Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel
In GCE History (9HI0/1C)
Advanced

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

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 or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

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

Summer 2023
Question Paper Log Number P72274A
Publications Code 9HI0_1C_2306_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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.
1	**1–3**	• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question. • The overall judgement is missing or asserted. • There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	**4–7**	• 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. • 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. • An overall judgement is given but with limited substantiation and the criteria for judgement are left implicit. • The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	**8–12**	• 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. • 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. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. • The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision.
4	**13–16**	• 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. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands. • 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. • 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.
5	**17–20**	• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands. • 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. • The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

Section C

Target: AO3: 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.
1	**1–3**	• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, with limited linkage to the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little or no supporting evidence.
2	**4–7**	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • 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. • A judgement is given, but with limited support and related to the extracts overall, rather than specific issues.
3	**8–12**	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts and shows some analysis by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • A judgement is given and related to some key points of view in the extracts and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation.
4	**13–16**	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by comparison of them. • 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. • 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.
5	**17–20**	• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • Presents sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

Section A: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
1	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that Charles I's actions and attitudes were the main reason for the failure of the King and his opponents to reach a compromise in the years 1640-49. The importance of Charles I's actions and attitudes in the failure of the King and his opponents to reach a compromise in the years 1640-49 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • By 1640, Charles I's period of Personal Rule had made meaningful compromise more difficult because the King's arbitrary actions and attitudes had led to widespread opposition among the political nation • Charles I's attempt to arrest five opponents in parliament in January 1642 led the parliamentary opposition to conclude that the King could not be trusted and he was determined to restore his authority by force • After the First Civil War (1642-46), Charles I attempted to drag out negotiations in the hope that the divisions between his opponents would deepen and put him in a stronger bargaining position • Charles I's Engagement with the Scots (1647) led to the Scottish invasion of England and the Second Civil War of 1648, which hardened opposition to the King within parliament and the wider political nation • Charles I's determination to retain/reclaim his royal prerogatives throughout this period provided a major stumbling block to a settlement, e.g. he had no intention of accepting parliament's proposals in late 1648. The importance of other factors in the failure of the King and his opponents to reach a compromise in the years 1640-49 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Parliamentary attacks on the king's 'evil counsellors' and the royal prerogative in 1640-41 narrowed the scope for compromise, e.g. the Act of Attainder, the Militia Bill and the Grand Remonstrance • The severity of the Nineteen Propositions presented by the Commons in 1642 suggested that parliament was not seriously intending to negotiate with the king • Divisions within Parliament between Political Presbyterians and Political Independents after the first civil war worked against commonly agreed settlement proposals • Parliament's handling of the New Model Army over the issues of arrears and indemnities in 1647 militated against a common approach for a settlement with Charles I • The army removed any possibility of a settlement between Charles I and Parliament by publishing the Remonstrance and carrying out Pride's Purge (December 1648), which facilitated the trial and execution of the King • The Irish rebellion, beginning in October 1641, exacerbated religious and political divisions, which made compromise between the King and his opponents more difficult to achieve. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
2	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that relations between Crown and Parliament did not improve during the years 1660 – 85. Arguments and evidence that relations between Crown and Parliament did not improve during the years 1660-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Opposition within Parliament to Charles II's perceived attempts to pursue a pro-Catholic agenda, e.g. his attempt to suspend the Act of Uniformity (1662) and introduce the Declaration of Indulgence (1672) • Parliamentary opposition to Charles II over finance and taxation in order to keep the King short of money to compel him to listen to Parliament e.g. the recall of Parliament in 1673 • 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 an absolute monarchy • Parliamentary discontent with the King was also generated due to the course and outcome of the Anglo-Dutch wars, e.g. the Dutch raid on the Medway (1667) • 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 • Following the Exclusion Crisis (1679-81), Charles II dissolved parliament for the rest of his reign and adopted a more authoritarian style of government. Arguments and evidence that relations between Crown and Parliament did improve during the years 1660-85 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the early 1660s, Parliaments were able to improve relations with the Crown to a certain extent by settling important issues such as control of the militia, indemnity, confiscated estates and finance • The Cavalier Parliament strengthened Charles II's position by imposing press censorship, banning mass petitions and ensuring parliament could not legislate without the monarch • During the 1670s, the Earl of Danby built up some support for the Crown in Parliament by combining a pro-Dutch/Protestant foreign policy with defence of the Anglican Church at home • During the Exclusion Crisis (1679-81), Charles II was able to work effectively with Tory supporters in Parliament to defeat the Whigs. Other relevant material must be credited.

Section B: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how successful the Poor Laws were in the years 1625 – 88. Arguments and evidence that the Poor Laws were successful in the years 1625- 88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Poor Law system (based on the Acts of 1601 and 1662) successfully established the remarkably advanced principle that parish taxes should be collected from the better off to help the poorest • Before the Restoration, the poor relief system (based on the Act of 1601) was relatively well run and provided a measure of much-needed support, thus reducing the impact of the growth of poverty • The Settlement Act (1662), designed to restrict the movement of people claiming relief, succeeded in placing constraints on the poor by limiting migration and authorising the arrest of vagrants • The poor relief system helped to ensure that England did not suffer famine during these years of climate crisis; Scotland, which lacked a poor relief system, experienced periods of famine • After 1660, the authorities in larger towns such as Norwich generally administered the poor law impartially in accordance with the rules and encouraged the poor to adopt 'better habits'. Arguments and evidence that the Poor Laws were not successful in the years 1625–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The poor relief system failed in its fundamental objective to reduce the overall level of expenditure on the poor, e.g. the annual amount spent on poor relief increased from £100,000 (1650s) to £400,000 (1680s) • The Poor Laws failed to stem the growth of poverty (e.g. in the 1670s approximately one-third of the population were poor) as population growth led to a shortage of rural and urban work • The provisions of the Settlement Act (1662) were not applied consistently, e.g. in rural areas less attention was paid to the rules and personal factors often determined who was given or denied relief • The poor law system was inefficiently run, e.g. from the 1650s conflicts developed between magistrates and parish officers over the level of relief and who deserved to receive assistance. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
4	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the significance of North America and Jamaica for the development of British overseas trade in the years 1625–88. Arguments and evidence that North America and Jamaica were significant for the development of British overseas trade in the years 1625–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Colonies in Virginia, Maryland and North and South Carolina established a lucrative tobacco trade that helped Britain compete with European rivals and generated customs duties for the Stuart economy • The Puritan New England colonies strengthened the British economy by creating markets for the fur trade and Newfoundland provided England with fish and other resources to be traded in Europe • Once Jamaica became an English possession (1655), English ships could sail freely between the Caribbean islands and engage in trading activity (e.g. coffee and cocoa), thereby fuelling domestic demand in Britain • The Jamaican-based sugar trade became more important, especially after slaves began to replace indentured British servants as the workforce and British and European demand for sugar increased • 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. Arguments and evidence that North America and Jamaica were not significant/other factors were significant for the development of British overseas trade in the years 1625–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The success of the Jamaican sugar trade was not particularly dramatic in this period, e.g. before 1688 the island had a relatively small slave labour force and was not part of established transatlantic trade routes • The Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660 regulated colonial trade and encouraged mercantilism in ways that benefited English traders and commercial interests • 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 • 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. Other relevant material must be credited.

Section C: indicative content

Question	Indicative content
5	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. 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, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new'. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • There was little in the Glorious Revolution that could be viewed as a historical turning point • The change of ruler, Bill of Rights and Declaration of Rights were all limited; only the Toleration Act could be viewed as ground-breaking • The legal constraints placed on the royal prerogative were limited and the monarch retained key powers, e.g. selection of ministers and policy making. Extract 2 • The constitutional changes of 1689-1701 established a strong parliamentary monarchy at the heart of the state • The new financial settlement and the constitutional alterations weakened the monarch's powers with respect to parliament • The Act of Succession removed some royal powers (e.g. the pardon for parliamentary impeachments) and subjected others (e.g. patronage) to parliamentary approval. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that that, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new'. Relevant points may include: • The limits imposed by the Bill/Declaration of Rights were much smaller than those intended by some in the Convention Parliament; many of the Declaration's constraints on royal power were not implemented • Under the Toleration Act, almost all Protestant churches were to be tolerated and Dissenters were released from obligatory church attendance • Largely personal monarchical government survived, e.g. William III controlled government business and approved cabinet decisions; the monarch could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy • The monarch's power of patronage preserved royal influence, e.g. 18 out of 26 incumbent bishops and 36 out of 112 lay peers owed their positions directly to William III. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that that, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new'. Relevant points may include:

Question	Indicative content
	• The Bill of Rights limited the king's power (e.g. he could no longer suspend the law) and asserted parliament's rights; the 1689 Mutiny Act and 1694 Triennial Act made parliament a permanent institution • 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 • The introduction of a Public Accounts Commission (1691) strengthened parliament vis-á-vis the monarch; the renewable civil list (1698) meant that the monarch's prerogative powers could not circumvent parliament • 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.

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