



Pearson  
Edexcel

## Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In History (9HI0)

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

Paper

Option 1C: Britain, 1625–1701: conflict, revolution  
and settlement

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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).

## **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)

November 2021

Question Paper Log Number P66250

Publications Code 9HI0\_1C\_rms\_20211216

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors: Sections A and B

**Target:** AO1: Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li> <li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li> <li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li> <li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is limited analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li> <li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li> <li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although descriptive passages may be included.</li> <li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li> <li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period, although treatment of issues may be uneven.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li> <li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence and precision.</li> </ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li> <li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li> <li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li> <li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li> </ul>

## Section C

**Target:** A03: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>4–7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the extracts, but only to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included.</li><li>• A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>8–12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>13–16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them.</li><li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge to discuss the views. Most of the relevant aspects of the debate will be discussed, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth.</li><li>• Discusses evidence provided in the extracts in order to reach a supported overall judgement. Discussion of points of view in the extracts demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.</li></ul>
<b>5</b>	<b>17–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li><li>• Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments.</li><li>• Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the successes of Charles I's Personal Rule (1629-40) outweighed its failures.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the successes of Charles I's Personal Rule (1629-40) outweighed its failures should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Charles succeeded in one of his central aims in that he was able to rule as the monarch without recourse to parliament for 11 years; as Lord Treasurer until 1635, Richard Weston halved the royal debt</li><li>• Taxes, including an extended Ship Money from 1635, were generally paid and collected without difficulty until problems began in 1637 in Scotland, e.g. in 1635 all but £5,000 of the £199,000 demanded was collected</li><li>• Charles I's encouragement of Laudianism was passively accepted by most, with limited incidents of open opposition mainly confined to a Puritan minority</li><li>• Under Personal Rule, royal administration, via the Privy Council, was generally effective; Charles was usually conscientious in overseeing this aspect of government and ably supported by Wentworth and Laud</li><li>• As Lord Deputy of Ireland (1633-40), Thomas Wentworth (the Earl of Strafford from 1640) was able to fund a small army in Ireland and contribute to Charles I's coffers.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the successes of Charles I's Personal Rule (1629-40) did not outweigh its failures should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Charles I was compelled to abandon Personal Rule and recall Parliament in a bid to secure subsidies due to the projected cost of the war with Scotland (£300,000)</li><li>• Growing resistance to Ship Money led to a serious shortfall in 1638 and only 20 per cent of the expected amount was paid in 1639; the Hampden case (1637) was seen as a moral victory against royal tyranny</li><li>• Charles I's attempt to impose religious changes in Scotland provoked a strong and organised opposition (spearheaded by the Scottish clergy and nobility) that offered effective resistance</li><li>• The Laudian church reforms, Laud's religious and secular role, and Catholic influence at court undermined Personal Rule by raising widespread fears about the reintroduction of Catholicism and absolutism.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the difficulties faced by Charles II, in the years 1660-85, were mainly due to the strength of anti-Catholic sentiment.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the difficulties faced by Charles II, in the years 1660-85, were mainly due to the strength of anti-Catholic sentiment should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hostile reaction within the political nation to Charles II's perceived pro-Catholic agenda, e.g. his attempt to modify the Act of Uniformity (1662) and introduce the Declaration of Indulgence (1672)</li> <li>• The inflaming impact on public opinion of the so-called Popish Plot which helped to create the Exclusion Crisis (1679-81)</li> <li>• Charles II's pro-French foreign policy in the 1660s and 1670s fuelled parliamentary fears that he was seeking to emulate Louis XIV by creating a Catholic absolute monarchy</li> <li>• Negative public attitudes regarding the role at court of Catherine of Braganza and her Catholic supporters</li> <li>• The Duke of York's conversion to Catholicism hardened the King's relations with Parliament; faced with the prospect of a Catholic succession, Parliament drew up a list of complaints and draft measures.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the difficulties faced by Charles II, in the years 1660-85, were mainly due to other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Restoration Settlement's lack of clarity left many areas for future debate and conflict (including the powers of the monarch and parliament), so parliamentary concerns about royal absolutism were unlikely to subside</li> <li>• Charles II's Declaration of Indulgence (1672) led to conflict with parliament partly because it claimed that the monarch had the prerogative powers to 'dispense with' (suspend) the operation of the law</li> <li>• Parliamentary opposition to Charles II over finance and taxation was designed to keep the King short of money in order to compel him to listen to Parliament, e.g. the recall of Parliament in 1673</li> <li>• Parliamentary and popular discontent over the course and outcome of the Anglo-Dutch wars, e.g. the Dutch raids on the Medway and Felixstowe (1667).</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>3</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the structure of British society in 1625 was remarkably similar to the structure of British society in 1688.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the structure of British society in 1625 was remarkably similar to the structure of British society in 1688 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The traditional aristocracy exerted similar influence in society in 1625 and 1688, e.g. the nobles continued to possess considerable power and wealth during this period</li><li>• Throughout the whole period, rural labourers constituted the majority of the working population in England and the church continued to be the traditional and largest form of occupation for professionals</li><li>• Foreign migration to the cloth towns of East Anglia (e.g. textile workers from the Low Countries settled in Norwich) did not produce markedly different local social structures</li><li>• In Ireland and Scotland limited industrial and trading developments did little to alter the predominantly rural social structure which remained largely the same.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the structure of British society in 1625 was different from the structure of British society in 1688 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The number and importance of professionals (such as financiers, and doctors) and the merchant class increased significantly, stimulated by expanding trade, foreign wars and improving living standards</li><li>• Urbanisation during this period led to the growth of towns such as Norwich, Sheffield and Derby; London tripled in size becoming the western world's largest city with some 575,000 inhabitants by 1688</li><li>• New employment opportunities existed for 10-20 per cent of the non-agricultural working population due to the growth of ports and shipping</li><li>• Between 1625 and 1688 the gentry class expanded significantly and enhanced their social standing, personal wealth, educational attainment and political influence within Stuart Britain</li><li>• Religious and legal changes had led to some changes in the status of women e.g. 1653 Marriages Act and greater freedom for Quaker women after 1650.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Question	Indicative content
4	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the significance of the Navigation Acts in the development of Britain's trading empire in the years 1651-88.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the Navigation Acts were significant in the development of Britain's trading empire in the years 1651-88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Navigation Act of 1651 promoted mercantilism and the regulation of colonial trade, leading to a huge increase in the number of English ships trading across the Atlantic with the American colonies</li> <li>• The Dutch agreed to respect the Navigation Act after the war of 1652-54, leading to growing British trade in areas including the Baltic and the Far East</li> <li>• The Navigation Act of 1660 (together with the 1663 Staple Act) provided further controls over colonial trade, which benefited English traders and fuelled commercial expansion</li> <li>• The Plantation Duty Act of 1673 (an update to the Navigation Act) boosted legal overseas trade by stipulating that captains of English ships had to deliver specified goods only to England or face financial sanctions.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that other factors were significant in the development of Britain's trading empire in the years 1651-88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The growing role of the East India Company in opening up trade with India, which generated profits equalling or exceeding those of the North American tobacco trade</li> <li>• Colonies in Virginia, Maryland and North and South Carolina established a lucrative tobacco trade that helped Britain compete with European rivals in North America</li> <li>• The establishment of the Royal African Company in 1672 enabled the British to control the lucrative slave trade along the West African coast by deploying armed forces and establishing military bases and trading posts</li> <li>• The importance of British control of the triangular trade (from the mid-17th century) between North America, the Caribbean and Europe based on the profitable slave trade</li> <li>• The Anglo-Portuguese Treaty of 1654 opened up the Portuguese Empire to English merchants; by 1660 trade with Portugal was estimated to be worth about £200,000 per year.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
<b>5</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that it was the financial revolution of the 1690s, rather than the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, that changed the relationship between the monarch and parliament.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Parliament became a permanent government institution because the monarch depended on taxation, notably due to the demands of war</li><li>• Parliamentary agreement was required for taxation and parliament could decide how such revenue was spent; this sustained public confidence in the system</li><li>• During the 1690s the principle of parliamentary grants being used solely for their specified purpose was established; parliament used the 'power of the purse' to gain concessions from the monarch.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Glorious Revolution of 1688 produced a parliamentary monarchy and this represented a significant change of direction, away from royal absolutism</li><li>• The Bill of Rights undermined the principle of hereditary right, which had underpinned the restored constitution of 1660, and replaced it with the notion of the national will expressed through parliament</li><li>• William and Mary owed their royal positions to a decision made by parliament rather than the concept of divine right.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that it was the financial revolution of the 1690s, rather than the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, that changed the relationship between the monarch and parliament. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Parliamentary control of finance (e.g. 'insufficient' annual settlements) meant that the king had no choice but to meet with parliament regularly, thus enhancing its influence and authority</li><li>• Through its control of military expenditure in a period of war, parliament could withhold supply and effectively hold the monarch to ransom</li><li>• Parliament was strengthened by the introduction of a Public Accounts Commission (1691) to scrutinise and audit government expenditure</li><li>• From 1698, the Crown's day-to-day spending was controlled through a renewable civil list, which meant that the monarch could not use the royal prerogative to avoid working with parliament.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that it was the financial revolution of the 1690s, rather than the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, that changed the relationship between the monarch and parliament. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the Bill of Rights (1689) the king's power was limited in various ways (e.g. he could no longer suspend the law) and the rights of Parliament were asserted</li> <li>• Through the 1689 Mutiny Act (and 1694 Triennial Act), Parliament became a permanent institution</li> <li>• The Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 ensured that government authority was now based on laws agreed by the monarch, Lords and Commons</li> <li>• The Act of Settlement of 1701 built upon the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 by consolidating Parliament's right to decide the succession and weakening the concept of hereditary monarchy.</li> </ul>