



Examiners' Report June 2018

GCE History 8HI0 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 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.



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. 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.

June 2018

Publications Code 8HI0_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 third year of the reformed AS Level Paper 1 Option 1C: Britain, 1625-1700: conflict, revolution and settlement.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of 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 hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, 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 greater depth of knowledge required where Section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the Section B questions covering a broader timespan. Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument 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, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, 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 targeted the reasons for the problems faced by the monarchy in the years 1625-40 and included an analysis of relationships between key issues and concepts required by question. Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (religious issues) and a range of other factors (e.g. Charles I's continued support for Buckingham, the Petition of Right and tax raising without reference to parliament). Judgements made about the relative importance of religious issues were reasoned and based on clear criteria. High scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for the problems faced by the monarchy in the years 1625-40. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or offered only on one narrow aspect of the question (e.g. of the stated factor – religious issues). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

On the 23rd July 1637, the new Laudian prayer book was read for the first time in Scotland - and it provoked rioting in St Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh. This precipitated the ~~end~~ end of Charles I's Personal Rule in ~~1640~~ April 1640. Other factors include the financial issues omnipresent throughout Charles' reign, and ~~monarchy~~ waning monarchial popularity in general; yet undoubtedly it was religious issues that was most crucial to the monarchy's problems in this period, being so inextricably tangled up with the other problems of finance, and ~~the~~ opposition.

Firstly, ~~the~~ Charles' Scottish Problems ^{were} were integral to the failure of Personal Rule: Now the Bishops Wars required exacerbated Charles' unfavourable financial situation to such an extent that he was forced to call the short Parliament in April 1640, under the advice of Stragford, in order to obtain funds to fight a second Bishops War after the initial defeat. Charles knew that his county militias, poorly trained, would no longer be sufficient, and thus needed Parliament

(Section A continued) to vote him a new taxation. Yet this opportunity was utilised by Parliament, long exasperated at their eleven years of repression, to ~~do~~ make a range of demands to assert their rights. Thereby the Scottish Problems foregrounded the political rift of between monarch and Parliament. This rift continued into the Long Parliament, in which Charles 6th had no choice but to remain with Parliament given that he had been forced to pay the Scots £850 per day whilst they occupied Newcastle as part of the Treaty of Ripon. In this way, Scottish Problems were integral to problems of the monarchy in this period, as they represented the confluence of the three major factors that plagued the Charles: monarchical unpopularity, ~~the~~ magnificent finance and religious disagreement.

Religious issues were central to the monarchy's problems as they accumulated opposition against Charles. Laud's religious reforms, based on his favouring of Arminianism and gave on the "beauty of holiness" greatly angered the vocal ~~part~~ Puritan minority in the Short Parliament and in Parliaments previous to 1629 (Personal Rule began on the 10th March 1629). The Puritans

(Section A continued) objected to Arminianism as they considered it "crypto-Catholic" and connected it to authoritarian government and absolutism (an association with Louis XIV's French model), as well as believing that aesthetic 'gorge' had no place in religion. This ever since 1626's York House Conference, where Villiers ^(the king's favourite) had made public his favouring of Arminianism, a rift had begun to open between Charles and his people. Furthermore, this was compounded by Laud and Charles' policy of religious uniformity, and they attempted to impose this on Scotland also. The Scot's Kirk, beloved since Knox's 1560 reformation, was Presbyterian and thus the Book of Canons (1636) and the English Book of Common Prayer (1637), when imposed, enraged the country, leading to the signing of the National Covenant by Mowbray, a declaration of intention to defend the Kirk from Charles. Charles' travails, unwise in his policy with Scotland, which he had only visited once - for his coronation in 1633 - and triggered the First and Second Bishops Wars. Other religious Religion, then, was integral as it was linked to public discontent with Charles' character and authoritarianism: for instance Charles

(Section A continued) In 1637 he sentenced Prynne, Bastwick and Burton to its mutilation and imprisonment for voicing their Puritan criticism of his religious policy.

Another ~~major~~ factor was finance and this caused problems for Charles ^{from} since his accession in 1625. His Personal Rule was an attempt to attain ~~the~~ financial independence from Parliament, whom he perceived to be demanding too much in return for authorization for taxes: notably their Three Resolutions (2nd March) (1629). Yet this cannot be called a major factor as Charles in many ways was successful in establishing financial security: he revived old feudal laws such as Distraint of Knighthood (a ~~fine of £100~~ ^{fine} for those ^{eligible} who ought to apply for knighthood) and ^{finer for} encroachment on royal forests. In 1635 he extended Ship Money as a ~~the~~ national tax to inland counties, which earned him as much as £200,000 annually. Yet these historians such as Bryce and Lynch have argued that Charles could have extended Personal Rule "indefinitely" had he not become embroiled in Scottish Problems, as his financial steps developments were admirable. Yet they were not uncontroverted: in 1637 the

(Section A continued) highly publicized John Hampden case caused ^{public} opposition and discontent onto Charles in such a way that it made the key defense lawyer Oliver St. John a heroic figure. The case's ruling that only £6,000 out of twelve lawyers in favor of Charles called into question the legitimacy of the Ship Money and arguably caused only 20% of the expected yield to be collected in 1639. (Though historians have argued that this was more due to county sheriffs being occupied with raising armies to fight the Scots.) In this way, finance was played a part, however it was less significant than the other issues.

Overall, religious issues were most fundamental to the problems faced by the monarchy in the period. Finance was important only as it was used as a pawns for Parliament and king to play out their own political and religious disagreements, and although it was the ultimate trigger and failure of the period, ~~it only had such its~~ the reason for this was that the monarchy had been sufficiently weakened and substantially weakened by Puritan opposition (for instance Pym and the Providence Island Shipping Company) and religious

(Section A continued) grievances with the Scots.



This Level 4 response possesses several strengths, namely: (1) it targets the reasons for the problems faced by the monarchy in the years 1625-40 and has a good focus on the stated factor - religious issues, (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the stated factor (e.g. Laud's reforms, religious conflict with Scotland) and other factors (e.g. financial problems, relations with parliament), and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on 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 the reasons for Charles II's difficult relations with his parliaments in the years 1665-81 and included an analysis of relationships between key issues and concepts required by question. Sufficient knowledge was used to develop the stated factor (fear of royal absolutism) and a range of other factors (e.g. parliamentary opposition over finance and taxation, and the king's attempts to pursue a pro-Catholic agenda). Judgements made about the relative importance of royal absolutism were reasoned and based on clear criteria. High scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly simple, limited analysis of the reasons for Charles II's difficult relations with his parliaments in the years 1665-81. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far or offered only on one narrow aspect of the question (e.g. of the stated factor – royal absolutism). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Restoration = 1660

Chosen question number: **Question 1**

Question 2

Plan

Absolutism

• Dissolves Parliament

↓
less trust

↓
frustration

• Divine Right.

Absolutism

Finance

↳ 1670 - Dover

↓
money outside of Parliament

• ↑ reliance on Parliament.

Religion

FEAR OF CATHOLICISM

• 1670 - Treaty of Dover → Louis XIV
money / land

↑ Catholic

Whigs vs. Tories

Tories

For James

• Divine right

BUT support ↓

Whigs

Clarendon Code

1661 - 64

Triennial Act

1669
↓
3 years
renew

(Section A continued) The fear of royal absolutism was a common occurrence and factor in the relationship between Crown and Parliament. The threat of tyranny was feared and it increased tensions with Parliament. There are other factors such as a fear of Catholicism, which, like absolutism, was a major concern and the two can be linked. In addition, Parliament itself and the Whigs and Tories also impacted the relationship between Crown and Parliament as there were clear divisions. Royal absolutism, for a major part, was crucial in the destruction of relationship with Parliament: ~~the relationship~~.

Finance could be seen as a trigger for absolutism. Parliament wanted to limit the Charles' independent ability by pushing for more reliance on the king's behalf. Furthermore, in 1670, the Secret Treaty of Dover was established between Charles and the French king, Louis XIV. This was a sign of absolutism as it enabled Charles to receive money outside of Parliament which undermined the authority of Parliament. Moreover, there was a fear of the influence of Louis, who was an absolutist and Catholic. This common factor of absolutism would draw Charles and Louis closer whilst driving Parliament away and would lead to suspected sympathies and more frustration from Parliament as Charles could not be trusted.

Another factor in Absolutism was the dissolution of Parliament several times. During the Exclusion Crisis, Charles dissolved Parliament each time it was not satisfied. Charles' inability to work with Parliament was significant as it meant tenuous relations with the monarch.

(Section A continued) and a continued lack of trust. Charles' arrogant belief in the divine right of kings made him feel a sense of superiority above everyone, including the Courts.

On the other hand, a fear of Catholicism also had a large role. For years, religious divisions were prominent throughout the country. Charles was supposedly a secret Catholic yet only converted on his death bed. His close ties to the absolutist and Catholic France, further weakened his relationship with Parliament. For a part, a fear of Catholicism links to absolutism due to Louis XIV and Charles' absolutist tendencies when attempting to impose Catholicism. One factor of the Secret Treaty of Dover ~~with~~ in 1670 was that Charles would declare publicly that he was Catholic in exchange for money and land. However, the fact he didn't could suggest that a fear of Catholicism, although important, was not crucial in regards to relationships with Parliament until James' reign.

Parliament's role, although not as pivotal as Charles', was still able to cause tensions. The divisions between Whigs and Tories demonstrated the oppositions within Parliament. The Tories were more royalist and supported the divine right monarchy, whilst the Whigs wanted to rid of the threat of absolutism and supported the liberties of people. The Clarendon Code (1661 - 1664) went against the idea of 'liberty for tender consciences' as outlined in Breda. It passed acts such as the Act of Uniformity (1662) which meant all public office holders had to take Anglican communion, but overall, it protected the Anglican monopoly in Church and state. Furthermore, in 1664, the

(Section A continued) Triennial Act was passed which meant regular Parliaments every 3 years. Such laws would have caused tensions as it undermined the authority of the monarch to try and prevent absolutism.

In conclusion, I would say that a fear of royal absolutism was significant in causing tensions between Crown and Parliament as the Secret Treaty of Dover (1670), for example, undermined the authority of the ~~man~~ Parliament. Also, the dissolution of Parliament in 1681 broke the Triennial Act which called for regular Parliaments. Despite the issue of religion, I think its significance was heightened with James II as Charles kept his religion a secret. Parliament passed such laws to go against the king but ultimately, the king had more power so this was less significant. I also think Parliament were successful in reducing the threat of Catholicism, making it less crucial.



This Level 3 response offers some analysis of the reasons for Charles II's difficult relations with his parliaments in the years 1665-81 (e.g. financial issues, fear of royal absolutism, dissolution of parliament, the monarch's perceived pro-Catholic agenda). Limited contextual knowledge is brought in to support and assess the relative importance of the causal factors selected. The criteria for judgement are mostly explicit and a conclusion on 'main reason' is reached at the end.



Be sure that you are able to make a logical judgement about the relative importance of the stated factor named in the question when set against your other selected factors.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses targeted the extent to which the power of the nobility declined in Stuart Britain in the years 1625-88. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (change/continuity) in the question. Sufficient knowledge to develop the argument was demonstrated too (e.g. impact of inflation, the civil war and overspending, the use of strict settlement or entail, the greater use of aristocratic titles under the later Stuarts). Judgements made about the extent of change and continuity concerning the power of the nobility 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 fairly simple, limited analysis of the extent to which the power of the nobility declined in Stuart Britain in the years 1625-88. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change/continuity or were essentially a description of the nobility during the 17th century. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. just the impact of the civil war or inflation). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The nobility influence declined during between 1625-88 mainly due to economic reasons. But religious and parliamentary changes also effected this.

The economy grew massively between 1625-88. The empire was bringing huge amounts of resources from the East. Spice, sugar, tea and tobacco

(Section B continued) because of this the insurance industry grew massively. In addition the size of London population boom in London ~~acted~~ stimulated the economy and many merchants and traders made a lot of money employing the new impoverished peasant work force escaping the from the poverty stricken countryside. This new group of powerful merchants and traders were ~~also~~ becoming more wealthy and gaining more political power ~~through~~ because of this at the expense of the nobility. This new group of ~~bourgeois~~ merchants



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This borderline Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers. It makes a few generalised statements about the decline of the nobility's power without really engaging with the issue at the heart of the question. It lacks range and depth and does not offer a clear judgement. There is little attempt to structure the answer appropriately.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

You will be expected to offer detailed knowledge to support your arguments. Check the specification so you know what is required.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses targeted the significance of the Royal Society in the promotion of a 'scientific revolution' in Stuart Britain (1660-88). These answers included an analysis of the links between key issues and a focus on the concept (significance) in the question. In addition, sufficient knowledge to assess the significance of the Royal Society in promoting a 'scientific revolution' (e.g. the Royal Society was boosted by a royal charter and attracted ground-breaking scientists such as Newton, Royal Society only dedicated exclusively to scientific research after 1684, other scientific groups at Oxford and Cambridge played a significant role) was demonstrated. Judgements made about the significance of the Royal Society 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 fairly simple, limited analysis of the significance of the Royal Society in promoting a 'scientific revolution' in Stuart Britain (1660-88). Low scoring answers often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of the Royal Society. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it lacked range/depth (e.g. the Royal Society was boosted by a royal charter and attracted ground-breaking scientists such as Newton). Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The creation of the Royal Society in 1660 was the arguably the most significant factor in promoting a scientific revolution because of how it created a community of scientists that could work together to ~~en~~ develop the ^{modern} ~~Seco~~ science. However, it could also be said that key individuals, like Frances Bacon had a larger impact.

The Royal Society played the most significant role in promoting the 'scientific revolution' in the years 1660-88 because it allowed scientists to share ideas. This was key because previously science was a ~~so~~ very solitary with few organisations, now however due to the Kings 1662 royal

(Section B continued) Charter and investments from wealthy men that see themselves as 'amateur scientists'; there was a well funded area of expertise. This was significant because. An example of how they shared ideas was through the first ever 'scientific journal', 'Philosophical Transactions' in 1665. It was because of this journal that ~~with~~ William Harvey found the missing link on the circulation of blood. ~~But~~ The Royal society became so popular and successful that it led to a shortage of fellows at universities and as they were all at the Royal Society. So the Royal society was very significant in promoting a 'scientific revolution' because gave scientists a respectable place in society (accepted by the King) and cleared away the suspicion surrounding society by making it so open and well known that others were attracted to join.

On the other hand, it could be viewed that a 'scientific revolution' was being promoted by Frances Bacon, before the Royal Society was even created. Frances Bacon was a scientist in the 1600's, he was significant because he created the Baconian Method, ~~the~~ which followed the idea that true science involves collecting all the data.

(Section B continued) possible on a subject before reaching a judgement. It also describes using precise, methodical, repetitive experimentation to ensure a fact is true before assuming so. The Baconian Method was revolutionary, inspiring philosophers and scientists alike, which is why he could be seen as the most significant aspect in promoting a 'scientific revolution', because he lay down a method that could be used for centuries and inspired many scientists, and the Royal Society itself.

One of those scientists he inspired was Isaac Newton who, despite being a part of the Royal Society (President in 1705), could be viewed as a significant individual in promoting a scientific revolution. In 1672, he invented the reflective telescope which allowed him to observe the heavens and help to prove Copernicus's theories on the movement of heavenly bodies (planets), it also allowed him to help prove Galileo's theories of the Earth orbiting the Sun.

While some may say that he only achieved these because of the Royal Society and the information it gave him access to, which is true. But however, he is a significant individual

(Section B continued) because his proofs of planetary movement and gravity began the separation of views between Church and science, because many religions believed Earth to be the centre of the Universe. This separation of views contributed to the 'scientific revolution' because it broadened the areas of research and made people question whether the church was wrong about ~~the~~ more things.

Overall, both Frances Bacon and Isaac Newton were revolutionary in their own ways and made contributions to the scientific revolution, however it was the Royal Society that creates the surge of science and new ideas that truly began the revolution, thus showing it is the most significant factor.



This Level 3 response offers some analysis of the significance of the Royal Society in promoting a 'scientific revolution' in Stuart Britain in the years 1660-88. Mostly accurate own knowledge is brought in to assess the relative significance of the Royal Society and some other factors (e.g. the individual contributions made by Bacon and Newton). 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 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were clearly focused on the extracts, and possessed the confidence and understanding to develop an extract-based analysis of the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to undermine the Anglican Supremacy. Higher scoring answers offered some comparative analysis of the two extracts, and used own knowledge effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views presented (e.g. the impact on mainstream Protestant dissenters, exclusion of Catholics, Unitarians and Jews, weakened Anglican influence). Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to undermine the Anglican Supremacy) rather than the general impact of the Glorious Revolution and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts. Weaker answers tended to show some understanding of the extracts and attempted to focus on the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to undermine the Anglican Supremacy but were likely to develop a limited range of arguments. At the lower levels, basic points were selected from the extracts for illustration and comparisons made between the two extracts were fairly rudimentary. Weaker candidates sometimes also relied almost exclusively on the extracts as sources of information about the impact of the Toleration Act. Others made limited use of the two extracts and attempted to answer the question relying largely on their own knowledge. Moreover, in lower scoring responses, the candidate's own knowledge tended to be illustrative (e.g. just tacked on to points from the extracts) or drifted from the main focus of the question. Furthermore, these answers were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 Historians have different views about how revolutionary, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution was. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your own knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How far do you agree with the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to undermine the Anglican Supremacy?

(20)

The two extracts have fairly varying perspectives on the significance of the Toleration Act on Anglican Supremacy. Miller argues that it was a "grudging measure" and enough other laws persecuting Dissenters and those that were in place that it did little to undermine Anglican Supremacy; Buchholz and Key see the event Act as more revolutionary and undermining of Anglicanism - "the Church's ability to demand obedience and good behaviour from its followers was weakening." Overall Miller's argument has more strength, as the Anglican ^{the} Church Supremacy retained much power.

Firstly, Miller argues that the Toleration Act "did not repeal any of the laws against Dissent," which is not ^{strongly} completely ~~done~~ contradicted by Buchholz and Key, who gave on the fact that "[m]ost of the penalties passed by the Cavalier Parliament were removed." In order to put this in context it is important ~~to~~ to

(Section C continued) understood that upon the 1660's Restoration of monarchy, the Cavalier Parliament of 1661 had forced Charles II to pass a number of Acts penalising non-conformists. This became known as the Clarendon Code and included the Corporation Act (1662), the Licensing Act (1662) and the Test Act (1673). The extracts agree that the Test Act was a ~~large problem~~ "chief remaining obstacle" yet Bucholz and Key propose that it could easily have been circumvented, whilst Miller presents it as more of a decisive & persecutory measure. It is likely that whilst Bucholz and Key are correct that it was not an impasse, many true Dissenters with true convictions would have found it difficult to practice "occasional conformity". In this way, the Test Act's ~~status~~ ^{notion} as remaining would ^{have} limited the Toleration Act's possibilities in undermining Anglican supremacy, as it preserved an Anglican elite who were able to inhabit important political offices. (It required an oath of allegiance to the Anglican Church, which Quakers, for instance, were unable to provide.)
~~Miller goes~~ // Miller goes on to argue that "higher education (& public offices) were to

(Section C continued) remain under Anglican control", supporting this evidence he uses is that of the "ban on dissenters attending... universities". Buchholz and Key disagree fundamentally with Miller on the nature of the Toleration Act's genesis. The latter ~~is~~ describes it as the "product of a cynical political deal", implying it is a compromise but not a drastic one, and certainly not one that reflected a ~~major~~ major transference of power away from the Anglican Church; whilst Buchholz and Key mention the "Church's ability... weakening", which implies a more substantial ~~deal~~ to ~~Anglican~~ blow to Anglican supremacy. Yet neither ~~see~~ extract sees the ~~act~~ undermining the reduction subversion of Anglican power as ~~as~~ by any ~~means~~ means final or conclusive; ~~it~~ ~~is~~ it is presented as a beginning step, not the "final humiliation of the High Anglicans", as it has been called elsewhere. Furthermore, both sources agree that any undermining of ~~the~~ supremacy was not to the advantage of "Catholics, Unitarians ~~and~~ or Jews" and only welcomed constituted ~~toleration~~ significant toleration for "Protestant Churches". ~~This argument is correct~~ ~~yet~~.

(Section C continued) Overall, the Miller focuses on the nature of Anglican ~~supremacy~~ ^{as} ~~be~~ remaining supreme over other denominations and religion, which is certainly correct. The Act of Toleration for other religions plowed out of the channels of Anglican power and ^{it} continued to govern ^{custom} dissenting meetings - they "had to keep their doors open", for instance. Baskin and Key focus more on the Anglican supremacy over ^{the} English people's everyday lives having been undermined. This, also bears weight, as the church's courts, especially, fell more and more into disuse and this constituted the ^{to} ~~end~~ also near to an end in attempts to enforce 'godliness' and to punish ^{of} 'sin' that was not already ~~covered~~ covered by the law; similarly the Toleration Act freed ~~the~~ "not only Dissenters... but also the sceptical, the lazy [etc.]" from having to go to church, which as a central ^{Anglican} ~~from~~ ~~church~~ centrality.



This Level 4 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely: (1) it offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis of 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 Toleration Act of 1689 did little to undermine the Anglican Supremacy) rather than the general controversy concerning the Glorious Revolution, and (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Miller and Bucholz/Key extracts.



Good responses often use 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 Paper 1 Option 1C, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses

Features commonly found in candidates' responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Paying close attention to the date ranges in the question.
- Giving sufficient consideration to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors.
- Explaining their judgements fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but rather a demonstration of their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements.
- Careful focusing on the second-order concept targeted in the question.
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable them to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one.
- 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.

Common issues which hindered performance were:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting 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 that 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.
- Making an assertion of change/causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change/cause of the issue within the question.
- Not reaching a judgement, or not explaining
- A lack of detail.

Section C responses

Features commonly found in candidates' 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 these 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 attempts to reconcile their arguments.

Common issues which hindered performance on Section C were:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, 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 these related to 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 lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within 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>

