

# Examiners' Report

## June 2018

### 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 2018

Publications Code 9HI0\_1C\_1806\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

# Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of this 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, 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 financial successes and failures of 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 relevant knowledge was used (e.g. reduction of the Crown's debt, taxes collected without difficulty until 1637, growing resistance to Ship Money, the projected cost of the war with Scotland forced Charles to abandon Personal Rule) with a consistent focus on financial success/failure in the years 1629-40. Judgements made about financial success were reasoned and based on clear criteria such as the degree of financial freedom possessed by Charles I or the ease/difficulty of collecting taxes. High scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge of the financial successes/failures of Personal Rule, or largely narrative accounts of the years 1629-40 with little focus on financial success/failure. 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. no recourse to parliamentary finance). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

In the years 1629-40, Charles was able to rule effectively for 11 years without the need for parliamentary finance. He did this through reviving medieval taxes like Ship Money, feudal dues and reviving the practice of selling monopolies. However, Charles' methods of gaining finance were not popular with the people, <sup>especially</sup> towards the end of the period, which caused a financial shortfall. As a result Charles had to recall Parliament in 1640 to gain finance. This demonstrates that Charles' Personal Rule was not a success.

In 1629, after dissolving Parliament, Charles had to look at other methods for gaining finance. Firstly, Charles revived the practice of monopoly licenses and feudal dues. Although there was resentment at this practice, for example the monopoly on soap sparked riots as prices rose, people were unhappy that they had to pay higher prices because Charles was unwilling to work with Parliament. However, these riots did not continue further on into the period, as most resistance came from Puritans who were unhappy with Arminians being in charge of the soap monopoly. But the Puritans emigrated to the

(Section A continued) colonies during Personal Rule, so resistance against these practices reduced over the period. Therefore, this demonstrates that at the start of the period Charles was able to rule effectively without Parliament, (~~sign of financial success~~) ~~due to his methods used to gain finance~~ which was a sign of financial success.

Furthermore, in 1634, Charles levied the ship money tax, which was for the upkeep of the navy, <sup>during war time.</sup> on coastal counties. However, a more controversial move was to levy it annually across the whole country. The tax proved to be a financial success as it raised around £300,000 in the first year, which was equivalent to three subsidies granted by Parliament. ~~Therefore, Charles~~ However, like his previous measures, the Ship Money tax caused resentment amongst the public. An example of this was the case of John Hampden in 1636, he refused to pay the tax and was supported by the Puritan gentry and nobility. Although this was a bigger threat than the previous small scale riots, Charles was successful ~~as~~ as the case was defeated by a small margin. Therefore, this supports the argument that Charles' personal rule was a financial success because he was able to introduce measures which effectively replaced parliament as a financial body and defeated any opposition to his



## (Section A continued) measures.

However, Charles was only financially successful at the start of his personal rule. As his personal rule continued people grudgingly paid for these feudal dues and taxes so the yield dropped. Charles was effective with dealing with opposition to his personal financial strategies but this opposition was steadily increasing and becoming more threatening of a threat to his financial measures. For example, when Charles sparked the First Bishop's war, the yield of Ship Money had dropped and he was no longer collecting the £300,000 annually that he had in 1634. In response to this

Charles chose to ignore the financial difficulties that were rising and decided to start the Second Bishops' war. By doing this Charles started a war that he could not financially sustain. To make the Taxpayer's strike of 1640 exacerbated the situation as Charles' treasury was already nearly empty and now the public were refusing to fund the war with Scotland. Charles went to war with a lack of finances which meant his troops were ill-equipped and disorganized. As a result, Charles' army was defeated at Newcastle in 1640 by the Scottish force.

(Section A continued) Charles had to pay the Scottish forces £850 a day whilst they occupied. Having already entered war with a lack of finance, this was a cost that Charles could no longer afford and was forced to recall Parliament. Therefore, Charles' personal rule was not a success as the taxpayers refused to pay Charles and as a result Charles was left without sufficient finances to run the country alone.

Overall, Charles' personal rule cannot be considered a financial success as Charles' methods of raising finances caused huge opposition and as a result ~~he~~ there was a financial shortfall. However, Charles can be credited for being financially independent for the first few years of his rule. But it is not accurate to say that he was financially successful as he had to recall Parliament due to lack of finances.



This response secured high Level 4 because it (1) attempts to focus on the financial consequences of Charles I's Personal Rule (1629-40), (2) considers both success and failure across the period (e.g. financial impact of levying ship money and war with Scotland) and (3) reaches a judgement in the conclusion related to the criteria developed in the analysis.





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 how accurate it is to say that relations between the Crown and Parliament improved in the years 1660-88, and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (change/continuity). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop a range of arguments (e.g. settling issues such as control of the militia, indemnity and confiscated estates, the role of Danby, the Crown's pro-Catholic agenda, differences over finance and taxation etc.) regarding relations between the Crown and Parliament during this period. Judgements made about the improvement/lack of improvement 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 Crown-Parliament relations in the years 1660-88, 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. the improvement or deterioration in relations over finance). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

From 1660-88, the ascension of both Charles II and James II to throne saw ever changing issues in relations between parliament and the Crown. Consistent battles over Divine Right beliefs and issues over religion and war caused growing divides between parliament and the monarch. However, ~~contrasting~~ compared to other monarchs, involvement in taxation and official decisions meant parliament's relationship with the Crown seemed to be improving.

Upon his ascending to the throne, Charles II had already conflicted with parliament over Subsidies. Parliament in 1660 ~~gave~~ granted a smaller sum of Subsidies to Charles, to ensure he would regularly need to call parliament to get more. Here, it shows how parliament were attempting to

(Section A continued) to eradicate the issue of no involvement <sup>Constitutional</sup> monarchy, which they'd encountered previously. However, this significantly weakened crown and parliament relations, because this was a threat to the king, as no other monarch had been engaged with such an act. It suggests that already relations between the two powers would get as badly as parliaments were undermining the king's authority by engaging such a small sum, that directly gave him no choice but to regularly call them.

Another issue in which the <sup>relationship</sup> ~~monarchy~~ between crown and parliament were tested, was the exclusion crisis in 1681. ~~the~~ This saw a deterioration in parliamentary relations because this was engaged by parliament ~~over~~ to prevent the ascension ~~to~~ as James II to throne, who was Charles' Catholic brother. Parliaments attempt at engaging this weakened the relations between the crown and parliament as again

(Section A continued) it was a further threat to the king's prerogative powers of choosing an heir to the throne. From this it depicts parliament as over-bearing in the king's affairs and implies relations were not improving as parliament was enforcing such measures upon the king, that he perceived as restricting. This derives from the previous <sup>monarch's</sup> ~~parliament~~ lack of parliamentary involvement, so they now enforcing it upon Charles II. The crisis signifies how parliament were intent on not allowing catholic heirs to the throne, ~~to~~ and how the dispute over this meant relationships were showing little improvement.

~~What also caused further issues was the imposition of the Declaration of Indulgences. The First Declaration in 1672~~

An issue which also showed little improvement to parliamentary and Crown relations was the Popish plot in 1682. This was an attempt to replace Charles with his catholic brother James II. This



(Section A continued) derived from Catholic radicals and suggests how the public had a growing distaste for Charles. It shows how parliamentary relations with Charles would therefore be weakened as Charles had little ~~the~~ no support suggesting there were little relations to improve, if he was not a favoured ruler.

What also meant ~~embarrassment~~ relations did not improve was the king's belief in Divine Right. When he ascended, Charles was under the assumption he'd been ruling since 1650, throughout the Interregnum.

~~The~~ This blatant ignorance of parliamentary rule meant Charles possibly viewed parliament as having little power and therefore believed they had no right of interference with royal affairs.

Parliament proclaimed their involvement within affairs by stating their involvement with taxation and granting subsidies for the war. Then giving money to help fund ~~the~~ the war with France in



(Section A continued) c.1672 suggests there was some ~~room~~ improvements in the relationship because it showed the two powers could cooperate during such a time of desperate need.

However, this was undermined when parliament exerted their role when the king <sup>had</sup> raised taxes previously in 1662, on how Charles needed to consolidate parliament first. Charles argued it was within his divine right at the start of his rule. This meant that any improvements ~~at~~ over financing ~~it~~ in the future (such as the war) would be overshadowed with the king's divine right belief and there would be little improvement.

With James II there was little improvement either. The Rye House Plot in 1685, upon James' accession blocked any further Catholic heirs and they were sent to the House of Monarchy. Parliament's religious conflicts over his open Catholicism suggested there would be little

(Section A continued) States as improvement due to religious conflicts parliament would have over catholicism.

To conclude, I believe - that <sup>it isn't accurate to say that</sup> ~~changed from~~ 1660-88, relations ~~but~~ with the crown and parliament didn't improve, because parliament had ~~ever~~ insecurities over their previous encounters with monarchy and these meant harsher encroachments upon the crown as Charles II and James II. This treatment meant the crown viewed parliament as a threat to their divine rule and there would be ~~be~~ little hope in improving their broken relationship.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Level 3 response offers (1) some analysis of the extent to which Crown-Parliament relations improved in the years 1660-88 but there is limited consideration of the period when James II was on the throne, (2) the criteria for judgement are mostly implicit and the conclusion at the end needs further development.



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 the significance of the role of migration in the population growth experienced by Stuart Britain in the years 1625-88. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. These responses weighed the significance of the stated factor (role of migration) against others (e.g. outbreaks of disease occurred less frequently during the 17th century, before 1650 and after 1680 fertility rates were relatively high). A clear range and balance was evident here too (across the period, and arguing for/against the significance of the role of migration) in order to examine and explore key issues. Judgements made about the significance of the role of migration 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 significance of the role of migration in the population growth experienced by Stuart Britain in the years 1625-88. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on significance 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. only focusing on the period from the 1650s). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

During the years 1625-88 the population greatly increased despite <sup>1639-49</sup> Civil Wars, plagues, The Great Fire of London in 1666 and ~~and~~ people marrying and having children when they are older and colonisation. Migration played a vital role in the growth of London due to there being job opportunities, trade and being the location of Parliament. People would migrate there looking for work and would settle close to London. London quickly became the largest city in England because it. Migration did not solely increase population in Britain.

The change in agriculture and the shift to enclosed farming created more good and better quality food which helped people to live longer, cities like London to develop and encourage more people to have children. The gentry would experiment with new types of agriculture, crops and methods. The increase and ~~of~~ diversity of crops further played in the role of increasing population.

(Section B continued) Migration and Immigration led to more population in rural areas and coastal areas, particularly would settle wherever they landed and would look for work, ~~that~~ ~~they~~ brought new skills and methods in textile design and for agriculture. Trade between colonies made more people go into London looking for more radical ~~the~~ and new ways to grow their ~~the~~ business. Rural areas soon became packed and would often send food to developing cities increasing population and allowing growth.

There were at certain points high mortality rates due to civil war <sup>and</sup> and plagues, along with people migrating to different colonies ~~to~~ such as America (New England) however there would ~~also~~ be an increase of births.

In conclusion migration played a significant role however I believe that the improvements in agriculture was the most significant as migration did not affect all of Stuart Britain <sup>by</sup> and it mostly affected London while agriculture played a role throughout Britain allowing people to live healthier and longer.

Other methods such as <sup>people</sup> consoling ~~disease~~ with disease lowered mortality rates and later marriages actually meant to keep children however the mother was more likely to survive childbirth.



(Section B continued) in total migration plays a small part  
as the growth of Stuart Britain but a large part in  
London and agriculture overall played the biggest  
part in population growth.



This Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers. (1) It offers limited analysis of the significance of the role of migration in the population growth experienced by Stuart Britain in the years 1625-88. (2) The candidate's own knowledge lacks range and depth (e.g. little of substance is offered on migration or mortality rates). (3) Although there is some limited focus on 'significance' several sections are essentially descriptive and (4) an overall judgement is given but because of the limitations noted above it lacks proper substantiation.



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 the reasons for the expansion of the Stuart economy in the years 1625-88 and weighed the stated factor (e.g. the growth of banking and insurance) 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, changes in the cloth trade, London's population and economic growth, 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 (causation) in the question. Judgements made about the relative importance of banking and insurance were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to describe aspects of the Stuart economy in the years 1625-88 with limited focus on causation. Low scoring responses also offered a limited analysis that either devoted little or virtually all attention to the stated factor (the growth of banking and insurance) or else focused only on part of the period (e.g. from the 1650s), thus restricting range. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The growth of banking and insurance was crucial for the expansion of the Stuart economy, as it meant trading became more safe <sup>and secure</sup>. For this reason, it must be considered as the most significant factor causing economic growth, as other factors such as the development of the national market and imperial expansion was only successful due to the rise of insurance and banking.

The growth in insurance and banking was most heavily prevalent within London, thus consolidating its position as the economic hub of the country. This enabled greater opportunities for the merchant class to ply their trade, thus developing the economy through increased trading possibilities. ~~For~~ Most importantly, more efficient banking provided traders with a safe place to ~~store~~ store their capital, therefore increasing the confidence to trade because of the increased security. Likewise, the growth of insurance encouraged more traders to trade across foreign countries. Due to the <sup>protective</sup> coverage that insurance provided, traders risked less transporting their goods overseas. Whereas previously traders could have lost substantial amounts of money due to deaths in transition, insurance meant that traders did not suffer economically for such misfortunes. Therefore, the growth of banking and finance led to the development of the Stuart economy as traders ultimately placed more trust in the nation's financial systems. Such trust led to

(Section B continued) an influx in trading, <sup>subsequently</sup> ~~there~~ leading to the economic boom that saw <sup>Stuart</sup> England profit.

Alternatively, another explanation for the Stuart economic expansion is due to the emergence of a National Market. The Turnpike Act meant that a toll had to be paid for the use of specific roads or rivers. Such tolls meant that the subsequent trading <sup>routes</sup> ~~roads~~ could be maintained and developed to such a standard that made trading feasible. This meant that goods could be transported across the country for <sup>national</sup> ~~internal~~ purchase, or to be sold on the <sup>international</sup> trading market. Whereas previously isolated towns and villages could not sell their surplus of produce, the National Market meant that trading routes improved, ultimately profiting all traders of any economic stature across Britain. However, although this boosted the economy, it is still not the most significant factor in comparison to the growth of banking and insurance. The improved insurance meant that whereas previously smaller traders could not afford to trade, even on a national scale, they now had a greater possibility to trade internationally. Therefore, the banking and insurance growth remains the most significant factor, as arguably it was responsible for encouraging the growth of the national market, and therefore the Stuart economic expansion.

On the other hand, it is also argued that Colonisation (the imperial expansion of Britain) was the most significant factor. Colonies in the US, specifically Jamestown in Virginia, farmed Tobacco and transported it to Britain, becoming known as the 'Cash-Crop' as its desirability encouraged mass sales amongst the wealthy elite across Europe. In addition, the ~~Treaty of Madrid~~ 'Great Western Design' (which disrupted the Spanish monopoly of Caribbean trade) meant that a further



(Section B continued) increase in desirable goods, such as sugar and cocoa, could be traded with other European countries by Britain. England's importation of desirable goods meant that European nations were keen to trade with Britain, thus creating an economic boom. However, whilst Britain's imperial expansion was certainly a cause for the expansion of the Stuart economy, it can be argued that such growth was only feasible due to the improvements within insurance and <sup>particularly</sup> banking. If England's banking system had not significantly strengthened, it is arguable that colonisation would have been less successful. This is because traders would have been less likely to risk large finances on trading if they did not have a safe place to store the substantial profits. Therefore, whilst imperial expansion was a significant factor, it was not as significant as the growth of insurance and banking which provided financial security for the many traders that contributed to the Stuart economic growth, who previously may have not been prepared to partake in large-scale international trade that bargained the greatest profits.

In conclusion, the growth of banking and insurance was the most significant factor for the economic growth in the Stuart era. It provided traders with the necessary safety and security that encouraged an increase in large-scale international trading. Whilst the development of the National Market and colonisation were also significant factors, their significance can be attributed to the development of banking and insurance which made national and international trading more feasible.



This Level 5 response possesses several strengths, namely, (1) It targets the causal importance of the growth of banking and insurance for the expansion of the Stuart economy in the years 1625-88. (2) Sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the importance of banking and insurance (e.g. increasing business security and confidence) and other factors (e.g. development of a national market and imperial expansion) and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



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 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts (e.g. the monarch was now more financially dependent on parliament, the monarch's prerogatives were reduced by parliamentary legislation, the Declaration of Rights did not compel the monarch to call parliament more regularly, financial oversight by parliament was not new). Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views put forward in the extracts (e.g. parliament's position relative to the monarch was 'transformed' through the Commission of Public Accounts (1691), the Act of Settlement (1701) and the Triennial Act (1694), the monarch could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy and choose his own ministers and advisers). Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'), 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. parliament now had greater financial power (extract 1), or the events of 1688 did not constrain the monarch (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.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'? (Extract 1, line 5)

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

(20)

Extract 1 is of the belief that the Glorious Revolution "transformed the relationship between King and Parliament", although in lines 15-17 makes it clear that legislation was not the significant factor in this transformation. Extract 2 differs, ~~stating~~ believing that there was a significant change in the relationship, the Glorious Revolution itself was not responsible, to a large extent. Both make valid arguments but ~~neither are entirely accurate~~ extract 1 is the more accurate, especially in its belief that the Civil Lists Act is what truly transformed the relationship between Crown and Parliament.

Extract 1, while it doubts the effectiveness of the legislation that makes up the Glorious Revolution, does highlight the Civil Lists Act as "the key decision of the Revolution". This Act granted William £700,000 a year, and any more money was to be granted upon Parliamentary approval. This was far less than William had been spending prior to this, as during the Nine Years' War, Crown expenditure reached £1.4 million a year. As a result, Parliament had firm

control over the King's actions, as extract 1 agrees stating: "1689 also marked the start of a... process whereby monarchs found it harder and harder to use their traditional powers". This restriction on the traditional powers of Parliament is showcased in the 1701 Act of Settlement which prohibited kings from entering "a war involving any continental territory, or even leave the country, without Parliament's consent". Where extract 1 fails is in its assessment that legislation didn't truly transform the relationship between king and Parliament on its own - Parliament clearly became more controlling as a result of the Revolution and the most effective control it created was a piece of legislation: the Civil Lists Act. This is most significant as it targeted finance, something essential to the functioning of the Crown. ~~As such, extract 1 is~~

Extract 2 is more critical of the Glorious Revolution, stating the vagueness of the Bill of Rights makes it "difficult to argue that the changes contained within the 1688 Revolution constrained the Crown". This is fair, as the wording of the document make it really only an advisory piece, in reality. Additionally, it cannot be said to be transformative on its own, as it bore little relevance to William, who later claimed to have not agreed to it, without punishment. Extract 2 does highlight the increase in Parliamentary activity in lines

20-23, thereby suggesting a shift in relationship between Crown and Parliament as Parliament was now permitted to operate far more freely than previously authorised by the Crown. However, extract 2 makes it seem this transformation was more out of free will than the events of the Revolution itself. This is evidenced by "after 1688 the Government chose, but was not required, to provide the House of Commons with an annual estimate of its expenditure", this coming before the introduction of a commission into the expenditure of the Crown by Parliament, with the support of William. The claim by extract 2 that the "Revolution Settlement was no more innovative with respect to financial accountability" is limited. The Civil Lists Act, ~~as previously stated~~ had the effect of limiting William's resources and thereby protecting Parliament's existence by ensuring William had to see it open annually. This is a significant transformation of the Crown - Parliament relationship as it very clearly and effectively ensures the king will not close Parliament without repercussions, as had happened frequently prior to this.

In conclusion, neither extracts are entirely accurate, as while of some value, both accept that a transformation of the Crown - Parliament relationship occurred but some of the reasoning behind it is flawed. Parliament truly



asserted itself as a permanent and essential feature of English politics, after decades of being dominated by the Crown as a result of the Glorious Revolution. The most essential part of this assertion was the right and effective control over the monarchy's finance, as money is the most practical area to target - without money, the King cannot operate. Parliament's control was not total as it did not truly topple the Crown until later, but Parliament's rise was so significant it should be described as a transformation of the Crown-Parliament relationship.



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 'transformed' the King-Parliament relationship) 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 Miller and Pincus/Robinson extracts.



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 the completion of all three questions with approximately the same time being 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>

