



Pearson

## **Mark scheme**

Summer 2018

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

Paper 1: Breadth study with  
interpretations

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

## 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 Charles I's Personal Rule (1629–40) was a financial success.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Charles I's Personal Rule (1629–40) was a financial success should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Taxes, including an extended Ship Money from 1635, were generally paid and collected without difficulty until problems began in 1637 in Scotland</li><li>• Under Personal Rule, the Crown's debt of £2 million (1629) was reduced to £18,000 by 1635 and a balanced budget by 1637; during this period too, Charles I's annual income rose from £600,000 to nearly £900,000</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><li>• Charles I was able to rule without recourse to parliamentary finance for 11 years.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that Charles I's Personal Rule (1629–40) was not a financial success should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The mobilisation of a 15,000-strong army in 1639 exposed the fragility of Charles I's financial position</li><li>• Growing resistance to Ship Money meant that only 20 per cent of the expected amount was paid in 1639</li><li>• Appeals to the City to supply the monarch with much-needed funds in 1639–40 did not result in loans being offered</li><li>• The projected cost of the war with Scotland (£300,000) compelled Charles I to abandon Personal Rule and recall Parliament in a bid to secure subsidies.</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 relations between the Crown and Parliament improved in the years 1660–88.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that relations between the Crown and Parliament improved in the years 1660–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• During the Exclusion Crisis (1679–81), Charles II was able to work effectively with Tory supporters in Parliament to defeat the Whigs</li> <li>• The 'landed Parliament', which met in 1685, made generous financial grants to James II.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that relations between the Crown and Parliament did not improve in the years 1660–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Parliamentary discontent with the monarch's handling of the Anglo-Dutch wars, e.g. the Dutch raid on the Medway (1667)</li> <li>• Prompted by the Exclusion Crisis, Charles II dispensed with Parliament for the rest of his reign (1681–85); when James II faced opposition to his pro-Catholic initiatives from MPs, he too suspended Parliament (1685).</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

## Section B: Indicative content

Question	Indicative content
3	<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 role of migration in the population growth experienced by Stuart Britain in the years 1625–88.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that migration played a significant role in the population growth experienced by Stuart Britain in the years 1625–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Population growth was affected by an influx of foreign migrants in 1651, notably Sephardic Jews, when religious toleration appeared to be an established policy</li><li>• Economic migration also had an impact on population size in particular areas, e.g. skilled weavers from the Low Countries settled in Norwich</li><li>• Internal migration to the towns during the 17th century often resulted in greater job security, which often led to more children being born</li><li>• The influx of French Huguenots following the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) contributed to population growth, as did slaves who were brought back from imperial possessions to work in England.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that migration did not play a significant role/other developments played a significant role in the population growth experienced by Stuart Britain in the years 1625–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• During the 17th century it is likely that more people emigrated from, than came to, Britain, e.g. some 330,000 left for the West Indies, Virginia, Maryland and New England</li><li>• Outbreaks of plague and other epidemic diseases occurred less frequently during the 17th century than in the late Middle Ages, partly due to better isolation and containment methods, and this lowered mortality rates</li><li>• When afflicted by disease, the population was often able to recover rapidly, e.g. some areas such as Eyam in Derbyshire had replaced their losses due to the 1665 plague within a decade</li><li>• Before 1650 and after 1680 fertility rates were relatively high, driven by the early average age of men and women at marriage, which tended to produce more children.</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 extent to which the growth of banking and insurance was responsible for the expansion of the Stuart economy in the years 1625–88.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the growth of banking and insurance was responsible for the expansion of the Stuart economy in the years 1625–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Banks played an important role in the expansion of lending as interest rates fell from 10 per cent (1624–51) to 8 per cent (after 1651), making commercial borrowing more attractive</li> <li>• Money scriveners such as Robert Abbott and Robert Clayton also offered or brokered loans to facilitate economic expansion; between 1652 and 1655 approximately £1.13 million went through Abbott's accounts</li> <li>• Goldsmith bankers based in London were able to use their reputation for integrity to offer competitive short-term loans at 6 per cent and encourage more businesses and individuals to obtain finance through banks</li> <li>• The availability of cheaper marine insurance (insurance costs fell by 75 per cent over this period) also promoted economic growth by encouraging overseas trade and imperial expansion</li> <li>• The development of housing/fire insurance stimulated economic growth, e.g. Dr Nicholas Barbon's Insurance Office for Houses (1680) had insured over 4,000 London houses by 1683.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the growth of banking and insurance was not responsible/other factors were responsible for the expansion of the Stuart economy in the years 1625–88 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commercial influence of banking during the 17th century was restricted, partly because most businesses were small and did not require sophisticated banking facilities</li> <li>• The part played by imperial expansion, e.g. the beneficial economic effects of the Navigation Acts (1651 and 1660), the growing role of the East India Company and British control of the slave-based 'triangular trade'</li> <li>• Changes in the cloth trade, e.g. the growth of the 'putting-out' system and the establishment of the 'new draperies' fuelled by Protestant immigration</li> <li>• The impact of the coastal coal trade (which expanded from 400 small to 1400 larger ships across the 17th century) and of agricultural developments, e.g. improved farming techniques and more specialised farming</li> <li>• London's population and economic growth during this period stimulated the growth of a market economy in the home counties, the beginnings of a national market, greater agricultural specialisation and better transport links.</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 the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King 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>• A key consequence of the Glorious Revolution was that the monarchy was now more financially dependent on Parliament than it had been under the Restoration settlement</li><li>• The monarch's prerogatives were reduced by parliamentary legislation, e.g. the Triennial Act (1694) and the Act of Settlement (1701)</li><li>• The monarch was also limited by the practical problems involved in dealing with Parliament.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Declaration of Rights did not compel the monarch to call Parliament more regularly</li><li>• Financial oversight by Parliament was not new since similar measures had been passed earlier in the 17th century</li><li>• After the Glorious Revolution, the monarch chose (but was not forced) to provide the Commons with an annual expenditure estimate.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To ensure its continued existence and role in government, Parliament controlled finance as much as possible, e.g. the Commission of Public Accounts set up in 1691</li><li>• The Act of Settlement 1701 provided for the Hanoverian succession to the throne, weakening the concept of hereditary monarchy and asserting Parliament's right to decide this issue</li><li>• The Mutiny Act (1689) and the Triennial Act (1694) ensured regular parliamentary elections and annual parliamentary sessions</li><li>• The need to cooperate with Parliament meant William III was restricted in his choice of advisers and policies; in practice William III needed advisers who could manage Parliament and ensure support in the Commons.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the Glorious Revolution 'transformed the relationship between King and Parliament'. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Bill of Rights was a limited document representing a response to the immediate situation with its potential for disorder rather than a considered</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="395 172 1023 203">plan of constitutional and ecclesiastical reform</p> <ul data-bbox="347 230 1406 546" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 230 1406 331">• During the second half of the 1690s, the Commission of Public Accounts was increasingly used to attack particular ministers rather than to act as a check on finances</li><li data-bbox="347 356 1406 456">• Committees of Accounts had previously been established in 1644 and 1667 and William III was actually the first to suggest that the royal accounts should be opened up for inspection</li><li data-bbox="347 481 1406 546">• William III could still decide on issues of war, peace and foreign policy, and was still able to choose his own ministers and advisers.</li></ul>