

Examiners' Report
June 2019

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 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 2019

Publications Code 9HI0_1C_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this 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 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. 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 of the extent to which Charles I's actions and attitudes were responsible for the problems that faced the monarchy in the years 1625-40. There was reasonably even coverage between actions/attitudes and other factors were also examined, e.g. Charles I's continued promotion of Catholic influence at the royal court, his continued support for the Duke of Buckingham, his tax-raising without reference to parliament, his determination to impose religious changes in Scotland, opposition to Laud's actions and personal nature, Wentworth's harsh rule in Ireland and his mistaken advice to the King in 1639 regarding parliament.

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 problems facing the monarchy, or a largely narrative accounts of the years 1625-40 with little focus on Charles I's actions and attitudes. Some low-scoring answers dealt mainly with one aspect of Charles I's actions and attitudes, e.g. his continued promotion of Arminians 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.

Charles I in 1625-40 embarked on personal rule after 1629 in an attempt to govern without parliament, causing His actions and attitudes between 1625-40 were the main reason for the problems that he faced. His inability to ~~see when~~ ^{over religious} ~~back down when~~ ^{when it} policy did not work, and his attempts to raise finance without parliament caused discontent, and later problems for the monarchy. That being said, parliament had a role to play, ~~deliberately~~ actions refusing to co-operate, ~~so~~ but it was minor compared to the role played by Charles.

Charles I drive over religious policy made him responsible for the problems that he faced. When a new house of

(Section A continued) prayer was introduced ^{by him} in Scotland, and the Covenanters formed in 1637, who ~~regas~~ were determined to remove the new book of prayer, Charles failed to back down. He failed to see the risk ~~and~~ which led to the 1st Bishops war. This created problems for Charles as he lacked the funds to ~~successfully~~ fight a war, leading to the calling of the Short Parliament. Instead of granting ^{grants} Charles ^{grants} they discussed 11 years of grievances where they had not met ~~because~~ ^{during} of personal rule in the 3 years that they sat before Charles dissolved them again. This served to make Charles's situation worse, as he still lacked the funds to fight a war. Whilst Parliament was being uncooperative at the time, they hadn't been called since 1629 so their dissent is natural. Charles also failed to make meaningful concessions, ~~also~~ making the calling difficult in the first place. Charles also created problems for himself with his pursuit of Arminian religious implementation. This was extremely unpopular to most, because of its similarity to Catholicism. Charles failed to see this and pushed on regardless. This created problems for the monarch as it built resentment against him and his advisors making governance harder. Furthermore the punishments dealt out to those who wrote against the religious policy, such as Prynne and Bastwick, ^{who were tortured and imprisoned} ~~who~~ ^{were} served to make Charles even less popular. As a result, Charles's religious policies made ~~him~~ ^{his} action and attitudes towards religious policy make him responsible for problems facing the monarch.

Furthermore, Charles's need for and push for religious ~~independence~~ ^{during personal rule} created problems for him. As part of this aim, Charles implemented many financial methods to create profit income. Some of these were popular such as the 1630 Treaty of Madrid, where Charles made peace with Spain, dropping expenditure ^{on war} from around £500,000 in the years before to £70,000 in the years after. Other methods however were extremely unpopular. Ship money, a tax ~~that~~ previously only levied in war was introduced and applied to all counties every year. This created problems for Charles as, much like religious policy it made him extremely unpopular, as its legality was dubious, being challenged by Hampden whose case was only dismissed 7-votes to 5 in 1637, showing the building unpopularity. In addition to this, policy of Thorough in Ireland, implemented by Strafford to balance the books was extremely unpopular. Previous policy had favoured the New English, but attempts to ~~stop~~ ^{prevent} losing money stopped this, an extremely unpopular. This created problems for Charles as it fueled unrest in Ireland for years to come, and Strafford became a target for prosecution in later years, being executed in 1641. ~~While~~ Although Strafford was responsible for his own actions, and so entirely of blame cannot be placed on Charles, he had putted himself as his representative, so ~~that~~ this

(Section A continued) means that Charles was ^{mostly} responsible for problems in Ireland as well as other areas as a result of his financial actions.

Despite Charles being primarily responsible, Parliament did play a role in the problems facing the monarchy. As previously mentioned, actions in 1640 were uncooperative, but these were also seen before the start of personal rule. When Charles came to the throne, they refused to grant him tonnage and poundage for life as had been the precedent for numerous monarchs previously. This ~~lasted~~ instead a year at a time. This created problems as for the monarchy as it ~~passed~~ ^{passed} had to go to parliament and diminished its power, as it was now increasingly reliant on parliament. This helped to damage the relationship between Charles and parliament as a result of parliament's actions. ~~De~~ Although this is true, parliament had already been angered by Charles's close ally Buckingham's disastrous attack on Cadix, meaning their reigning in of monarch spending is understandable. Parliament also ~~was~~ ^{is} responsible for problems by ~~not~~ ^{not} celebrating Buckingham's death, refusing to follow the king's rule of law. When ~~he~~ ^{Charles} ordered the dissolution of the house of commons in 1629 they held down the speaker till they passed their three motions. This direct attack on Charles's authority is an example of them creating problems facing the monarch. ~~attacking~~ ^{attacking} on his

(Section A continued) rights as a king. Despite this, Charles's actions and attitudes were still primarily responsible, Parliament only sitting from 1625-29 before they were dissolved. This small time frame means that they could have limited impact, placing the responsibility for problems faced by the monarch on Charles.

In conclusion, despite parliament being answered with uncooperative at times, even attacking the monarch's authority, the short time frame that they sat meant that they could not be the primary reason. Charles was responsible for this. His failure to back down on religious policy and financial policy led to war and extreme unpopularity across England, Scotland and Ireland. This makes Charles I's actions and attitudes the primary reason for problems facing the monarchy 1625-40.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Q1 response secured high level 4 because it

- (1) attempts to focus on Charles I's actions and attitudes across the 1625-40 period;
- (2) considers the role of other causal factors e.g. the actions of Parliament;
- (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 failure of republican government in the years 1649-60 was primarily due to divisions over religious issues. These high-scoring answers gave reasonable chronological coverage and covered a sufficient range of factors contributing to republican failure, e.g. conservative reaction to (1) the development of the Fifth Monarchists, Ranters and Seekers, (2) Quaker radicalism (3) the separatism of the Baptists and Congregationalists, the narrow support base of the Commonwealth, opposition to Cromwell actions as Lord Protector and the rule of the Major Generals, Richard Cromwell's inadequacy as a leader. There was some depth on the issue of failure, 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 how divisions over religious issues contributed to the failure of republican government, 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, e.g. the conservative reaction to the development of Quaker radicalism in the 1650s. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

It would be accurate to say that division over religious issues were heavily responsible for the failure of republican government in the year 1649-60 as division in the Rump and the Nominated Assembly over religion delayed the reaching of a settlement, while opposition to Cromwell's religious reforms greatly increased the unpopularity of the government. However, Cromwell's role was also key to its failure due to his contrasting aims and failure to establish a settlement that would survive his death as well as the role of the army who created instability throughout the period.

One reason why religious divisions played a great role in the failure of republican government is because division in the Rump and the Nominated Assembly led to delays in reaching a lasting settlement. Having been heavily involved in the establishing of the republic during Pride's

(Section A continued) Purge in December 1649, the army were hopeful that the new republic would offer a greater amount of religious toleration. This There were, therefore, great division when the Rump failed to establish such toleration, with their godly reforms, such as the ~~Act against~~ seemed more like an attempt at controlling the religious radicals, while the Toleration Act of 1650 did not go far enough. Opposition to this therefore led to army intervention, when Cromwell and 30 soldiers entered the Rump and dissolved it on 20 April 1653, showing how religious division were key to the failure of the Rump Parliament. Such divisions were also present in the Nominated assembly, where a minority of 5th monarchists were keen to pass more radical religious reforms, such as an act declaring civil marriages could be performed by JP. However, this assembly too was unable to last due to religious division, as moderate opposition to a proposed Bill against tithes led to the ~~Parliament~~ Nominated assembly being shut down completely on 12 December and the power then handed back to Oliver Cromwell, who then proceeded to create more division with his

(Section A continued) religious reforms under the Protectorate.

Overall religious ~~divisions~~ divisions were key in the failure of government within the NA and the Rump, as due to them, neither was able to survive dissolution.

Another reason why religious divisions were key in the failure of republican government was because opposition to religious reforms under the protectorate created further instability and hostility towards the government. Cromwell, as Lord Protector, announced his aims for 'just and righteous reformation', and, as Parliament were not able to meet until September 1648, began his rule as Lord Protector by ruling by ordinances, reforming religion by introducing a system of trials and ejection to examine the clergy. This also created great division however when Parliament sat in September, as even the remaining MPs following his oath of Recognition refused to accept his ordinances as law, leaving Cromwell to quickly dissolve his first Protectorate Parliament ~~as soon~~ as soon as possible, after just 5 lunar months. Opposition to his godly reforms was also

(Section A continued) prevalent ~~due to~~ during his rule of major generals from 1655-56, leading to its end in January 1647, with the second Protectorate Parliament desperate to create a new settlement. Overall, religious ~~division~~ divisions under the Protectorate were key, as, ~~they~~ again, no way of rule was able to last long at all due to opposition to religion.

However, one could also argue that the role of Cromwell, and not religious divisions, were more key to the failure of republican rule, as it was his own failure to reach a stable political settlement, and indeed create religious policies that pleased were popular that led to the failure of republican government. A key error made by Cromwell in his attempt to reach a political settlement was his contradictory aims: ~~to~~ to 'heal and settle' implying an end to attempts to establish toleration, and a 'just and righteous reformation' implying a number of reforms to the church. Therefore, Cromwell was both opposed by ~~moderate~~ moderate republicans, shown by the 100 MP, who withdrew from the first Protectorate Parliament, and also moderates, who continued to oppose

(Section A continued) his returns once they had left, checking a stable settlement impossible to reach. These ~~contradictory~~ ~~aims~~ contradicting aims were also key as they meant that Cromwell was unable to establish a political settlement that would survive his death in September 1648, shown by the rapid failure of the republic under his son, Richard Cromwell by January 1650, who fled after being put under pressure by the army. Overall therefore, Cromwell's contradicting aims were key in the failure of republican government ~~to~~ as any proposed settlement, such as four ~~fundamental~~ fundamental principles were met with opposition on both sides, meaning he eventually failed to reach stability. However, one must also consider the challenge posed to him by religious divisions making it almost impossible for him to reach a settlement agreeable to everybody.

~~Another reason~~ One could also argue that it was in fact the army who played a greater role in the failure of republican government as it was their harsh imposition of

(Section A continued) godly reforms during the rule by major generals that caused so much religious opposition, as well as and as well as this, they constantly played a significant role through their use of force, not only dissolving the Rump Parliament, but also reinstating Charles as king. During the rule by major generals from 1653-56, where England and Wales were divided into 11 districts, each ruled by a major general, the army played a key role in their harsh imposition of godly reforms which created so much hostility and unpopularity, that this way of ruling was shut down after 2 years in January 1647. The army also of course played a key role through their use of force, not only shutting down the Rump in 1653, ~~but also through~~ ~~Monck's role in reinstating~~ and therefore delaying any settlement, but also through Monck's role in reinstating Charles II in January 1660, marking an end to, and therefore the failure of, republican government.

In conclusion, religious division were the main reason for the failure of republican

(Section A continued) rule as the ~~spread~~ spread of radical ideas created demands that ~~the~~ more moderate MPs refused to meet. Although the role of Cromwell was key to the failure of republican government, this was largely due to ^{the difficulty in dealing with} ~~his failure to deal~~ with the religious divisions already established in society and Parliament, while much of the opposition to the army was also heavily based on religious ideas, and in the same way, many of the army's motives for abolishing the Rump Parliament and reinstating Charles lay within religion.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

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

- (1) it targets the importance of divisions over religious issues for the failure of republican government in the years 1649-60;
- (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the importance of these religious divisions and other factors e.g. the role played by Oliver Cromwell and the army;
- (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



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 3

On Q3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the extent to which religious and legal changes altered the status of women in the years 1625-88 and were focused clearly on change/continuity. Examples included, limitations of the Marriage Act (1653) and the Adultery Act (1650), no change in law on witchcraft, women remained legally under the control of their husbands or fathers, the spread of Puritanism led to some improvements for women in education, concessions for women introduced by the Toleration Act of 1650, the Marriage Act reduced a husband's rights over his wife.

Sufficient knowledge was applied to develop an analysis and there was a clear range and balance (across the period and arguing for change and continuity regarding the status of women) in order to examine and explore key issues. Judgements made about change/continuity regarding the status of women 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 aspects of legal and religious changes 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, e.g. the impact of the spread of Puritanism or focused on part of the period, e.g. from about 1650, thus restricting range. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

For	Against
• Still ruled by men.	• Petitions allowed them to have their voices heard.
• Only took mens. places temporarily (during war).	• Could partake in some religious movements.
• Charles II reverted back to pre-war expectations.	• Women could be seen as prophets.
• Still seen as carer of house and children.	• Published more literature.
• Still couldn't hold offices.	→ Some exceptions such as Cromwell's granddaughter.

Prior to the revolutionary years women were seen as weak and incapable of performing the tasks men do. They had the role of caring for their home and children. However some changes were made during the years 1625-88 suggesting that the status of women did change such as the fact they could take part in some religious movements and some women even became prophets. On the other hand it's shown that women's status hadn't really changed as Charles II restored the changes as he wanted to revert back to the pre-war beliefs. However although even without Charles' actions women's position hadn't really changed significantly.

The main religious change was that ~~men~~ women were allowed into some religious movements, those who [↑]allowed. This was because some religious groups were trying to create social equality within England. This was mainly by radical religious

(Section B continued) Groups like the Levellers and Quakers, these groups also allowed women to become prophets for their religions. Women used this as a platform to express their opinions because they knew that as a prophet, their opinion would be heard. This suggests that the status of women did ~~increase~~ improve as they were accepted by religious movements and even moved into positions of authority when they became prophets.

Despite this the widespread ideology of women was that they were too weak, as in the Bible Eve committed the sin of eating the fruit. This led to men suggesting that women were both physically and intellectually weak and therefore they could not be educated or do the work that men do. This ideology was reinforced throughout 1625-88 which kept women in the same position they were always in as it was widely accepted that this was their role.

~~Women writing~~ After the collapse of censorship, women were allowed to write literature, ~~resulting~~ resulting in a massive increase of literature that was written by women. In their works they were again given a platform to express their opinions. In addition to this women began to petition in order to have their voice heard. This was shown when women petitioned to have John Lilbourne, the leader of a radical religious group, released.

~~the~~ This implies that women had a better position as they were able to express their opinions as censorship could no longer stop them.

During the wars like the Dutch Wars women took over

(Section B continued) Their husbands work as they went to fight in the war. This could suggest that women's ~~pre~~ status had improved as many were performing the jobs their husbands would prior to the war. However they were only temporarily ~~pre~~ doing their husbands job as when they came women would return to their role of being the carer of the home and children.

After the restoration settlement, Charles II was made the King of England and he wanted to return to England to its pre-war state meaning that the small changes ~~some~~ that had improved the position ^{of women} were reversed. Although some women still made it through the society Charles had created.

Overall legal and religious changes failed to improve the status of women as they were still seen as being subject to their husbands ~~but~~ despite the changes made in the revolutionary years. Furthermore the restoration of a monarch removed all the changes made in the revolutionary years so women's status remained the same other than a ~~selective~~ minority of women such as Oliver Cromwell's granddaughter.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Q3, level 3 response offers

(1) some analysis of the extent religious and legal changes in the years 1625-88 altered the status of women (but the candidate offers limited range and depth);

(2) mostly implicit criteria for judgement and a conclusion at the end that needs further development.



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 the significance of developments in agriculture for the growth of the Stuart economy in the years 1625-88. They weighed the stated factor (developments in agriculture) against the significance of others, e.g. the development of the lucrative tobacco trade in the early 17th century, the impact of the Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660, changes in the cloth trade, London's population and economic growth, British control of the triangular trade and the importance of the Caribbean sugar trade between 1655 and 1688.

A clear range and balance was evident here too (across the period, and arguing for/against the significance of developments in agriculture) in order to examine and explore key issues. Judgements made about the significance of developments in 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, at best, offered a limited analysis of the significance of developments in agriculture for economic growth. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on significance or were essentially a description of aspects of the British economy or agriculture during the period under discussion. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth, e.g. 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.

Plan

- ① Agriculture - intellectual changes
2 to 3 tiered society - large farms
- ② Agriculture - developed trade - growth of London
- ③ International trade
- ④ Commerce

Answer

The Stuart economy witnessed great change in the years 1625 to 1688, and one could argue this was a result of the development of ~~the~~ agriculture that thus saw its growth as a trading force, significantly increasing its efficiency, given the dispersion of new ideas through literature. Furthermore, agricultural changes saw an increase in farms and thus the structural and technical developments made in agriculture further consolidated its gain to the economy, ~~however, it could~~ ^{whilst} ~~be argued that the development~~ ^{when allowing crucially for the development} of international trade. ~~However it could be argued instead that it was~~ ^{However it could be argued instead that it was} ~~the growth of London, as well as the potential for~~ ^{the growth of London, as well as the potential for} the development in commerce in the textile industry, ~~as~~

that were

(Section B continued) ~~being~~ of greater significance.

The dispersion of new agricultural techniques served to generate ~~a~~ more efficient farming techniques that thus allowed for the increase in produce that helped ~~a~~ ~~create~~ create gain for the economy. New ideas were proposed and spread in literature, and therefore new techniques emerged, causing the use of crop rotation and fodder crops, as well as the focus on turnips and nitrogen rich crops, thus improving agricultural techniques so that they could become more efficient and generate greater produce, thus adding economical gain. Furthermore, intellectual changes in attitudes to agriculture caused the use of specialised farming, which instigated change for larger farms, and thus farms over 100 acres increased from 32% in 1600 to 53% in 1700. The growth of farms caused a fundamental shift from a 2 tiered society to a 3 tiered society, and caused the emergence of a large, wage-earning labour force. The preference for larger farms consequently served to increase the effectiveness of agriculture, and thus instigated an increase of produce, with grain exports increasing from 200,000 quaters per annum in 1660 to 300,000 quaters per annum in 1675. Furthermore, the development and emergence of large farms have contributed to the economy, given they

(Section B continued) became able to be purchased by gentry members, and therefore allowed for greater contribution to the economy.

Furthermore, the developments in agriculture essentially contributed to the growth of trade, both domestic and international, given the ability for grain to be exported, and thus benefitting the Stuart economy. Given the expansion of interest in international trade in the 17th century, the increase in exports helped to establish England as an international force. This economical gain, with custom revenues increasing 3.5 times in 1649-53, was consolidated by the Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660, as well as the staple Act of 1663, all of which served to assert British dominance given the closed and controlled trade. This therefore allowed Britain to prosper in exporting grain, however also generated greater developments in international trade, through new ^{sugar} plantations in the Caribbean, and the growth of the tobacco trade in North America, and therefore British diversification and expansion of trade routes ~~to~~ allowed for great economical gain, as it was agricultural developments that allowed for England to become an international force. Furthermore, the operation of the East India Company in trading tea in India allowed England to prosper financially greatly, given

(Section B continued) by the 1680s, profit could reach as much as £600,000 per annum. Furthermore, since England became established as an international trading force, the revenue from colonies further asserted economical gain, whilst the prominence of Stuart Britain as an international force can be seen in the influence and power of the Royal African Company. Therefore, it was the development of agriculture that allowed for grain to become an export that thus instigated the development of Britain as a potent international trader, with great economical gain, and since it was agricultural changes that catalysed this development, one must see the developments in agriculture as crucial contributors to the economical gain from 1625 to 1688.

However, one could argue instead that it was rather the growth of London that caused greater economical gain as its emergence of insurance and financial sectors could be argued to be more significant in surpassing the development of Stuart Britain as an international trader. London grew significantly, with a population of 200,000 in 1600, increasing to 575,000 in 1700, and it was this growth that catalysed the emergence of new professions. London saw the development of the financial and insurance sectors, and thus saw

(Section B continued) new professions such as brokers and bankers, with the first commercial building set up in 1651. Therefore, one could argue that it was rather the development of London that allowed it to become an entrepôt for international trade, and thus without its growth, the development in international trade could not have been supported, thereby making it of a greater significance.

Furthermore, it was the development in commerce, in the textiles industry, that saw a greater growth and similarly contributed to international trade, and thus it could be argued that agricultural developments could not have been any more significant than those in the textiles industry. The diversification of the textiles industry due to the influx of French and Dutch immigrants, especially to Norwich and Colchester, thus allowed the textiles trade to become prominent, with 26% of those living in Colchester involved in the textiles trade in 1619, however increasing to 90% by 1699. Therefore the textiles trade increased, however expense simultaneously increased as well, and thus came the 'new draperies', as cloth began to be woven not just carded. Therefore, the increased quality of produce by the ^{textiles} trade industry, as well as its expansion on the whole, causes it to be of an equal

(Section B continued) significance to agricultural changes in improving the economy, however the increased quality of the cloth produced created greater demand on ~~the~~ agriculture for a broader range of crops. Therefore, one could argue that given the textiles industry created greater demand for the agricultural industry, and thus helped facilitate its growth, as well as its equal contribution to both domestic and international trade, as cloth could now be exported for a higher price, it must therefore be of a greater significance to the Stuart economy than agricultural developments.

To conclude, given the structure of society remained very much rural ~~for~~ throughout the 17th Century, the changes to this industry were the most significant given Britain was indeed an agrarian culture. Therefore the developments to the most prominent industry in Britain were the most significant, as not only did it significantly increase the produce and thus the exports, gaining the society, but it further facilitated the growth of England as a prominent international force, catalysing the late developments in international trade. Therefore, although the growth of London was significant, ultimately only 2% of the population lived in towns other than London, and thus its development was in isolation, and therefore

(Section B continued) *It was his contributions to the largest force in Stuart England, agriculture, that had the most impact.*



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

(1) it targets the significance of developments in agriculture from the growth of the Stuart economy in the years 1625-88;

(2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to assess the significance of developments in agriculture, e.g. new agricultural techniques and other factors, e.g. the growth of London and the development of the textile industry;

(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 extent to which the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts, e.g. the Toleration Act reflected a desire to bring excluded Protestants into the Church of England, some Anglicans felt that Protestant Dissenters would undermine the Anglican monopoly in Church and State, the Act enabled different Protestants to worship in their preferred ways, the Act marked an important step in the transition to a more tolerant multi-confessional society.

Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views put forward in the extracts, e.g. the Act was a reactionary attempt to maintain order and preserve the Anglican Church rather than extend religious toleration, the laws enforcing uniformity (Test Act and Act of Uniformity) were not repealed, many Catholics enjoyed a degree of de facto toleration, the power of the Church courts was severely weakened by the Act and was firmly linked to issue of religious toleration and the extracts. Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question (the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance), rather than the 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, e.g. the Toleration Act still placed constraints on Dissenters (extract 1), or the Toleration Act marked a stage in the gradual easing of religious tensions (extract 2). Such responses often revealed limited recognition of the differences between the two extracts and sometimes drifted from the specific question to the wider controversy surrounding the Glorious Revolution and the monarch-parliament relationship. Low-scoring candidates also relied heavily on the extracts as sources of information. Alternatively, they made limited use of the sources, attempting instead to answer the question relying almost exclusively on their own knowledge. Here, too, candidates' own knowledge tended to be illustrative, e.g. 'tacked on' to points from sources or drifted on to less relevant points. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Following the Glorious Revolution of 1689, historians have debated the effect of religious change. It could be argued, as done so by Whig historians, that there was a clear application of liberal Lockean ideology in a strive for religious toleration, and this is reflected in extract 2, thus suggesting that the Toleration Act did not fail to promote religious tolerance as it was driven by liberal ideals. Furthermore, the Toleration Act did successfully grant ~~granted~~ religious freedoms and thus could be seen as promoting full tolerance. However, revisionist historians would uphold the view that the Toleration Act in 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance, as it could be argued that the Act was merely a result of political motivations rather than aims for toleration, as seen in extract 1. Similarly, ~~therefore~~ one could argue further that the Toleration Act was severely limited given the limits to its rights given to dissenters, both political and religious, as again seen in extract 1.

The Toleration Act could indeed be seen as failing to promote religious tolerance given its aims were those of secular,

political motives, rather than a genuine desire for Toleration. In Extract 1, Coward argues that 'what many in England wanted in 1688-89 was not religious tolerance' but rather the creation of a more comprehensive Church'. This is reflected in the view that the Toleration Act of 1689 was politically motivated given a lack of theological debate, and thus was rather a result of the underlying fear of anarchy, due to the religious radicals such as the raskers in the 1650s, as well as the Scottish Presbyterian success in 1689, with the abolition of bishops in 1686. Thus it was the fear of extremism that caused a political desire to redefine the church, as more 'comprehensive'.

Furthermore, the Toleration Act was limited in its aims given the resurgence still of Anglican intolerance that thus ensured religious toleration was not promoted.

Coward, again, argues in Extract 1 that 'not all Anglicans were willing to co-operate with Protestant Dissenters'. This is reflected in the Tony and Convocation's rejection of the Comprehension Bill in 1690, as well as the Convocation's demand for action to be taken against heresy and Occasional conformity, thus demonstrating the lack of genuine desire for toleration due to the presence still of Anglican intolerance. Furthermore, this caused many to fear, in the words of Coward, 'the end of Anglican monopoly in Church and State'. This can

be supported by the rise of the Tory call of the "Church in Danger", thus reflecting the desire of many still to maintain an Anglican dominance.

Furthermore, it could be argued that the Toleration Act failed to effectuate any religious tolerance due to its 'limited scope', as put by Extract 1, and thus there remained both religious and political limitations for dissenters, thus ensuring the Toleration Act was curtailed in its impact. Extract 1 believes that the Toleration Act 'did not end religious intolerance', due to the limitations of the newfound right to 'legally worship in freedom', as the Act included 'humiliating conditions' that therefore limited its use. ~~Dissenters~~ This reflects the Act still requiring 'the doors of their [dissenters'] meeting houses had to remain open', and therefore the provisions under the Act ensured that there was by no means equal religious freedoms granted to the dissenters, as corroborated by Extract 2, which points out dissenters were not 'fully tolerated', thus making toleration limited in application. Furthermore, ~~the~~ the 'limited scope' of the Act is reflected in its exclusion ~~of~~ of Unitarians, Jews and Catholics, whilst the effectuation of Toleration is further obviously absent in the failure of the Comprehension Bill, which thus ensured the Anglican Church remained narrow and dominant, limiting toleration. Furthermore, the absence of political rights due to the

monopoly still of the Anglican Church ensured that full Toleration was not effectuated. The political rights of dissenters remained fundamentally absent, given the 'Test Act remained unrepealed', this meant due to the Test and Corporation Act, no dissenters were able to hold any form of public office, or to be in parliament, as Extract 1 continues to argue, these positions required 'a certificate of attendance at services held in parish churches', meaning they must be of 'the Church of England'. Furthermore, these limitations on the political rights of dissenters were extended to everyday life, as they were unable to attend university, or belong to medicinal or legal professions, and further, were still required to pay tithes to a church they did not belong to. Therefore, the Toleration Act was highly limited in its application of true toleration, as dissenters fundamentally remained as 'still second-class citizens', as put by Coward in Extract 1.

However, it could be seen instead that the Toleration Act did effectively promote religious toleration given its application was underpinned by genuine beliefs in toleration, and thus the application of Lockean ideology. Extract 2 argues that 'partial religious toleration' must have been achieved given the newfound ideology that ~~is~~ witnessed the abandonment

of 'the idea of a coercive national church' by Parliament. This reflects the Lockean influence on his 'essay concerning toleration' and his 'letter on toleration' in 1687 and 1689 which argued that toleration would prevent, not cause anarchy. Thus parliament rejected the radical view that loyalty to the state was dependent on religious uniformity, or that religious pluralism would lead to anarchy. Extract 1 argues that 'some churchmen and politicians' tried 'to provide means by which most protestants ... would be able to become members' of the Church of England. This is reflected in the Archbishop of Canterbury Sancroft's removal from power in 1690, and the replacement instead of latitudinarian bishops who aimed to reach out to dissenters. Thus, given the Toleration Act was driven by liberal religious ideals, it can be assumed that it was effective in promoting actual toleration.

Furthermore, the Act can be viewed as effective given its grant of religious rights. This allowed dissenters to 'worship in their differing ways', allowing dissenters to flourish, with numbers reaching 8% of the population by 1715. Similarly, the decline in the monopoly of the political hierarchy by the Church would ensure the 'gradual ease' of

'religious tensions' as put by Extract 2, as it allowed greater political rights for dissenters as well, for example, the church could no longer enforce attendance, and Occasional Conformity allowed dissenters to escape the provisions of the Test and Corporation Acts.

To conclude, the Toleration Act failed to effectuate total religious toleration, due to the limited religious and political rights, as put by Extract 1.



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 (the Toleration Act of 1689 failed to promote religious tolerance) 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 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 this paper, candidates are offered the following advice.

Features commonly found in section A/B responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- 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, e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.

With regards to the level and quality of knowledge, candidates and centres should recognise the expectation of Advanced Level. In short, it is a combination of the knowledge candidates are able to bring to the essay, married with their ability to effectively marshal this material towards the analytical demands of the question. It is fair to say that on Paper 1, where candidates study a range of themes across a broad chronological period, the expectations regarding depth of knowledge will not necessarily be as great as in the more in-depth periods studied. As well as offering more depth of knowledge, candidates who have engaged in wider reading tend to be more successful as they are able to select and deploy the most appropriate examples to support analysis and evaluation.

Common issues which hindered performance in section A/B 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.
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues.
- Failure to consider the date range as specified in the question.
- 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 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 (selection over sheer amount of knowledge).
- Careful reading of the extracts to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within them were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors.
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or an attempt to reconcile their arguments.
- Confident handling of the extracts, seemingly from experience in reading and examining excerpts (and no doubt whole books), allied to a sharp focus on the arguments given, recognising the distinct skills demanded by A03.

Common issues which hindered performance in section C were:

- Limited or uneven use of the extracts, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other.
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations.
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support.
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered.
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of the arguments in the sources.
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or the lifting of detail out of context from the extract.
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again 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>

