts, 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 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 the lifting of detail out of context from 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

