



# **Examiners' Report** **June 2022**

**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 2022

Publications Code 9HI0\_1C\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this first post-Covid 1C paper, 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. A number of scripts 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. On the whole, candidates 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, make assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence or drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider-taught topic.

## Question 1

On Q1, stronger responses offered an analysis on how accurate it is to say that the failure of Charles I's personal rule (1629-40) was mainly due to the religious policies of William Laud. There was reasonably even coverage between the religious policies of William Laud (eg Laud's religious reforms and his concept of the 'beauty of holiness' weakened personal rule by offending English Puritans who feared a revival of Catholicism under Charles I; Laud weakened personal rule by giving church courts the power to interfere in secular affairs and many saw this as an attempt to reverse the Reformation and undermine the power of the nobility and the gentry) and other factors (eg resistance to the levying and extension of Ship Money; resentment generated by the revival of feudal payments and selling monopoly licences; Charles I's problems in funding the military campaign against the Scots). There was some balance in arguments for/against, although valid conclusions could be reached either way. More importantly, the focus remained largely on causation with consistent analysis exploring this second order concept. Judgements were well-reasoned and thus considered criteria, and high-scoring responses were clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge of the reasons for the failure of Charles I's personal rule (1629-40), or a largely narrative accounts of the years 1629-40 with little focus on the religious policies of William Laud. Some low-scoring answers dealt mainly with one aspect of Laud's religious policies (eg Laud's policies hardened opposition to Charles I's personal rule by reinforcing popular perceptions of growing Catholic influence at the royal court) but where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it was not developed very far. Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

In the years between 1629 and 1640, Charles ruled without the assistance of parliament. ~~This meant that he had to~~ during this period, a number of factors can be attributed to long parliament being called in 1640. One of these factors is William Laud's influence on religious policy in Britain and the ways in which his aim of achieving arminian religious uniformity led to an increased call for a parliament. Alternatively the religious events, implemented by Charles I had an ~~impact on the~~ influence on why parliament was recalled, particularly the introduction of the prayer book in Scotland. During this time, Charles faced a number of financial issues, and his response to these can also be seen as having an effect on parliament being called. Therefore, this essay will assess these aforementioned factors in order to reach a conclusion on which was the most influential in the ending of the Personal Rule.

One factor that had considerable influence during the Personal Rule, was William Laud,

(Section A continued) Laud was made bishop of London in 1628 and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, ~~clearly~~ ~~laud~~ had strong ~~reflex~~ his rise to clerical power showing his influence in Charles and thus the nation's religious policy. Laud was an Armerianist much like Charles ~~an~~ which meant that his reforms in church had catholic influence, such as the changing of the colour of the clergy's vestments and installation of stained glass windows in churches. These introductions were heavily disputed as England was a ~~catholic~~ protestant country and in the 1600s, if you believed that you were worshipping incorrectly, that would have been a terrifying prospect. At this time, the majority of the political elite were calvinists and therefore opposed Laud's reforms. ~~the anti-laudian~~ Anyone publicly opposing Laud such as John Lilburne in 1638 who distributed anti-laud pamphlets was prosecuted using the Court of High Commission - this was seen as an abuse of power ~~by~~ parliament which can be seen by their abolition of this court after they were recalled in 1641.

(Section A continued) This therefore shows how lands influence during the personal rule was strongly opposed and therefore was ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> important significant part of ~~parliament's~~ the ending of the personal rule.

~~At the~~ In this period, Charles was unable to raise taxes without the approval of parliament following ~~to~~ a 1628 Act. This meant that he had to ~~effect~~ raise funds in alternative, often highly disputed ways. Perhaps the most ~~significant~~ significant of which was the introduction of ship money in 1634, ship money ~~was~~ was a wartime tax and was used to build ships. Its initial introduction in coastal counties wasn't a problem, however when the tax was made to be paid in all counties, many felt that the tax was being used as a way for Charles to avoid calling parliament as it was not necessary for ship money to be collected inland as they were counties less at risk. Charles making the tax an annual tax the year after only heightened peoples dislike for ship money, therefore pushing for the recall of parliament.

(Section A continued) in 1640, and with its recall, Parliament swiftly ~~was~~ made Ship Money illegal in 1641. ~~This~~ Ship money can thus be seen as creating a rising anger against the monarch and parliament was the obvious solution, hence the end of the rule.

Another key reason for the recall of parliament was the introduction of the Anglican prayer book in Scotland in 1637. The prayer book was announced in 1633 at Charles' coronation ~~at~~ and was opposed strongly then, leading up to its introduction, this opposition grew, and therefore when it was introduced in Edinburgh 4 years later, there were organised riots and general protest. This was because the Prayer book was Romanist, and the Scottish were predominantly Presbyterian. This new prayer book was seen as having too much Catholic influence, hence the rioting. This tension grew as can be seen in the ~~signing of~~ <sup>1638</sup> a National Covenant opposing the book, which was signed 300,000 times. This then resulted in ~~the~~



(Section A continued) The Bishops War of 1639. This war put a huge drain on the king's resources and therefore can be seen as one of the key reasons for the recall of parliament in 1640, as Charles needed a way of raising taxes to fund the war.

One other factor that can be attributed to the failure of the personal rule, was the number of financial policies brought in by Charles to accommodate for the lack of funding from parliament. Charles brought in a scheme by which he would offer a knighthood to anyone earning above £100 a year, and then fine anyone refusing the offer. Charles also created monopolies, with soap for instance, where he would fine anyone caught not using said monopoly. Whilst this raised considerable amounts of money, it was heavily opposed as it was seen as an abuse of power on the king's behalf. This ~~can~~ can be seen as one reason as to why parliament returning was such an

(Section A continued) appealing prospect to people of the time.

In conclusion, a number of factors can be attributed to the failure of the personal rule. However the introduction of the Prayer Book in Scotland was clearly the factor that had the most significant influence on parliament's recall as it caused the bishops war on thus pressured the king to call parliament to raise funds to fight this war. Whilst Charles continued ~~financial~~ introduction of opposed financial policy did cause turmoil, it if anything led to the prolonging of the personal rule as it kept Charles financially stable. William Laud is perhaps the second most influential factor in the failure of the personal rule, as his strong Arminian influence could be arguably a factor in the introduction of the prayer book in Scotland, and his abuse of the the Court of High Commission led to much disapproval of parliament.



This Q1 response secured high level 4 because it:

(1) attempts to focus on the role played by William Laud's religious policies in the failure of Charles I's personal rule (1629-40);

(2) considers the role of other causal factors eg financial issues and relations with Scotland;

(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 answer.

## Question 2

On Q2, stronger responses targeted how accurate it is to say that the instability of republican government in the years 1649-60 was primarily due to the attitudes and actions of Oliver Cromwell. These high scoring answers gave reasonable chronological coverage and covered a sufficient range of factors contributing to republican government instability, including the stated factor (eg Cromwell's role generally served as a source of tension since, ideologically, he was torn between religious radicalism and political conservatism; Cromwell's introduction of the rule of the Major-Generals (1655-56) was unpopular; Cromwell's refusal to become king (1657) was a lost opportunity to stabilise the Protectorate since the offer of the crown came with a new constitution, which would have established a limited monarchy; the development of radical religious groups provoked a conservative reaction against republican government; parliament-army divisions; the financial strains imposed by wars in Ireland and Scotland, and against the Dutch and Spain; the economic impact of harvest failures in 1658-60). There was some depth on the issue of government instability, and a consistent analysis exploring the interaction and/or weighing of these factors. Judgements were well-reasoned and thus considered criteria. Stronger responses were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to offer limited knowledge or limited analysis of the reasons for republican government instability, or a narrative of the 1649-60 period. 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 (eg Cromwell's pursuit of religious toleration was at odds with the prevailing views of the propertied classes who put conformity and order before freedom of conscience). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

It would certainly be ~~for~~ feasible to argue that the political instability of 1649-50 was primarily due to Cromwell's attitudes; ~~in that he not only~~ ~~was~~ did he present the nation with contradictory aims which turned both moderate and radical MPs against him (as seen ~~as~~ in the withdrawal of the 100 MPs during the first Protectorate parliament), but ~~to~~ he ~~for~~ controversy of having been the driving force of the regicide of Charles I meant that he ~~was~~ seen as deeply hypocritical and even blasphemous from the start of his leadership his leadership was difficult to legitimise from the off. However, it must also be considered that both the failure of the Rump to integrate any true radical changes, along with the politicisation of the army, also deeply heightened political tensions between 1649-50.

While Cromwell's spiritual leanings

(Section A continued) inevitably inspired hostility from a largely Anglican public, it must be considered that on taking on the role of Lord Protector in 1653, he inherited a country both under financial and military strain. ~~The way that the Rump had taken~~ The fact that the Rump had effectively been brought into existence by the military coup - Pride's Purge in 1648 - meant that they did not necessarily represent the politics of the people, but rather the vocal, radical minority: the Levellers. ~~This meant that~~ Charles I's execution thus inspired mass religious hysteria, due to many believing that the Rump had effectively killed 'god on earth' due to the widely believed terms of divine right. ~~The Rump were responsible in~~ ~~re-pace the country~~ The political unrest and growth in radicalism thus meant that the country were in no fit state to call elections, particularly of Feb 1649 when Scotland crowned Charles II king, a blatant rejection of republican rule. ~~To~~ To pacify the threat from dissenters, the Rump had introduced

(Section A continued) Conservative MPs ~~to~~ later in 1649, but this in turn angered the army. Having been intrinsic to the Pride's Purge, the New Model Army had been hopeful that their desire for more religious ~~education~~ ~~education~~ ~~education~~ would be realised, but this induction of Conservative MPs meant that radical reforms were less likely to be passed. Thus, the Rump was set in a precarious position between the threat of the army ~~to~~ and their already proven ability to manipulate politics by force, and ~~the~~ ~~moreover~~ their desire to appease ~~the~~ ~~Administration~~ ~~Administration~~ ~~Administration~~ appalled by Charles I's death. Moreover, the threat of military invasion, which was realised when the Scottish government gave Charles I their extremely well rewarded army, triggered a brief civil war, meaning that the Rump was also significantly weakened financially, making it even harder to pass significant reforms that needed adequate funding. This unrest and, arguably, vulnerability of the Rump led to Cromwell disbanding it by force in 1653, while this showcased that

(Section A continued) Cromwell was prepared to use militant force, ~~to~~ perhaps nodding to absolutist tendencies, ~~that~~ it could also be seen here that ~~position~~ the Rump had already established hostilities on both political sides, as well as Ireland and Scotland, before his rule.

However, it cannot perhaps be denied that Cromwell's contradictory aims for the country further heightened political and religious dissent. He claimed to want to 'heal and settle' the nation after the tumult of the civil wars, and yet his desire for a 'godly reformation' implied more church reforms. ~~however, his~~ ~~to more~~ ~~this~~ <sup>means,</sup> ~~the~~ blatant puritanical leanings, ~~means~~ and the religious anxiety they caused ~~can~~ can be exemplified in Perceval's uprising of 1655, which, while easily quashed, ~~was~~ perhaps ~~totally~~ was a factor to Cromwell's establishment of the highly unpopular Major Generals late that year. ~~Indeed, the~~ ~~the~~ ~~Major~~ ~~generals~~



(Section A continued) \* His apparent anti-monarchist stance regarding absolutism ~~etc~~ was also made to seem deeply dubious in his later acceptance of the Humble Petition and advice

The induction of the Major Generals came about after Cromwell's dissolution of the first protectorate parliament when 100 MPs withdrew ~~down~~ as a sign of non-compliance with the Instrument of Government, ~~etc~~ showing that from the outset Cromwell was not governing a parliament who held him in complete confidence. Their establishment acted as ~~an~~ almost a ~~sort~~ of military dictatorship before the recalling of the second protectorate parliament two years later, ~~and~~ ~~was~~ 11 Major Generals were each assigned one county, and were put in place both to impose Cromwell's protestant reformation, as well as to put a stop to potential uprisings. Their powers, however, deeply undermined the little popularity Cromwell had held at the start of his regime. They were not only given the ability to punish people for behaviour considered 'blasphemous' (they closed inns,

(Section A continued) ~~brackets~~ deeply alienating ~~and~~ them from the public, but ~~at~~ were also unpopular ~~at~~ with JP's, whose power they undermined. Perhaps more significantly, they also ~~they~~ brought about the levying of a new tax for their upkeep, ~~the~~ ~~decimation~~ - decimation tax - which ~~caused~~ caused mass tax refusal and further decreased popularity in the Protectorate. Therefore, here it is arguable that Cromwell's radical religious reforms proved deeply provocative, both to members of authority (JP's) and also the general public, thus further ~~introducing~~ ~~the~~ invigorating threat of religious and political dissent, and ~~therefore~~ ~~caused~~ instability.

It could be further argued that ~~Cromwell's acceptance of the Humble~~ ~~petition~~ also showcased both <sup>internal</sup> ~~the~~ political instability, in that Parliament ~~at~~ were attempting to gain more control ~~of~~ over the king, and also created more public instability due to the hypocrisy of Cromwell ~~totally~~ agreeing to most of its terms. In ~~the~~ ~~the~~ B Petition

(Section A continued) ~~They~~ would make parliament a more prominent and permanent political force as it proposed a Constitutional Monarchy; they would thus hold more power and leverage over Cromwell. However, Cromwell's power was not only not undermined, ~~to~~ while he was Cromwell accepted all terms other than king - he was effectively 'king in all but name' - and while his <sup>generally</sup> 'appeared' the army, who had opposed taking the role of king voluntarily, there were some who saw this as deeply undermining of Cromwell's ~~to~~ apparent anti-monarchical values, ~~a~~ again lowering his popularity as leader. Cromwell's power within government, despite parliament's attempts to curtail it, was not constrained; he assigned allies ~~to~~ the ~~places~~ seats in the 'Other House' which was able to veto ~~the~~ laws put forward by government. ~~This was~~ It is thus evident here, then, ~~to~~ that despite theoretically agreeing to terms issued by Parliament, Cromwell still ~~held~~ held definitive power, thus exemplifying

(Section A continued) The lack of genuine democracy within parliament, and thus ~~for~~ the ~~potential~~ <sup>potential</sup> for political ~~stability~~ <sup>instability</sup> that he instigated.

To conclude, it must be recognised that Cromwell inherited a country deeply shocked from the regicide of Charles I, meaning that religious dissent was perhaps even more abundant than in the reign of Charles I. However, it must also be acknowledged that the militancy with which he attained leadership, the extremity of his radical religious charges, and the hypocrisy of his stance on blasphemy when he led, to many, quite literally killed off 'god on earth', meant that his leadership was inevitably unstable.



This Q2, level 5 response possesses several strengths, namely,

(1) it targets the importance of Oliver Cromwell's attitudes and actions for the instability of republican government in the years 1649-60;

(2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the importance of Oliver Cromwell's attitudes and actions and other factors eg the role played by Oliver Cromwell, the Rump parliament and the Major Generals;

(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 3

On Q3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the significance of the role played by the Royal Society in promoting a 'scientific revolution' in Britain in the years 1625-88. They weighed the significance of the stated factor – the Royal Society (eg the Royal Society was boosted by a royal charter and Charles II's interest in science, which made it a high-profile forum for scientific investigation; the Royal Society attracted ground-breaking scientists such as Robert Hooke and Isaac Newton; the Royal Society produced the first scientific journal, *Philosophical Transactions* (1665) which performed the important function of disseminating scientific discoveries and information) against the significance of others (eg the role of notable individuals such as Bacon; the influence of earlier forums such as the Gresham College Group and scientific groups based at Oxford and Cambridge; the impetus for scientific enquiry from other quarters such as the Royal Observatory). A clear range and balance was evident here too (across the period, and arguing for/against the significance of the Royal Society) in order to examine and explore key issues. 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 limited analysis of the significance of the Royal Society. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a narrative account of the Royal Society during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (eg only focusing on part of the 1625-88 time frame). Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The years 1625-88 created a massive foundation for Scientific changes and social change that is still considered useful to this day. Through this period there was a new promotion of logic and reason over superstition and tradition. However many historians still debate the significance of each cause of this Scientific Scientific revolution. While some believe it was mainly down to the promotions of the ~~Scientific Revolution~~ Royal society, others believe that ~~it~~ it had been widely promoted by individuals like Francis Bacon and Isaac Newton before this. Therefore this essay will discuss the significance of each role in promoting the Scientific revolution.

First to be considered is the key role of the Royal Society, this was a group of individuals that met to share new scientific ideas. The group consisted of well educated upper class men that had a common interest in promoting new ideas based on logic rather than superstition. This ~~group~~ group created a useful platform to help share and promote ideas rather than only a single individual carrying out their own experiments. It help spread ideas quickly and more

(Section B continued) widely and also allowed scientists to debate ideas with each other. However, when considering how useful this group was in promoting ideas, it must be noted that this was only made a formal group in the 1660's. Before this there was not a climate for promoting these ideas, this was until the restoration, after Charles there was more eagerness and interest in this development and of scientific ideas, this was when the Royal Society was formed. It could be thought that this group was merely a smaller contribution to the revolution after the hard work individuals had put in prior to set a climate for it.

A key individual in the scientific revolution was Francois Bacon and his development of the experimental method. The idea behind this method was to evaluate the outcomes using facts and experiments, to set aside any preconceptions and to use the mind and commonsense during experiments. This set up a whole new idea on how to look at things that happened, rather than using religious beliefs to rationalise issues, they would be resolved through reason and evidence. This helped pave the way for individuals like Newton to help create theories like the laws of gravity still used to this day without change.



**(Section B continued)**

In conclusion, when considering what was most significant in promoting the scientific revolution, it is important to notice the links. The roles of key individuals like Bacon were really useful in setting the foundations for this revolution, however when considering which body was more useful for the promotion of it this must be the Royal Society. This created a platform to not only debate and share ideas but improve and spread them. For years prior to this many had tried to promote their discoveries but with little notice. Having a group with royal and higher connections allowed for the spread and development of these ideas to evolve at a rate higher than before.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Q3, level 3 response offers

(1) some analysis of the significance of the role played by the Royal Society in promoting a 'scientific revolution' in Britain in the years 1625-88 (but the candidate offers limited range and depth);

(2) some analysis of the significance of other factors/individuals but this is limited to Francis Bacon.



When planning your answer to support/challenge a 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 4

On Q4, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of how accurate it is to say that British agriculture was transformed in the years 1625-88 and were focused clearly on change/continuity. Sufficient knowledge was applied to develop an analysis (eg enclosure intensified in the 17th century; new agricultural techniques/crops were introduced; the development of specialist regions; the emergence of large commercial farms after the 1650s; enclosure was not new in 1625; agriculture could still be adversely affected by harvest failures (eg 1657-61); agriculture continued to dominate the economy; large commercial farms were not that common during this period) and there was a clear range and balance (across the period and arguing for change and continuity regarding the transformation of British agriculture) in order to examine and explore key issues. Judgements made about change/continuity regarding the transformation of British agriculture were reasoned and based on clear criteria. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and often described features of British agriculture in the years 1625-88 with limited focus on how these changes did or did not alter the status of women. Some low-scoring responses devoted virtually all attention to one particular aspect (eg the introduction of new agricultural techniques or the intensification of enclosure) or focused on part of the period (eg from about 1650), thus restricting range. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

In the years 1629-88, British agriculture experienced huge ~~agricultural~~ changes, which ~~arranged~~ <sup>significantly</sup> benefitted the Stuart economy. The ~~the~~ new techniques used ~~massively~~ caused Britain's agricultural output to skyrocket, as farming became more efficient and yields increased. However, when using the criteria of whether all classes benefitted and whether changes were widespread, it can be determined that agriculture was not transformed, as many <sup>farming</sup> suffered financially from these developments.

Many ~~from~~ <sup>farming</sup> ~~agricultural~~ techniques were introduced ~~down~~ during the years 1625-88, aimed at modernising agriculture. One significant example ~~is~~ of this is enclosure, which replaced the previous open field system. This enabled small holdings to be ~~as~~ enclosed by fences to allow ~~one~~ a single land owner to have more freedom to experiment with new crops and specialised breeding.\* Thanks to the increase in yeoman literacy rates books advocating new farming.

\*Some farms in East Anglia even exceeded 500 acres.

(Section B continued) Techniques became available, such as Walter Blith's 'A New Survey of Husbandry', with 1649.

This contributed to the spread of new agricultural ideas. <sup>and meant techniques were not isolated to one part of the country.</sup> However, it must be considered that ~~these~~ books were not accessible to the lower classes, many of whom were unable to read. In addition, the process of enclosure caused common land to shrink, meaning many were now unable to keep animals.

Many new techniques were introduced by the Dutch, such as the use of crop rotation, aided by the use of crops rich in nitrogen, such as clover. This meant that less land was left fallow, allowing for an increased yield and therefore more creation of wealth. ~~By 1720~~ In 1720, 7 million acres of land was available for the use of arable farming, with 3 million left fallow, compared to 9 million available acres and 1.8 million left fallow in 1700. ~~Therefore, when~~ When considering whether these changes constituted an ~~new~~ agricultural revolution, it is important to remember that not all classes benefitted from these changes equally, with many ~~being~~ ~~forced~~ small farms being forced out of business. Whilst new techniques were widespread throughout most of the country, their usage was not equally distributed throughout the classes. By 1688, there were over 1 million labourers, ~~and~~ indicating

(Section B continued) that there had been a decrease in small farms in favour of working for big farms. This work was considerably less secure, forcing many rural peasants to supplement their income through other means - by the end of the century, over 240,000 people were working in stalled crafts. Therefore, whilst new techniques significantly boosted the economy, and allowed for <sup>efficiency</sup> ~~growth~~ across the country to increase, the fact that this resulted in many less wealthy individuals losing their livelihoods shows that agriculture was ~~not transformed to a lesser extent~~ only transformed to a small extent.

The need to feed London's growing population was a significant factor in the <sup>development</sup> ~~growth~~ of agriculture, with the large food demands necessitating the introduction of national markets, such as those in Whitechapel and Fulham. ~~With~~ National markets meant that farmers were no longer limited to what growing only what their community desired, and could instead produce crops more suited to their regional climate. For example, the deep, dry soil and warm climate of the South & East was ~~perfectly~~ ideal for growing hops and oats. The need to supply London with food also ~~led~~ led to a boom in infrastructure, as well as the widening of rivers.

(Section B continued) to enable faster mass production of agricultural produce, with the use of rivers such as the Thames, the Ouse and the Severn. However, although small, isolated rural communities were unlikely to have access to national markets, and thus the impact of London did not benefit all areas. Furthermore, the resources of many South East communities were drained, and smaller brewing industries were forced to shut down as they were outcompeted by London. Therefore, although the growth of London did lead to agricultural developments, agriculture was only transformed to a small extent.

In conclusion, the Britain experienced many agricultural changes between 1625-88, which were indeed transformative for ~~so~~ certain sections of society, such as yeomen, the nobility and the higher gentry. However, these changes can not be considered truly transformative as they did not benefit all areas of the country, and resulted in the loss of livelihood for many much of the lower classes, worsened further by the impact of London's huge demands. Therefore, agriculture in Britain was not transformed in the years 1625-88.



This Q4, level 5 response possesses several strengths, namely,

(1) it targets change/continuity (transformed) in British agriculture in the years 1625-88;

(2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the extent to which British agriculture was transformed during this period, eg new agricultural techniques, insecurity in the agricultural economy and the growth of London;

(3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant, analytical response.



## Question 5

On Q5, stronger responses developed a clear extract-based analysis of the statement that, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned'. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts (eg after 1688, personal government by the monarch remained largely intact; the royal court remained central to political influence; the cabinet did not reduce the monarch's personal power; parliament exploited the King's need to finance his war against France to strengthen its position relative to the monarch; in the 1690s, parliamentary scrutiny of public expenditure constrained the King's authority; William III had to choose ministers who could work with parliament). Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views put forward in the extracts (eg in 1689 the King still retained most of the executive powers restored in 1660 and remained head of the Church of England; William III ensured that the cabinet was rigorously segregated in its functions to preserve monarchical power; the introduction of a Public Accounts Commission (1691) strengthened parliament vis-à-vis the monarch; through the 1689 Mutiny Act and the 1694 Triennial Act, the monarch had to accept parliament as a permanent institution; 'insufficient' annual settlements meant the King had no choice but to meet regularly with parliament, thus enhancing its influence and authority) and was firmly linked to issue of 'still ruled as well as reigned' and the extracts. Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned'), rather than a more general Glorious Revolution 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 (eg the events of 1688-89 did not constrain the monarch (extract 1), or parliament now had greater financial power (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, eg '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, after the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89, the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned' [Extract 1, line 1]? Politics 3

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

(20)

Both extracts present contrasting perspectives on the notion that the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned'. Extract 1 propagates that the king remained dominant, supporting the above statement, whereas Extract 2 acknowledges the limits on the king's power in practice, and ideological changes <sup>may</sup> dispute the idea he 'still ruled'. For this reason, Extract 2 is more convincing.

In Extract 1, Coward ~~is~~ shows us that the king was still pre-eminent and as such 'still reigned'. He says: 'Government was still largely personal — by the monarch... William retained a firm grasp of ~~the~~ the process of decision making'. This shows us that in practice, especially day to day, the monarch was still most powerful. We know this to be true as government was personal during the period, and William still had to approve decisions made by the cabinet. Therefore this supports the idea that the king 'still ruled'.



Bill of Rights, and the fact that as a result, "the nature of the monarchy was to change dramatically. This shows us that perhaps the monarch did not 'rule' as freely as previous Stuart kings, allowing to the changes as a result of the Bill of Rights.

The Bill of Rights 1689 fact that the Bill of Rights (1689) can be seen as the basis of <sup>a</sup> constitutional monarchy reinforce this. In ~~theory~~ The king was no longer allowed to interfere with the law, and in theory William could not levy taxes on the basis of prerogative without parliament's position. As such Miller shows us that maybe, considering the fact that previous Stuart kings had heavily relied on these powers, we can reason that ~~the king~~ <sup>William</sup> did not 'rule' to the same extent. This foundation of a constitutional monarchy and parliament's growing power emphasise this.

Furthermore in Extract 2 Miller continues to support the idea that the monarch 'still ruled' through his acknowledgement of parliament's military ~~power~~ control. He

The Civil List Act of 1697 meant parliament controlled all that draws attention to the fact that: "The commons used the king's need for money... to make regular parliaments and strengthen their bargaining position." This shows us that through financial changes in regards to the military, ~~it~~ one could say parliament now 'ruled', not the monarch. ~~But~~ The Civil List Act of 1697 reinforces this, as it meant parliament had complete control over military expenditure. This meant they could withhold supply when William needed support during his wars, and effectively hold him to ransom.<sup>\*2</sup> The notion of parliament being able to 'ransom' the king clearly shows us that ~~it~~ as a result of the Glorious Revolution and subsequent financial changes, ~~it~~ <sup>Miller</sup> conveys that it was now parliament who truly 'ruled', with William's 'reign' becoming a much more symbolic.

The Extracts disagree over the role of ministers ~~and~~ in their ~~fact~~ ~~the~~ king did contrasting perspective on the king's power. In Extract 1 Coward states

more: "Ministers might have to ~~supp~~ secure support for: "ministers... main concern was to retain royal favour." Miller instead highlights the significance of parliament regarding ministers in practice, stating: "In theory he was free to choose his ministers, in practice he needed men who could push his measures through parliament." This shows us <sup>of Charles's priorities regarding</sup> their disagreement ~~are the priorities of~~ ministers during the period. ~~The~~ In the Bill of Rights, <sup>William</sup> Charles was theoretically still free to choose his advisors and ministers. However, in practice this was massively undermined by the 1694 Triennial Act, ~~which~~ as a result of more frequent parliaments it resulted in ~~that~~ William could not establish a majority in the Commons. This meant in practice, ~~he had to choose~~ ministers as Miller alludes to, he had to choose ministers who were agreeable to parliament in order to be able to push any measures. Therefore this shows us a key disagreement among the two extracts, as Miller shows us that in practice the king's power was greatly changed, and he uses the

issue of ministers to support this. Coward instead focuses more on the medicinal power of the king through the shortcomings of the Bill of Rights.

Both Extracts do ~~not~~ agree on the presence of smaller committees in government during the 1690's. Coward states "decisions were made in smaller committees" and Miller highlights the "committees of accounts which scrutinized expenditure. We do know that the afore mentioned Committee of Public accounts (formed in 1691) did have some bearing on policy, given that they compelled William to reassess the size of the military. <sup>the extracts agree</sup> Therefore this shows us that these smaller committees did hold some political significance during the 1690's, however they were also heavily obstructed by government officials, - which neither extract acknowledges.

In conclusion Extract 2 is more convincing in its view that the monarch did not 'rule as well as reign'. This is because of Miller's recognition of the practical limits upon the king's power - particularly regarding ministers -

most do he shows, ~~and~~ coincided with the rise of parliament's power during the period. This disproves Coward's affirmations of William's "day to day" power, as it had become ceremonial by 1698, parliament was dictating policy.

---

### (SECTION C)

\*1 In addition, the fact that William made most key decisions during the Nine Years War demonstrates his ultimate power over government during the period.

\*2

This resulted in Parliament voting to reduce the size of the standing army to 10,000 in 1697 and 7,000 in 1698.





This Q5, 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 (after the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89 the monarch 'still ruled as well as reigned') rather than the general controversy concerning 1688-89;
- (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Coward and Miller 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 this paper, candidates are offered the following advice.

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question.
- Careful consideration of the issue in the question (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.
- A careful focus on the second-order concept(s) targeted in the question.
- Consideration of timing to enable the completion of all three questions (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, eg 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 in section A/B were:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, eg 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, eg looking at other causes, consequences, etc.
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg 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.
- 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.

Features commonly found in section C responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question (as opposed to preprepared 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, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits.
  - Careful use of own knowledge, eg 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 (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, eg 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 AO3.
- 
- Limited or uneven use of the extracts, eg 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, eg 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 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:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

