



Examiners' Report June 2024

GCE History 9HI0 1B

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 2024

Publications Code 9HI0_1B_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, Advanced Level, paper 1B.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1). Section B offers a further choice of essays, typically covering a longer time span. Both Sections A and B target any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3).

Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were a few cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. This was most evident on Section C, as would be expected, although there seemed to be fewer instances of this than has been seen in some previous years. The responses that managed time most effectively planned time accordingly in the first place and offered more direct responses. Where responses indulged in lengthier contextual description or explanations of, say, changes in the Tudor period, rather than focused analysis of the significance of these (for Question 1), or descriptions of the extracts and problems Elizabeth faced, rather than an analysis and evaluation of the views in relation the proposition that Elizabeth's response was 'remarkable' (Question 5), they were both less likely to produce responses at the highest level, but also experience time pressure issues. Those who produced responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given issue in the question, and on Question 5 the given views, were more likely to produce an effective response.

In sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates offered substantial knowledge but did not effectively direct this towards the conceptual demands of the question. In the main though, 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 greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan. One of the central features of responses attaining the highest marks was an ability to consider and evaluate in relation to the specific demands of a particular question. For example, some candidates offered detailed explanation of changes, but the strongest responses tended to offer more consideration of the extent of change.

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 also need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that responses sufficiently cover the given period, and do not spend time detailing issues that are outside the timeframe of that particular question.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic. A small minority did approach the question in a manner which would be more suited to an AO1 (ie Section A/B) response, engaging with the issue in the question and showing understanding, but tending to neglect the extracts, or treat them more as sources of information, rather than interpretations.

Question 1

Question 1 was the more popular choice with candidates in Section A of the paper. The vast majority of candidates were able to engage with the conceptual demands of the question sufficiently and apply appropriate knowledge in order to allow them to access levels three and above. What distinguished within these tended to be down to the extent to which they focused material on an exploration of significance, and to a lesser extent, the quality of material offered, most typically in terms of range. This tended to be where responses had depth which was at least sufficient on Edward and Henry, but offered limited material beyond the period after 1560, or omitted discussion of Elizabeth altogether.

On the given issue, the vast majority of candidates had something to say on the relevant developments under Edward, such as the reversal of the Act of Six Articles, the Injunctions of 1547 and iconoclasm, and especially the Forty-Two Articles and 1552 Prayer Book, with a fair few making the point that the latter largely formed Elizabeth's religious settlement. Many answers also included such features as the dissolution of the Chantries and Cranmer's homilies, with a few also mentioning clerical marriage and the impact of scholars influenced by Calvinist ideas such as John Hooper. In exploring the counterargument, many answers identified the key significance of the earlier period, namely the all-important Break with Rome, Cromwell's Injunctions, the Ten Articles, and the introduction of the English bible, whilst many answers also discussed the significance of the dissolution of the monasteries as being an attack on traditional beliefs as much as motivated by finance. A fair few candidates examined Anne Boleyn's influence, although significantly fewer considered Katherine Parr's influence in the longer term. Many candidates also referenced such issues as the brevity of Edward's reign, the unpopularity of religious changes as evidenced by the Western Rebellion or the Pilgrimage of Grace, and Henry's conservatism as shown by the Six Articles and the King's Book. With regards to Elizabeth, typical arguments tended to be that her reign was significant in terms of the success of establishing Protestantism over the longer run, whilst also referencing this as being a 'middle way' designed to please Catholics and Protestants. A smaller number, perhaps reflective of more recent historiographical work, recognised Elizabeth as a committed Protestant arguing that the Settlement reflected her own beliefs and thus how the new Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-Nine Articles played a significant role in establishing a more mainstream Protestantism, based as they were, as some candidates stated when discussing Edward, on the 1552 Prayer Book and Forty-Two Articles. A number did consider the significance of the various penalties against Catholics after 1570, notably the various Treason Acts. A small minority also referenced issues such as the influence of Elizabeth's Council including ex-Edwardians supportive of Protestantism such as William Cecil, or that of senior church figures such as Edmund Grindal. Some also argued that for all Elizabeth's supposed antipathy to 'puritans', in the long run they helped advance the cause of Protestantism at a local level.

Throughout the years 1529-88, there was a significant shift from England as a Catholic country to one which was genuinely Protestant by 1588. Arguably, Edward VI's reign (1547-53) as the first Protestant king was the 'most significant' development, however Mary's successful restoration of the Catholic faith after Edward's death counters this. Therefore, the most significant development was clearly during Elizabeth's reign, as by 1603, only 10% population were Catholic.

However, on the one hand, Edward VI's reign can be argued to have been the most significant development in Protestantism because he was the first Protestant monarch, a radical change from the Catholic past. When he claimed the throne in 1547, Catholic priests were imprisoned and by 1549, the clergy were allowed to marry. Furthermore, in 1549, his injunctions and book of common prayer, ^{and act of uniformity} worked to entrench and expand the Protestant faith, as mass was decreed as simply an 'act of remembrance' rather than the Catholic belief in transubstantiation. Also,

Edward's church repealed his fathers 6 articles of faith ~~the~~ (made in 1539) in 1547, allowing for his own 42 articles of faith to proliferate in 1553. Before this, in 1552 Edward's second act of uniformity and books of common prayer enforced harsher ~~decrees~~ ^{Punishments} for those who refused to adhere to his Protestant church. By making it illegal to reject the Protestant faith certainly had an impact on its growth, as when Mary takes the throne in 1553, she's unable to subvert ^{the} Protestant faith in its entirety, especially in London and the South East, proving the influence of Edward's reforms. Therefore, by entrenching the ~~the~~ Protestant faith through his books of common prayer and 42 articles, and by scaring Catholic opposition into submission through his acts of uniformity, arguably Edward had created a genuinely Protestant church that ~~is~~ was the antithesis of his fathers ~~the~~ 6 articles where pilgrimage, masses for the dead and Catholic church decoration was valued. By 1553, Edward had created an iconoclastic church with limited decoration, and a focus on God's word.

However, Edward's reign can ~~also~~ ^{convincingly} be argued

to not have been the most significant development in Protestantism because despite attempts the succession to make Lady Jane Grey queen, this reign was usurped by the Catholic Mary I, Edward's sister, and during her reign 2/3 of the population returned to the Catholic faith. Thus, evidence from wills in the 1550's ~~do not~~ demonstrate the lack of progress Edward made regarding Protestantism because most wills still had traditional references to ^{masses} praying for the dead and indulgences, which were firmly Catholic beliefs.

Therefore, in evaluation of the significance of Edward's reign, it is clear that by 1553, the majority of the population are indeed still Catholic, therefore his reign can not be argued to have been the most significant development. It seems clear that it is not till 1588 that England can be argued to have been genuinely Protestant, thus it is not Edward, but Elizabeth's reign that ~~was~~ witnessed the most significant development.

However, it could be argued that the reign of Henry VIII, and especially the influence of his 'vice gerant in spiritualibus', Thomas Cromwell

was the most significant development in Protestantism as the 'Reformation Parliament' from 1529-36 & was the first step towards a Protestant church being created. In 1534, when Cromwell passed the Act of Supremacy through Parliament, Henry is officially ^{supreme} head of English Church, thus disregarding the Pope. This break with Rome arguably fundamentally ~~an~~ altered the Catholic faith forever, and created a Protestant beginning that could not have been undone. Cromwell's former reforms, such as his 10 articles of faith in 1536 and his injunctions to the clergy instructing that only 3/7 sacraments: penance, baptism and mass were necessary for salvation was indeed a very significant development in Protestantism. His further injunctions in 1538 propelled the church in a more Protestant direction as they ordered an English Bible to be placed in every parish, a rejection of the Latin Catholic emphasis. Furthermore, the bishops' books in 1537 and Cranmer's *Collectanea sacra copiosa* ⁽¹⁵³¹⁾ also pushed the Protestant church, justifying Henry's 'imperial theory'. Therefore, Henry's reign, particularly from 1534 when he was deemed supreme head of the church by statute law

represented a significant break and provided the circumstances for Edward's protestant regime. This significant shift from papal authority to Erastian kingship arguably altered Protestant fortunes in the most significant way throughout the period 1529-88.

However, in evaluation of this, by 1547 when Henry died, 85% still showed Catholic references, and Henry himself died as a Catholic. Events such as the burning of John Lambert and the King's book in 1543 showed how Henry was decisively Catholic. Therefore, it is not convincing that Henry's reign was the most significant development in Protestant fortunes.

Therefore, it is most apt that it was the reign of Elizabeth that was the most significant development in protestantism. Although only a 'moderate' protestant, unlike her radical brother Edward, this worked in her favour as moderate Catholics even accepted her church, thus her Protestant settlement in 1559, represented a peaceful, acceptable protestant church. Furthermore, Elizabeth's long reign (1558-1603) allowed for the

faith to develop, as usually people would die at around 40 years old. Thus throughout her life Protestant ~~bishops~~ priests could be trained and those newly born would be raised in the Protestant Church. In 1559, Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, book of common prayer and injunctions all entrenched the Protestant faith, ensuring those who opposed her were punished too. Despite being papally excommunicated in 1570, Elizabeth managed to retain the Protestant faith, issuing an act of treason in 1571 for anyone trying to bring the papal bull into the country.

Furthermore, the most significant development of Protestantism was the last years of Elizabeth's reign, as fines ~~for~~ for recusancy were raised from 12p to £20 in 1581, ensuring everyone was concurring to her church. Also, there was an act of attainder, in 1584 where 103 of nobles signed to promise to be loyal to Elizabeth, ~~accepting~~ accepting that ^{it was} treasonous to go against the Protestant church that she had firmly implemented through her 1563 39 articles. Furthermore, in 1585, it was declared illegal to benefit from the queen's deam (e.g. Catholic pilgrimage) and

(Section A continued)

the Act against Jewell and seminary priests
ensured they left the country. Her harsh actions
against the Catholics, such as the execution of
Babington and Throckmorton reiterated this non-
tolerance that ultimately ensured a prosperous
Protestant nation.

* Thus, the statement is untrue to a large extent.

In conclusion, it is clear that the last years of Elizabeth's reign represent the most significant development in Protestantism because by 1588, there were harsh punishments for those who resisted and her 39 articles of 1563 had fully entrenched the Protestant regime. Although Edward's reign represented the first Protestant kingship, his early death in 1553 unfortunately meant that Protestantism was not fully embedded within society by this time*. Similarly, Henry's break with Rome and reformation Parliament, although acted as a catalyst for the Protestant church, did not represent the most significant development because the majority of people remained Catholic in 1547. Therefore, the most success can most certainly be seen in Elizabeth's reign, and particularly her final years, as 90% of the population had become Protestant.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question. One of the strengths of this response is the quality of specific exemplification, and the deployment of this – the response offers a range of detailed examples which are used to demonstrate the extent to which the most significant developments in Protestantism were those seen during the reign of Edward VI. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned judgement, weighing the relative importance of the various issues.

Question 2

This was the less popular choice of question within Section A, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within levels three and above, with many very strong responses. There was a sound grasp of the role played by the migration of foreign workers, and in the main convincing analysis in relating this to the question's demands, with most candidates demonstrating sufficient knowledge and understanding to discuss a range of issues of significance to the domestic economy in the given period.

The given issue of the migration of workers was largely understood and addressed with some depth, alongside other issues commonly covered, such as innovations in cloth production, developments resulting from the growth of London, overseas exploration and the consequences of broader developments in agriculture. The majority of discussion of foreign workers centred on their influence in textiles, as would be expected. Within this, responses typically discussed the impact of Dutch settlers and their new skills and techniques regarding the cloth trade in the South East, with a fair few also noting the impact of wider immigration of skilled artisans fuelling the growth of cities such as London and Norwich. A small number of responses also examined the contribution made by German miners around Keswick, or window glass production following the arrival of French glass makers such as Jean Carre. A number of candidates questioned the extent to which developments relating to foreign workers were significant, seeing them as being limited when considered against the wider economy. Such responses tended to be explicitly critical throughout their responses, without being artificially so, eg with regards to the given issue, making clear distinctions over the direct contribution of foreign workers in a particular trade or area, and their wider significance, such as the spread of techniques they brought, their contribution to the revival of a particular sector, or attempting to qualify the extent to which their influence did or didn't spread beyond a particular area.

With regards to the counterargument, a good number of candidates noted such issues as Government actions facilitating trade, notably the granting of the charter to establish the Muscovy Company, the Levant Company and the Barbary Company, and many candidates also referenced John Hawkins' voyages to West Africa and the development of the slave trade, plus goods such as sugar being brought back from the Americas. Some candidates had quite a bit of knowledge on the growth of London and its effects on commerce and framed their answers accordingly, and a few considered such issues as the replacement of the debased coinage and the issuing of licenses, patents and monopolies. Where candidates were able to clearly relate these issues to developments in trade, they were most successful.

Generally, most candidates were clearly able to focus the material they had towards the demands of the question. Where responses were less successful, it tended to be down to not consistently relating material to the demands of the question, such as a lack of focus on how the material being considered related to developments in the domestic economy. There were a minority where knowledge was insufficient or confused, but these were thankfully rarely found.

Foreign workers had a ~~huge~~ significant impact on trade in 1560-1588 as well as exploration and growing role of London. Elizabeth's reign showed great advancements in trade, however some booms and slumps, but brought in great amounts of money for English economy. It can be argued that foreign workers was the main factor to developments of trade and this will be argued through criteria; how many people were affected by the development, what classes those people were in, whether it progressed trade or was an enabling factor.

Foreign workers was the most significant factor towards development of trade. Due to the Dutch revolution of 1560s, there was an influx of migrant Dutch workers who were highly skilled in cloth making. While suspicious due to typical Tudor fear of foreign people, the English government accepted and distributed them to areas with the most raw material. Due to the regulations put on the Dutch workers, their skills greatly impacted the poor and unskilled as they offered training.

In addition to this, in a time of high unemployment this offered jobs. However this only impacted the local people. The Dutch workers bought new material, worsted wool with them which expanded English ~~sta~~ trade to the ~~me~~ Mediterranean, diversifying their products. ~~Th~~ Foreign workers developed trade significantly as they bought new materials and expanded trade to Mediterranean which shows progression. However, this only impacted the local people where these Dutch workers were, not having so much of an impact to those in areas which lacked the raw materials.

Another factor which showed development of trade was exploration. Exploration was very important to advance new trade routes to trade luxury items whilst exploration started in Edward, most significant happened during Elizabeth. The aim was to find North-East passage which, whilst failed, the 1570's showed major progression. 1570's a trade route was established with Turkey, enabling English to get luxuries such as carpets. This also showed great development as it was the most profitable trade route. In addition, in the 1570's Sir Francis Drake started trade with

Asia which became the East India Company in 1600. Exploration developed trade greatly by opening new trade routes, offering new resources so the English trade covered a greater geographical area. In addition, exploration became an industry so offered jobs to the unemployed. Similarly, this benefitted the nobles as due to access to more resources, more monopolies were able to be granted which increased wealth of individuals.

~~Another~~ The growing role of London also had impact of development of trade. London was the largest city in Europe which meant that it had the highest demand for resources. In addition, London was the home to ~~the~~ ~~most~~ Elizabeth and many nobles which increased demand for luxury goods. Due to improved navigation of Thames in 1540s, there was a rapid increase of foreign and domestic trade which caused London to take over previous large ports, showing progression. London was the centre for manufacture so had high exports which ~~was~~ brought lots of money. However, the massive amounts of money brought in through trade only benefitted the merchants and those in charge so had no impact on the general population. This

supports the typical ~~view~~ divide between the rich and the poor.

To conclude, the ^{*}~~most significant factor towards the development of trade in 1560 to 1588 was foreign workers~~. This is because their skills were pivotal towards advancement in English trade, diversifying English trading opportunities which shows progression. Foreign workers also had the greatest impact on the most diverse range of people, offering training and jobs to the locality whilst providing cloth to the merchants. This is not to say that the other factors are not important as London was more of an enabling factor to increase levels of trade and both role of London and Exploration had greater ~~effects~~ of impact on the nobility and merchants, having little impact on general population.

* highly
I agree that development in trade was mainly due to impact of foreign workers



This response shows most of the qualities of level 4. There is an overall analytical focus, and issues are explored to some degree. Argument is organised and largely clear. Sufficient knowledge is offered to develop arguments, although some areas could be developed further. Judgements show some reasoning, and the overall judgement is substantiated.

Question 3

Question 3 was the more popular of the two within Section B. The vast majority of candidates were able to engage with the conceptual demands of the question sufficiently and apply appropriate knowledge in order to allow them to access the middle to higher levels. What distinguished within these tended to be down to two issues, which were often related. Firstly, the extent to which candidates were able to go beyond basic explanations of how any particular reason may have caused poverty, in order to explore and attempt to assess the impact this actually had. The second issue was the quality of supporting knowledge. A number of candidates seemed to have some understanding of how certain factors worked to cause/contribute to the increase in poverty but lacked the necessary detail to develop this very far. Those who were able to precisely examine and substantiate arguments as to the extent to which changes in the use of land, or other factors such as population growth, did actually contribute to increases in poverty, were best placed to reach the highest levels.

With regards to the given factor, many strong responses had a secure grasp of issues. A good number of responses identified the sheer scale of population growth in the period and how this placed a strain on resources and led to inflation, with many candidates also having something to say about food prices in particular, as landowners were unable to sufficiently increase output to keep up, although fewer answers connected this with downward pressure on wages. The migration of surplus population from rural areas to towns and the problems this caused also featured in many answers. Only a minority of candidates connected the switch to pasture farming with low population growth in the preceding period, and the subsequent implications of this as the population grew.

On the counterargument, candidates were in general perhaps slightly less detailed, and although many identified such features as enclosure and the dissolution, those that set themselves apart were able to deploy detail on this to explore how, and how far these led to poverty. So, for example, on enclosure, whilst many candidates were familiar with the view that the loss of common land was identified as a cause of poverty at the time, those who were able to link this with the issue of changes from arable to pastoral farming and the resulting decrease of demand for agricultural labour, were best placed. A smaller number discussed such issues as rack-renting and forestalling.

On the dissolution, many were aware that it removed the 'safety net' in regards to the care of the sick and poor, but fewer were able to say much about the consequences of the sale of monastic land and how this led to changes in use, and the extent to which this did mean such land made less of a contribution to local economies and thus offered fewer opportunities for the rural poor. Some also focused the material around clear arguments such as the impact on the monks and nuns. A fair few candidates included such issues as the debasement of the coinage, increased government spending, and the impact of bad harvests at various times in the period – and again, those that were clear in how to deploy such potentially relevant information to explore the precise demands of the question were more likely to reach the highest levels.

The strongest offered convincing attempts to ascertain the way in which such reasons contributed and their relative importance, eg recognising population growth as part of a longer-term trend, set against factors more particular to the period, such as the dissolution.

Defining the criteria for the main reason for the increase in poverty between 1509 and 1588 as being the most long-term and constant reason, it is incredibly accurate to state that ~~both~~ population growth was the main reason for the increase in poverty in the years 1509-88. Population growth, in contrast to enclosure, financial changes and harvest issues, was the most continuous, constant reason for poverty and affected the entire period, making it the ~~most significant~~ ^{main reason} for the increase in poverty.

Although enclosure and other landlord issues such as rack-renting ~~caused~~ ^{exacerbated} poverty, they were arguably less constant than the increase in prices caused by population growth between 1509-88, and certainly less long-lasting. Therefore, increase in population was more of a reason than enclosure for the increase in poverty. Between 1525 and 1591, the Tudor population increased in size from 2.23 million to 3.89 million. Coupled with the increase in urban populations after the early 1550s dip in the cloth trade, this led to a decrease in wages as there were a high ^{and increasing} number of people competing for jobs. Thus, due to the economic principle of

supply and demand, wages decreased, despite the supervision of JPs in regulating them. By the late 1580s, wages were ~~but that should not~~ ^{significantly less than} what they'd been in the previous century as fairly long-lasting peacetimes, from around Edward, but particularly between 1560 and 1585 under Elizabeth, had allowed significant increase in population, although it had been continuous from 1509-88. Therefore, compared to enclosure, increase in population was a greater cause of increasing poverty as the 1533 Sheep and Farms Act, limiting the number of sheep individuals could own, 1547 sheep and cloth tax, 1555 Act imposing 2 cows and a calf on those owning >120 sheep and dip in the cloth trade due to the revaluation of the coinage (1551-52) meant that enclosure was less of a constant issue than population growth. By Elizabeth's reign, despite the worries of contemporaries such as Thomas More in his book "Utopia", enclosure no longer seemed to be a prominent issue, nor were related problems like rack-renting. Therefore, between 1509 and 1588, it is accurate to say that population growth was the main reason for poverty as it caused long-term and constant ~~poverty~~ ^{wage decreases} and was more constant and long-term than enclosure in causing an increase in poverty.

Another reason that population growth was the main reason for increase of poverty between 1509-88 was the

increase in prices caused by inflation and forestalling, which was more of a constant and long-term reason than the debasement of the coinage and price revolution. Despite economic reform, such as Mary's reformation of ^{import} customs, there were prevalent economic issues in Tudor society, such as the debasement of the coinage from 1542-51, which worsened inflation, although it did cause a temporary, artificial boom in the cloth trade. However, as the coinage was revalued in 1551-52, it was only a short-term cause of increasing poverty, so less of a reason than population growth. Additionally, whilst the price revolution of the 16th century was arguably as constant and long-lasting as population growth as gold and silver was frequently imported by privateers from the New World, it only exacerbated pre-existing inflation issues and high prices caused by increased demand of a ^{although not completely unchanging} fairly constant supply of food and goods. Therefore, whilst the price revolution was similarly as long-lasting and constant as population growth, it was still less significant, so not the main reason for reform. As the debasement of the coinage was temporary, it was definitely not as key a reason for the long-lasting, constant issue of population growth which can accurately be called the main reason for increasing poverty between 1509 and 1588.

Whilst the loss of the charity of the Catholic church in ~~after 1530~~ the 1530s was a significant cause of poverty, it was quickly replaced by government and merchant charity,

meaning that the increase in population size was still the main reason for increasing poverty between 1509-88 as the lack of employment was constant and long-lasting. Whilst monks and nuns had traditionally given food to the poor and almshouses provided relief, the removal of monasteries in 1536 (small monasteries £700 a year) and 1539 was not a long-term, constant cause of increasing poverty as the gap was quickly filled by merchants who made up roughly 60% of 16th century charity. Rather than leaving money for almshouses, many of which had been dissolved as chantries in 1547, individuals such as Stephen Jenyns and William Lambe left money for specific charitable endeavours in their wills, the former financing a school for ¹² poor boys and the latter leaving £6 for 120 buckets, so 60 poor women could carry water for a living. ~~Additionally~~ On top of this, Edward VI gave crown lands to ~~state~~ ^{found} charitable organisations, like St Bartholomew's Hospital, and the 1563 Act for the Prevention of the Poor made alms collections mandatory. In contrast, the lack of employment caused by an increasing population size was much more long-term as the 1531 Vagrancy Act, 1547 Poor Law, 1552 Poor Law, 1563 Statute of Artifices, 1572 Poor Law and 1576 Poor Law all attempting to tackle vagrancy. The issue of population growth was therefore clearly constant and was compounded by Tudor belief that the able-bodied 'idle poor' were just lazy, the 1563 Poor Law stating that every unmarried person under 30 must learn a trade and be in employment during the harvest.

Therefore, whilst the loss of monastic charity was a short-term issue due to secular charity, the increase in employment due to population growth between 1509 and 1588 was ~~very~~ ^{much more} consistent and long term. Therefore, it is highly accurate to say that the main reason for increasing poverty in the years 1509-88 was increasing population growth.

In conclusion, as it fulfils the criteria of being the most constant and long-lasting reason for poverty between 1509 and 1588, it is extremely accurate to say that, in the years 1509 to 1588, population growth was the main reason for the increase in poverty. Other contributors, such as economic issues, loss of monastic charity and land problems such as enclosure, were less significant, short-term ^{factors} ~~issues~~ which only exacerbated the fundamental increase in poverty from population growth.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates many of the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with sufficient knowledge to explore these. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated, evaluating the extent to which population growth was the main cause of poverty. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 4

This was the less popular choice of question within Section B, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within the higher levels. At the higher end, there was an impressive knowledge of the role of parliament in the years 1509-88, with candidates drawing upon relevant knowledge from across the course studied to explore the extent to which parliament in the period before 1529 was similar to that in the years from 1529-88. It was pleasing to see many candidates demonstrate clear thinking to relate their knowledge of issues to the demands of the question.

Commonly covered issues included the religious developments during the Reformation Parliament, the concept of King-in-Parliament, the growth of social legislation, the make-up of parliament, the frequency which parliaments met, supply, and incidents of tension over parliamentary attempts to discuss prerogative matters during Elizabeth's reign. In arguing that there were similarities, responses typically considered issues such as the pre-eminent status of the monarch, who appointed ministers and called, prorogued and dismissed parliaments, and a fair few candidates had something to say about such themes as the voting of subsidies, parliamentary management through the Privy Council and the voicing of opposition at key times, eg the 1523 parliament, the Exiles Bill under Mary or 'puritan' campaigns in Elizabeth's reign. In countering the question's proposition, candidates commonly explored issues such as the development of the notion of 'king-in-parliament', statute law, the decline of royal proclamations, involvement in religious change, and social legislation in the later period. Some explored the extent of similarity/difference by making arguments such as 'whilst there were developments that were indeed different, they ultimately served to reinforce rather than challenge the power of the monarch', or how instances of conflict between Crown and Parliament were not typical, and thus worked against attempts to see these as being clearly different.

Factors limiting the success of responses were largely (i) limited material, and thus a lack of substance behind attempted argument, (ii) potentially relevant material, not convincingly connected to the issue of parliament's role, and/or the second-order concept of similarity/difference, and (iii) not addressing the chronological demands of the question.

On the one hand, Parliament's ^{role} could be argued to have remained similar and constant throughout 1529-88, having the same role as before 1529. However, it seems more convincing that the role of Parliament transformed throughout 1529-88, becoming an omnicompetent body that worked alongside the monarch.

Although, on the one hand, it could be argued that the role of Parliament was similar throughout 1529-88 to its role before 1529 because it remained the junior part of the constitution and the monarch remained in full control, retaining all their prerogatives. Parliament's role before 1529, and throughout the ^{Tudor} period remained as a body to pass tax for the monarch. For example in 1513, Henry VIII used Parliament to vote for money for war against France in the Battle of the Spurs where he won the territories of Tournai and Therragne. Similarly, Elizabeth used Parliament for the same reason, to fund war against Spain in 1580's. Therefore, it is clear that Parliament's fundamental role remained the same. The

Monarchs throughout the period also retained the same perceptions regarding Parliament as they had had before 1529, such as the right to call and dissolve Parliament. They also appointed the speaker of the House of Commons, and Elizabeth's chief advisor, Cecil worked to employ 30 of his clients to be MP's, thus Parliament remained as a body under the monarch's control. In Elizabeth's reign, Parliament was only called 13 times, meaning for 26 years there was no session, proving its limited importance, similar to before 1529. Also, Elizabeth was able to tame Parliament with her leadership, much like the monarchs before her. Henry VIII also only called Parliament 4 times ~~from~~ ^{before} 1529, proving its limited role.

Therefore, in evaluation of this, much like before 1529, Parliament remained the junior body in the constitution, meaning its role was indeed limited. However, throughout the period 1529-88 MP's did grow in confidence, and Parliament created many statute laws which suggest the argument for its limited change is not pertinent or convincing.

Thus, from 1529-88, the role of Parliament was not similar to before 1529 as it became an omniscipotent body, dealing with a plethora of issues that extended far beyond ^{just simply} ~~the~~ voting for tax. Firstly, the Reformation Parliament from 1529-36 saw the legitimisation of Henry as supreme head of the Church, a reform that needed the support of law to confirm it. This Parliament included radical reforms such as the 1532 restraint of annates and the 1534 restraint of appeals that saw more power transition to the monarch. This culminated in 1534, where Henry was declared head of church by Act of Supremacy and for the first time a declaration of succession was passed through Parliament. Therefore, Mary and Edward were both forced to use Parliament too, as Henry had created a new precedent of 'king in Parliament' from the 1529 'king and Parliament'. Thus, Edward used Parliament for his religious reforms and to ensure his supremacy and Mary used it to repeal supremacy and hand over control back to the church.

However, most importantly, Parliament demonstrated a shift during Elizabeth's reign, from its role in 1529, as by 1558, it was enacting

~~Legal~~ ^{social} reforms such as the poor law of 1562^s and ~~the~~ 1576 where ~~genera~~ Parliament enforced taxes to help poorest in society. Also, as MP's grew to over 450 in Elizabeth's reign, from just over 300 in 1529, MP's began to become more confident and demonstrated against Elizabeth. MP's such as Peter Wentworth demanded free speech over religion and succession, thus challenging the monarch's supremacy and clemency on the issue, an unimaginable claim to have back in 1529. Furthermore, there were even attempts in 1584 and 1587 to introduce a presbyterian church in Parliament. Thus, Parliament's role had clearly shifted to ^{ent.} one of defiance and challenge rather than dutiful submission to the monarch. Thus, with Elizabeth's prerogatives being challenged, it is clear just passing ^{confidence for} taxes was a distant memory. Also, the infamous historian J.E. Neale even suggested there was a 'puritan choir' present during Elizabeth's Parliaments, suggesting the challenge from Parliament was radical and damaging. However, it is unlikely there were more than 40 Puritan MP's from 1558-88. Also, MP's were increasing well educated with the growth of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. Thus by 1588 they were more intelligent and confident debaters. In evaluation of this side of the argument,

it is clear that the role of Parliament was not similar from 1529-88 to what it had been before 1529, because the monarchs were challenged and Parliament was used for a myriad of ~~the~~ reasons, including social reform in this period. This argument is more apt than ~~the~~ its counter that Parliament remained the same because although still the junior institution, it is clear that Parliament did challenge monarchs, especially Elizabeth.

In conclusion, although Parliament remained as a body that the monarch could effectively control, its role can not be argued to be 'similar' to that in 1529. This is because, before 1529, Parliament could only ^{be used to raise} ~~pass~~ tax, but by 1588 Parliament had been used to alter the head of the Church, pass social legislation and chirpy MP's had now been confident to challenge the monarch. Therefore, it became an omniscient body that was increasingly used to tackle the problems the Tudor period faced. Although J. E. Neales 'puritan choir' thesis has been discredited by modern historians, it remains certain that he was correct in highlighting the

newfound confidence of MP's and their ability to challenge authority. Therefore, it is indeed true to say that the role of Parliament before 1529 was not similar to the role it played from 1529-88 and this is encapsulated in the notion of 'King and Parliament' to 'Kings in Parliament.'



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question. Argument is logical and well organised. Material is carefully deployed to demonstrate and explore the degree of similarity. There are well reasoned judgements, and an overall conclusion which confidently evaluates.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to access the higher two levels, generally by recognising and explaining the arguments in the two extracts and building on this with their own knowledge. The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Most candidates were able to identify the differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, eg how Extract 1 offers argument to support the contention that Elizabeth's government responded to the problems England faced in a manner which was 'remarkable', seeking to reduce the burden on the poorest and mitigate the impact of hardship via poor relief, whereas Extract 2 emphasises that the efforts of Elizabeth's government were inconsistent and did little to alleviate the suffering in the face of the multiple problems the nation faced in the 1590s.

The more successful responses tended to be those whose careful reading of the extracts meant they identified the clear differences between the two views, recognising that whilst there was some common ground in terms of material, the two interpretations ultimately saw the response of Elizabeth's government differently. Where candidates were less successful, this tended to select detail from the extracts, but were less clear in the differences between them as interpretations. Such responses tended to describe and explain the extracts and see them more as sources of information, rather than attempt to discuss and assess the arguments they offered. Thankfully very few responses became side-tracked in an attempted analysis of the provenance of the extracts.

With regards to Extract 1, many picked up on the suggestion that Elizabeth intervened to limit the impact that the demands that extra burdens, notably wartime taxation, had on the poorest, and that taxation assessments meant that the wealthy elites avoided shouldering their true share, and many also had something to say about government efforts at Poor Relief. Fewer explored the issue of the selling of crown lands, spending cuts, or the significance of the admission that 'money simply disappeared' because of the lack of 'proper and accurate accounts' in relation to the question's demands. Stronger responses did place such context concerning the condition and constraints within which Elizabeth's government operated in relation to Rowse's arguments that their efforts could be deemed 'remarkable'.

Extract 2 was often used to catalogue Elizabeth's various failings, for example, the wide range of economic, social and political problems, with the poorest in society being hit hardest, although fewer explored the suggestion that the government's response was often inconsistent and aimed more at concerns over social order than concern for subjects.

Candidates' knowledge and understanding of issues was varied, with knowledge of monopolies and relations with parliament, efforts to alleviate the consequences of bad harvests and dearth, the impact of war. Some also referenced poor harvests from 1594, food riots in 1595-7, the pressures caused by inflation and the subsequent decline in real wages, and a smaller number related the latter to criticism in parliament and the various political problems this caused. A discriminating factor in success was to some extent the deployment and development of knowledge offered, ie the difference between referencing an issue with contextual knowledge linked to the extract, and, at the higher levels, exploring this in relation to the precise focus of the question, and assessing the validity of argument. With regards to judgement, it was pleasing to see a substantial number of candidates offer reasoned and considered assessments of the merits of both arguments, regardless of their ultimate decision. Overall, Question 5 produced a strong response from a good number of candidates.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, in the years 1589–1603, the response of Elizabeth's government to the problems her nation faced was 'remarkable' [Extract 1, line 16]?

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

(20)

Historians have long debated whether the response of Elizabeth's government to the problems her nation faced from 1589–1603 was 'remarkable'. Rouse takes the stance that, given the elements out of control of Elizabeth's power, herself and the government made valiant efforts to respond to these problems. Ashton takes a different stance, stating that Elizabeth's governmental response was ineffective and failed to deal with the problems faced during this period. It will be made clear that the government's response to these problems was not remarkable, which more so aligns with the view of Ashton.

There are clear arguments in the extracts which support the view in the question. For example, Rouse states "the Queen desired the poor to be spared and the broken land on those bestable to be arit". This can be taken to mean that the government largely avoided negatively impacting

the lives of the poor when devising their solutions to deal with the problems faced. This can be challenged by historical evidence, for example, from the period of 1584 to 1603, England was at ~~war~~^{war} with both Spain and the Earl of Tyrone's forces which cost each country £2000 a month to equip their men. Despite this tax burden inevitably impacting the lives of the poor through enclosure or rack renting (the superficial inflation of rent), over 105,000 men were forced into conscription and subsequent Bastard Feudalism on their return in which they were forced to work for whom had conscripted them. This created immense social ^{and mental} instability throughout the poor population. This reinforces the judgement that government's response to these problems was not 'remarkable', sharing again that Ashton has the strongest interpretation. Rouse also states that "criticism of the Queen's financial administration is wholly unjust... she did her best for the common soldier". This can be taken to mean that Elizabeth and her government efficiently handled their financial problems in a way that reduced any fallout. However this can be challenged by historical evidence, for example the H9J finds that Elizabeth went to Henry of ^{France} ~~Navarre~~

in Brittany was about £35,000 along with around 12,000 troops. However, this spending was rendered almost useless after France and Spain entered into a 1598 peace treaty, excluding England; showcasing ineffective spending. In regards to doing the best for her "common soldier", the 1598-1589 naval mission to attack the remnants of the Spanish Armada saw 11,000 of the 19,000 soldiers killed due to bad leadership, specifically the disobedience of orders by Generals such as the Earl of Essex who joined the mission without permission. The funds of £400,000 from this mission and those subsequent saw £100,000 taken by sailors for personal profit and so by 1592, only £80,000 reached the treasury in England. Therefore, reinforcing the judgement that Elizabeth's government's response ~~to~~ these problems was not 'remarkable' showing again that Ashton has the strongest interpretation.

There are also clear arguments in the extracts that challenge the view in the question. For example, Ashton states "it was the poorest who bore the heaviest burden of the depression". This can be taken to mean that the ~~negative~~ solutions posed by Elizabeth's government most significantly and negatively impacted the poor. This can be

supported by historical evidence. For example, during this period there were around 11 to 17 poor laws introduced, some enforcing even 'houses of correction', however, the levels of poverty continued to increase, in London levels rose from 5% to 9%. In Ipswich in 1597, 13% of their population was made up of both impotent and able-bodied poor. This reinforces the judgement that the government's response to problems faced were not 'remarkable' and did not significantly impact the poor. Again, showing Ashton has the strongest interpretation. Ashton also states "the fear of starvation and... the threat to public order here too great to be ignored". This can be taken to mean that government's actions at the time led to a degradation in social order ~~and a threat~~ and threatened the integrity of England. This can be supported by historical evidence, for example, there were multiple deaths from starvation in Cumbria, 1596, and this led to a rising in Oxfordshire led by 4 rebels as a result of fear from food scarcity and declining relief. Food riots continued to spread throughout England, with over 1000 rebelling against London merchants after shortages. This led to a severe increase in poverty, ~~as~~ which was already seen as a threat to

social order. This reinforces the argument that the government's response to problems was the nation faced was not "remarkable". Again, sharing that Ashton has the stronger interpretation.

The main differences between the two extracts are their attitudes to the problems faced. Rouse takes a more positive approach, arguing that they were mostly out of control of the monarch and all that could have been done, was. Whereas, Ashton takes a more negative approach, arguing that the governmental response only worsened and perhaps created more problems than what was originally being faced. The basis of these arguments differ because of the perspective each historian takes, Rouse argues more from a top-down perspective, from the point of view of the monarch and ~~her~~ the government's means. Ashton argues from a more grass-roots perspective, using the impact on the poor to support his argument ^{and} how their hardship reflects the government's failures.

Overall, it is clear that the government's response to problems was not 'remarkable', which aligns with the evidence and arguments of ^{Ashton.} Ashton.

The most convincing aspect of their argument is when they state "the poorest bore the heaviest burden" because it accounts for the fact that the health of English society reflects the effectiveness of its government, and society in this period reflects badly. They have based their argument on this perspective of the poor which is the best approach as it offers a wider view of England at the time, not just the isolated experiences of the government and monarch. Where Rones falls short is by stating "we find Elizabeth and her government doing its best to protect the poor" because by evaluating the health of lower classes in England at the time, this ^{claim} can be easily disproved, especially when evidence suggests the conditions of the poor only worsened. Rouse has based their argument on an isolated view of the monarch ~~and~~, weakening their arguments as it fails to fully evaluate the impact of her actions and policy on the rest of society. Therefore, a final judgement can be made that in the years 1589 to 1603, the response of Elizabeth's government to the problems her nation faced was not 'remarkable'.



This 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 (whether the response of Elizabeth's government was 'remarkable') rather than the general controversy and (4) It offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (eg main factor), as well as some other factors
- 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
- Focusing carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – eg a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Answers which pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, eg write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt 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
- Where a response does not give sufficient consideration to the given issue/proposition in the question (eg looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- 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
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, 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; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, eg consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, 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 these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, eg through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

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

