



# **Examiners' Report June 2024**

**GCE History 9HI0 1C**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2024

Publications Code 9HI0\_1C\_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 1C.

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 answered in lengthier contextual description or explanations of, say, the growth of London and the British economy, rather than analysis of the significance of this growth in the development of the economy (for Question 4), or descriptions of the extracts and the consequences of the Toleration Act, rather than an analysis and evaluation of the views in relation to the proposition that the Toleration Acts did little to undermine Anglican supremacy (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 the 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 as 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 the middle and higher levels. What distinguished between these tended to be down to their ability to exemplify the different factors – religious issues or otherwise – and their ability to develop this material with a clear focus on how these contributed to the problems faced by the monarchy.

In examining the role played by religious issues, responses commonly covered some of the following: how Laud's religious reforms weakened personal rule by offending English Puritans, how these reforms and Charles' marriage created fears of a revival of Catholicism, the issue of puritan opposition from within and outside parliament, and the extent to which this, rather than Charles' religious preferences, were the cause of problems, and the attempt to impose religious uniformity in Scotland. A smaller number considered the perceived interference and influence of Arminians in secular affairs, and how this undermined the power of the traditional elite, and the extent to which Charles' religious policies were associated with absolutist tendencies. Less successful responses were more likely to offer a narrower range of issues, eg Henrietta Maria's Catholicism, and were less likely to explore how this contributed to problems. Other factors commonly covered included issues arising from involvement in the Thirty Years' War, resistance to the levying and extension of Ship Money; resentment generated by the revival of feudal payments and selling monopoly licences; Charles I's problems in funding the military campaign against the Scots; the constitutional issues arising during personal rule and opposition to the legality of these. A number framed these around the role of advisors or Charles' own personality. There was some balance in arguments for and 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 the necessary criteria, and high-scoring responses were clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Less successful responses tended to offer limited knowledge of the reasons for problems, or descriptive accounts with limited focus relating knowledge to the question's demands. More secure responses tended to demonstrate more careful selection in deployment of knowledge, a sufficient range of this knowledge, and a secure grasp of how this related to the precise demands of the question. A good number of responses were able to explore the interrelationship between issues, eg making distinctions over how the prayer book crisis in Scotland was rooted in Charles' religious policies, but triggered a subsequent crisis which revealed the latent financial and constitutional weaknesses in personal rule, or exploring the interplay of factors during the years 1625-29, taking in the financial pressures of war, constitutional arguments highlighted by measures such as the Petition of Right, the significance of advisors such as Buckingham, or how arguments over Richard Montagu highlighted religious and constitutional tensions.

During the years 1625-40, Charles I faced many difficulties and ruled without parliament for 11 years. ~~During~~ ~~the~~ ~~period~~, ~~the~~ ~~backman~~. With many people opposing him throughout the period, he recalled Parliament in 1640 due to his lack of finances. On the one hand it could be said that the problems the monarchy faced were primarily due to financial issues. However, it is accurate to say that the most significant reason as to why he faced problems was due to religion.

It is accurate to say that Charles I faced

problems due to religion as Laudian reform created much opposition within England. William Laud was made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 and started to implement many changes within the Church of England. For example, fonts were decorated, the communion table was moved to the east and organs were introduced. These changes had serious ~~in~~ connotations of Catholicism and as Laud was Arminian, pursued 'Beauty of Holiness', something that many English Puritans opposed. English Puritans feared a revival of Catholicism and its links with Absolutism, most importantly during Charles' personal rule that replicated it quite closely. More significantly, Laudian reform introduced the Book of Sports, directly attacking the belief of Sabbatarianism and deeply offended Puritans. One example of this opposition is seen by the case of Bastwick, Burton and Pymne in 1637, three Puritans who greatly opposed Laud's reforms. All these individuals

(Section A continued)

were tried using the Star Chamber, showing how Charles and Laud were extremely strict about imposing uniformity. Although ~~there~~ in England there was limited opposition, many members of the parliamentary opposition were Puritan, like Pym and Cromwell. This shows that problems the King faced after Personal Rule were partly due to ~~his~~ ~~own~~ religion as many saw Laudian reform as tyrannical due to its absolutist implications.

It is also accurate to say that the problems faced by the monarchy were due to religion due to the problems it caused in Scotland. Charles issued the English Book of Common Prayer in Scotland by royal proclamation in 1636. When it was read aloud in St Giles' Church, Edinburgh in 1637, riots ensued and led to the signing of the National Covenant in 1638 - with 300,000 people signing it - Divisions over religion, led to the Bishops' Wars in 1639 and in 1640, causing a huge

(Section A continued)

drain on the Exchequer. Charles faced a humiliating defeat at both wars and the Treaty of Ripon in 1640 meant that Charles had to pay the Scots £50 a day while they occupied Newcastle. The <sup>effects of the</sup> Bishops' Wars were also worsened by the Taxpayers strike from 1639 to 1640 which led to Charles having to recall Long Parliament in 1640, leading to increased opposition from Parliament. However, it ~~could be said~~ <sup>could be</sup> financial problems arguably ~~were~~ more significant as they led to Charles facing further problems with Parliament and the eventual Civil War. But without religious issues, the Bishops' Wars would have not occurred and Charles could have ruled without Parliament for longer.

It is not accurate to say that religion was the primary problem faced by the monarchy but ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> instead finances. During his personal rule, Charles had to find many ways to live without parliamentary subsidies,

leading to a lot of opposition. For example, Ship Money was levied in 1634, being extended to the mid & inland counties in 1635. By 1636 it had become an annual tax and its successes were seen, as in the first year the non-payment was only 2.5%. However, Ship Money had become extremely hated and resented as it was not used for its original purpose. This is evidenced by the Hampden Case in 1637, where Hampden refused to pay Ship Money. Although when he was tried the King was found unsurprisingly in favour, it showed that opposition did exist. Moreover, Hampden was a leading MP in the opposition against Charles, highlighting that Charles' tyranny during Personal Rule caused problems due to finances. In addition, the City of London were fined £70,000 in 1635. They were a very influential company that would often give Charles loans during times of need. In 1639, Charles requested money from them, and ~~they~~ the City only, gave him £5000,

rendering him unable to fight the Bishops' War. Overall, finances did play an important role in the problems he faced and ultimately led to him recalling Long Parliament.

In conclusion, it is accurate to say that the problems faced by the monarchy were primarily due to religious issues as it caused opposition in Scotland and England. Laudian reform created a fear of Catholicism and greatly angered Puritans, many of whom led the opposition against him after 1640. The problems in Scotland were a direct result of his actions and led to the Bishops' Wars. It ~~could~~ can be said that financial issues did not significantly affect Charles until the Bishops' Wars and there were actually many financial successes at the beginning of Personal Rule. For example, Ireland was made self-sufficient by Wentworth and the Treaty of Madrid saved his annual expenditure from £500,000 to £70,000.

Therefore, it was religious divisions that caused Charles many problems as without the Bishops' Wars, he possibly could have continued his Personal Rule for longer.



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 examine the reasons for the problems faced by the monarchy in the years 1625-40, demonstrating knowledge and understanding of issues. The argument is logical and well organised, and there is a well-substantiated overall evaluation.

## Question 2

Question 2 was the less popular of the two within Section A. The vast majority of candidates who did attempt this question seemingly found it sufficiently accessible enough to achieve levels three and above. What distinguished within responses tended to be down to the quality of knowledge, and the ability to relate this to the demands of the question, both in terms of marshalling information around royal absolutism or other factors, and relating these points fully to the issue of difficult relations between Charles II and parliament.

Stronger responses targeted how accurate it is to say that difficult relations between Charles II and parliament was due to absolutism. Responses in the higher levels gave reasonable chronological coverage and covered a sufficient range of factors during the given period.

Stronger responses targeted the role played by fears of royal absolutism in the difficulties faced by Charles II in his relations with parliaments, clear focus on causation, and an analysis of the links between key factors. Sufficient knowledge to develop the key factor typically included issues such as Charles's actions during the Third Anglo-Dutch War, including the Declaration of Indulgence and the 'Stop of the Exchequer', concerns over relations with Louis XIV, and the events of the Exclusion Crisis. A good number directly countered the proposition by highlighting issues such as Charles II's willingness to make concessions during the 1660s, his withdrawal of the Declaration of Indulgence in 1673 and his relative flexibility in issues such as the appointment of ministers in response to parliamentary concerns. Other factors commonly considered were Catholicism and anti-Catholicism, finance, war and the nature of the Restoration Settlement. Some stronger responses were able to argue that the level of fear and suspicion wasn't a constant, and explored the extent to which Catholicism and absolutism were related, and indeed amounted to one and the same thing in the minds of many Protestants at the time.

Less successful responses often lacked focus, or were essentially a narrative of the period under discussion with limited distinction between factors. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth, with limited material to support claims.

After the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660, the relations between the new monarch, Charles II, and parliament faced difficulty. One of the primary fears causing tension was that of royal absolutism, whereby a monarch rules without an elected representative body. This fear stemmed from Charles II's close relationship with his cousin, Louis XIV of France, an absolute monarch. However, it could be argued that fears of absolute monarchy were only driven by the fear of Catholicism and its influence that caused many other problems during the years 1660-81. Another argument that matches the criteria of how difficult it made governmental relations is that the true reason for instability was instead the initial Restoration Settlement (1660) that did not lay the suitable foundations for stable relations and emphasised the issues later on, such as the fear of absolutism, making it an invariably significant reason.

The fear of royal absolutism had carried over from the reign of Charles II's father, Charles I, and continued to plague relations between the Crown and parliament in the years 1660-81. Charles II's close relationship with Louis XIV, the absolute monarch of France, did little to reduce any fears in parliament of such a system being established. The Triennial Act had ensured that parliament had to be called at least once

every three years, though as demonstrated by Charles I, the monarch could just dissolve parliament at will. Despite fears over absolutism, Charles II was forced to call parliament for grants, loans and the wiping of his debt. This meant that as long as parliament was required for economic support, Charles could not embark upon any form of personal rule or establish an absolute monarchy. However in 1670, this power balance did somewhat shift, as the Treaty of Dover was signed between Louis XIV and Charles. This agreement guaranteed Charles II financial and military backing in the event that they challenged his prerogatives further, which Charles strongly valued, owing to his major belief in his Divine Right to rule. The sole condition of the agreement was that Charles openly convert to Catholicism, highlighting the undercurrent of these fears of absolutism, a growing Catholic influence, which consumed so much more than just fears of absolutism and therefore had a much wider influence on relations between Charles II and parliament.

The fear of Catholicism is yet another issue that continues on from the previous Stuart monarch, owing to a number of reasons. The prior mentioned Treaty of Dover was seemingly the confirmation of the Catholic sympathies of Charles II, posing a major threat to the Protestant nation. In France, Louis XIV's rule had seen the persecution of the Huguenots after Protestantism was made illegal, and fear of a similar fate spread across Britain.

The war against the Dutch for economic gain in the North America, also increased suspicion as the Netherlands was a fellow Protestant nation that was also in fear of the Catholic powerhouse of France. However, the most significant development was the conversion of the Duke of York, James Stuart, to Catholicism. As Charles II had no legitimate children to succeed him, his brother James was next in line for the throne, and this was viewed as a major threat to Protestantism in Britain by radical Whig MPs who attempted to remove James from the succession. This was the Exclusion Crisis of 1688, where radical MPs attempted to pass the exclusion bill to prevent any Catholic monarch of Britain. Charles viewed this as the over-extension of parliamentary right and too much of a challenge to the Divine Right of a monarch, and so dissolved parliament to prevent the passing of such a law. However, earlier acts such as the Test Act (1673) had prevented Catholics from holding public office by stating that all who held such positions had to attend Anglican communion, changing some successful limitations placed upon Catholicism. The influence of this fear across the whole period demonstrate its importance, and how it particularly motivated fears of royal absolutism, making it more of a catalyst than that fear in itself.

The Restoration Settlement was a series of laws and acts between the restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660 and

1664, as an attempt to create a more constitutional monarchy and prevent the same issues from the reign of Charles I. The ~~King~~ parliament that was left following the resignation of Robert Cromwell as Lord Protector in 1658 were left with little choice but to recall Charles Stuart from exile in the Netherlands. Colonel Pride sent the Declaration of Breda to Charles, which was used as the basis for his restoration as monarch, and coronation as King Charles II of England. However, many of the points on the declaration were not actually brought into law during the Restoration Settlement. In the declaration, Charles had promised religious toleration, however, the 1662 Act of Convention by parliament constrained any Anglican dissenters, preventing the meeting of groups of more than five. Charles II did attempt to pass a Toleration Act in 1663 but was pressured into withdrawing it. The 1664 Act of Uniformity only further ensured these strict religious constraints, and the constant rebuttal between Charles and parliament over this issue continued. When Charles finally did pass his Toleration Act in 1672, ~~it was~~ Catholics and Jews were excluded, and parliament further ensured this by the 1673 Test Act that only further cemented Anglicanism as an immutable force. This demonstrates that the Restoration Settlement (1660-68) was unsuccessful in establishing a solid basis upon which good relations between the Crown and parliament could have been built, catalysing further suppression of Catholicism, and potentially motivating Charles' alliance

with Louis XIV.

Overall, royal absolutism whilst being a significant fear for people in the years 1660-81 was not the main reason that caused tensions between Charles II and parliament, as it was ~~not~~ motivated by the more overarching fear of Catholicism that was of greater significance. The Restoration Settlement (1660-64) did little to solve this fear of Catholicism that had continued from the reign of Charles I, and if the settlement had made progress towards doing so, then relations between Charles II and parliament may have been more stable with less conflict, making the failure of the Restoration Settlement to provide this the most significant problem.



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 less popular of the two within Section B, and produced a wide range of responses. The main discriminating factor in the success of responses was the range and depth of knowledge on the issue, although there were a number who had some range and depth, but lacked consistent focus on the issue of decline, or offered a one-sided argument, emphasising decline with limited counter argument.

Arguments typically put forward in relation to the decline of the nobility were the impact of the Civil War and republican rule, relative economic decline when set against to the rise of the gentry and the growth of urban elites, the impact of inflation, and examples of indebtedness as a result of living beyond their means. A number organised their essays into an exploration of the extent of decline in social, financial and political terms, evaluating the extent of each in turn before arriving at an overall conclusion. On the whole responses offered less to counter the proposition. Common arguments to do so included the continued presence of the nobility amongst the political elite either side of the interregnum, the significance of their landholdings, their continuity in their social status and the relatively limited impact issues such as indebtedness or the rise of other groups had on their position. A small number also explored issues such as the flux within the membership of the nobility.

Whilst some responses were very successful in relating the nobility's position to that of other social groups, a minority did spend time detailing the position of groups such as professionals and merchants, with limited focus on the demands of the question. Where candidates were more securely focused on addressing the second-order concept of change, they tended to be more successful.

The political power of the nobility did not much decline between 1625-1688. While ~~the~~ political power fell the most and also fell somewhat financially, in <sup>social</sup> religious matters their power remained the same so their power was overall declining.

The political power of the <sup>nobility</sup> gentry decreased significantly over the period. In 1625, nobles such as Sir Francis Cotterel had very strong political power with their ability to be (to be) advisers to the King who at this time had the ultimate political power. This shows that especially this time and especially in the personal rule the nobility had very powerful political leverage as they were the advisers to the King and so essentially they were the only group that had sizeable power as there was no parliament for the gentry to influence or to operate on. This means that this was the peak of their power. However after the King's personal rule had ended the nobles' power of the political arena began to fall rapidly due to the emergence of the long parliaments in

(Section B continued)

on November 1640. This parliament gave rise to the very wealthy and powerful gentry such as John Pym who were able to obtain political power to pass legislation they otherwise could not have before. Such as passing the Triennial Act in 1641.

This shows the decline in the political power of the nobility as they now were not the only undisputed political class in the country with ~~the~~ now being a new class that was gaining power. ~~John~~ Pym was even so powerful that he was able to pass the Act of Attainder in May 1641 which led to the execution of Lord Strafford.

This indicates how the powers had shifted and how now it was the gentry who had power as they were able to go against the wishes of the nobility even managing to create one without the noble being able to stop it.

This worsened after the pride's purge in 1648 which called the Rump parliament who was essentially a gentry controlled parliament that either could be the cause of ~~the~~ nobles or the noble power. This highlights how the nobles had fallen from the undisputed political elite to now by 1649 being political outsiders. However this did ~~not~~ ~~not~~ decline was not complete as by 1660 and the restoration nobles such as the Earl of Clarendon, Lord Asher Shaftesbury and Sir Thomas Donby returned to the fore front of

political life. Despite this the emergence of the Whigs to combat the Tory elite show how the political power never recovered back to the undisputed power held during Charles I's personal rule.

The financial power of the nobility declined but not as significantly as its political power. The nobles were very financially powerful under Charles I due to having vast lands and many farms to which they were able to gain revenue. This power was again undisputed however the rise of the gentry and a new class of professionals and merchants began to combat this power. As a result this resulted in the gentry controlling  $\frac{1}{2}$  of all the land in England while the nobles only controlled  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the land. This shows that the gentry became superior to the nobles in terms of financial matters which was also coupled with the fact that merchants also started to grow powerful. By 1688, there were 64,000 merchants compared to 30,000 merchants in 1580. As a result of this massive increase in wealthy merchants the nobility now faced greater levels of competition than they had previously especially during the personal rule. This then again reminded that

condispued power that had existed before hand,  
Also the growth of a new class of professionals  
also began to earn a greater amount of money  
which was get into the class that called them  
complete financially. However many of these new professions  
were noble themselves with the other temple sagi  
stating that by 1640 90% of their students were either  
gentry or nobles which they that the nobles still were  
involved in the new money making schemes at the  
time. This is also shown in the fact that while merchants  
were becoming more numerous and wealthier especially  
in 1650 during a consumer boom in London they  
as a class was never able to compete with the  
nobles as was shown by the fact that the Marquis  
of Newcastle and the Earl of Worcester were able  
to give £900,000 and £700,000 respectively to the royalist  
cause in 1642 which was more than what the average  
worker made in a year. This significant spending  
highlights that while they lost their undisputed position  
and that at the top of financial matters they still  
were the dominant and powerful as they had not  
lost their power like they had so significantly in  
politics.

In ~~respect~~ the social structure of England, the

nobles power remained the same were most of the time period. This ~~means~~ can be seen how during Charles I reign the top of the social structure was the nobles with only the king beneath him. This shows that at the start the nobles were the dominant class socially due to the fact that they were with the king and they were the king gave them the most important jobs and gave them strong political power. This was maintained during the Restoration with the new King Charles II giving the nobles power ~~at~~ socially by putting the likes of Clarendon in power. This then socially put the nobles in at the top of the social ladder whenever there was a king as they always ensured that the aristocrats had power.

Overall the power of the nobility decline significantly in political matters losing their undisputed power while financially they lost their power ~~at~~ but were still dominant while socially they remain at the top ~~for~~ ~~among~~ y for as long as the Civil War.



This response demonstrates some of the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with good knowledge to explore the extent to which the power of the nobility declined. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

## Question 4

This was the more popular choice of question in Section B, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within level three and above. Few responses were significantly lacking in knowledge, and at the higher end there were some impressive responses with a range of precise supporting material. The main discriminating factors tended to be how well responses dealt with the given issue, and the ability to fully explore material to establish its significance in the development of the economy.

In terms of the given issue, the most common argument was to examine London in relation to finance and the expansion of overseas trade. Some tended to conflate these with London, but stronger responses were secure in examining this relationship. Many responses also examined the significance of London as a hub for domestic and foreign trade, the importance of the growth of its population in stimulating demand for agricultural produce and other goods, exploring the impact this had on the economy in the South East (and beyond, eg demand for coal) and the extent to which London attained a concentration of population which enabled it to support an economy that by 1688 was undergoing a significant transition.

Most responses approached the question by attempting to weigh the significance of London against other issues, an approach which largely proved successful, although the strongest were those that consistently kept the precise demands of the question in mind. A range of other issues were considered, most commonly developments in agriculture, changes in the cloth trade, colonial trade, particularly tobacco and sugar, the impact of the Navigation Acts, and British control of the triangular trade and the East India Company. A clear range and balance were evident here too (across the period, and arguing for/against the significance of the growth of London) in order to examine and explore key issues. Whilst some responses were less secure in their material, many had sufficient knowledge. Within these, some responses were less organised in focusing this around an analysis of the significance of London.

Judgements made about the significance of London were reasoned and based on clear and varied criteria, eg in quantitative terms such as numbers of people involved or value to the economy, across the timespan, or impact on the composition of the economy in terms of different sectors. Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated. Less successful responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a limited analysis of the significance of developments for economic growth.

Whilst it is certainly true that the growth of London played a pivotal role in the growth of the British economy in the years 1625-88, it was not the most significant one. Instead it is more accurate to say that developments in the cloth trade played the most significant role. This is ~~due to~~ due to how the cloth trade provided a wide impact on all areas of Britain ~~the~~ and the economy, helped create more jobs for ~~many~~ people, and helped increase monetary gains. Based on this, whilst the growth of London, and other factors, such as banking and insurance, played a role in growing the economy, it is unquestionable that the cloth trade played the most significant role.

It is fair to say that the growth of London played a great role in developing the British economy, as it provided a centre for trade and that would help facilitate economic expansion. However, it must be noted that much of this trade growth, and the monetary impact they had, was driven by the growth of the

cloth trade. Nevertheless, London's growth was a transformative change for the economy, with the population of the city reaching 400,000 by the 1650s, which meant increased supplies of food were brought into the city, as evidenced by the increase in grain shipments from 6.5 million kilograms in 1605 to 14.5 million kilograms in 1661. This development of national market links was further accentuated by the ~~growth~~ implementation of 8000 toll roads under the 1607 Turnpike Act, which helped build links between London and areas of agricultural ~~then~~ production to fuel its role as an area of food and markets, which helped stimulate the domestic economy. Moreover, London began to flourish as a centre of trade, spearheaded by the founding of chartered companies such as the Levant Company in 1601, which strengthened links with European trading powers in the Ottoman Empire and in the Mediterranean. This was then facilitated by the spreading of shipping news in new coffee houses in London, such as the one founded by Edward Lloyd in 1688, which helped increase London's prolific status as a centre for trade, which helped bring in more jobs for new workers in London which

helped grow the economy. However, it must be acknowledged that ~~so~~ much of London's growth as a centre of trade was made possible by the growth in the cloth trade. For instance, by <sup>the</sup> 1640s the cloth trade and its materials made up a staggering 92% of London's exports, which shows how, whilst London did grow as a ~~an~~ city to help develop the Stuart economy, much of the financial and job gains were down to the cloth trade, and thus show how it played a more significant role than the growth of London.

The rise of banking and insurance also critically played a part in the development of the British economy in the years 1625-~~8~~, by providing great financial growth for everyday citizens. However, its specialised nature as a small business and lack of ability to provide a plethora of jobs means that areas that did achieve this, such as the cloth trade, played a more significant role. Nonetheless, banking and insurance was a major player in ~~the~~ promoting the consumer boom post-1650. For instance, the reduction of interest rates from 10% to 8% in 1651 was aimed to make commercial

Following more attractive which helped build up economic links in urban areas. There was also the work of money sciences such as Robert Abbott and Clayton based in Cornhill, who brokered loans at low rates and encouraged lending, as seen in how roughly £1.13 million went through Abbott's accounts from 1652-55. This showed how banking was helping circulate money safely around the Stuart economy, and money was also preserved by the growth of insurance. Marine insurance, for instance, fell by 75% during the time period, which enabled and promoted greater overseas trade and shipping, a comfort to the merchant class, who had fears of shipwrecks instilled through the events of Shakespearean works of literature such as *The Tenth Night* and *The Merchant of Venice*. There was also a rise in great house ~~the~~ insurance, as seen in the work of Dr. Nicholas Barbon and his Insurance Office for Houses set up in 1680, and had insured over 4000 houses by 1683. Thus it is evident to see that banking and insurance helped provide a key security for finance that would help grow the Stuart economy. However, whilst it did

promote greater financial prosperity, banking and insurance was limited in having a wide impact since businesses were mainly small scale and limited in their reach. Moreover, the growth of banking and insurance would do little to help advance job opportunities in the economy, since it was such a specialised skill to learn, which can be seen in how there were only around 400 banks by 1877. The ability of the cloth trade to not only secure financial gain but to also provide jobs <sup>and</sup> meant that it ultimately played a more significant role than banking and insurance.

As mentioned, the development of the cloth trade had great <sup>development</sup> ~~importance~~ for the British economy in the years 1625-88, given how it managed to accumulate amounts of money but also crucially have a broad impact and create job opportunities, rather than it played a far more significant role than the growth of banking and insurance. The cloth trade crucially helped to build links between urban areas of work and rural workers through the putting out system, where merchants would bring wool for

rural families to weave, then would sell the product at the market. This crucially provided more jobs not only for merchants, but also for ~~with~~ the rural families, who began to emerge into nuclear families as a result of the cloth trade. ~~There~~ The cloth trade also managed to develop wide links with other areas, appealing to Dutch weavers and the 200,000 Huguenots who fled France after the revoking of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. These workers led to more skilled and quality products being ~~produced~~<sup>shipped</sup> around the globe, and the development of horsted drapery in Norfolk helped expand different products in a variety of areas, with places such as Lancaster who produced worst cloth, showing the wide impact of the cloth trade on the economy. Crucially, the cloth trade also saw great financial gains, by providing most of London's export materials, as seen by how it amounted to 74% of exports and £1.5 million pounds annually in the 1680s, even as ~~these~~ rival ~~products~~ entered the market. Thus, given how it gave great financial gain and also created wide impacts and jobs, the cloth

trade ~~had~~ played the most significant role in developing the British economy.

Weighing out all the factors, it became clear that, whilst London's growth and banking and insurance helped create ~~to~~ development in the economy, it was the ability of the cloth trade to directly stimulate financial gain in London and offer jobs that banking and insurance could not, that meant the cloth trade ~~was~~ ~~the~~ most significant role in the development of the British economy in the years 1625-88.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

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, and there is well reasoned judgement, exploring the significance of London and weighing this against other issues. Sufficient knowledge is effectively deployed throughout the answer.

## 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 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 Extract 1's arguments concerning the Toleration Act's origins as a begrudging half measure with limited scope, which enabled Anglicans to continue to dominate public life, in contrast with Extract 2's emphasis on the gains dissenters made as a result of the Act, and the impact these had in eroding Anglican supremacy.

Where candidates were less successful, this tended to be (i) limited use of contextual knowledge, or offering valid contextual knowledge, but with limited linkage to the discussion of the views, or (ii) a tendency 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.

Candidates' knowledge and understanding of issues was generally sound and varied. In a minority of responses the knowledge offered was limited. However, a good number of candidates did display excellent knowledge about the background to the Toleration Act, the role and attitude of William III, courts and local officials in the implementation of the Act, and figures on the growth of dissent. They were therefore able to expand beyond the points made in the interpretations and apply knowledge to discuss and evaluate them. Others also utilised their knowledge of religious uniformity and measures to enforce this in the reign of Charles II and were able to argue that, comparatively, Anglican Supremacy had indeed been weakened.

The vast majority were able to identify the conflicting arguments of Bucholz and Key (E1) and Miller (E2), and a good number built their success on establishing the essential differences at the outset of the response, giving a sense of early structure and coherence to their responses. A good number also made use of select phrases and quotations from the extracts that could be developed by candidates. The vast majority avoided previously seen problems of neglecting the extracts at the expense of own knowledge, eg producing a response where contextual knowledge leads and where a phrase from the extract is then added on by way of support. Rather, the majority were extract led, identifying and attempting discussion of these views. 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 end, 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 to 1701, the Toleration Act of 1689 did little to weaken the Anglican supremacy?

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

(20)

John Miller in Extract 1 puts forward the more convincing argument that the Toleration Act of 1689 did not reduce little to weaken the supremacy of the Anglican Church. He asserts that it was "the product of a cynical political deal" and "was introduced reluctantly". William had intended to pass a Comprehension Bill which would have widened the scope of Toleration and repeal the 1673 Test Act. Instead, the Toleration Act was passed as a compromise; this supports Miller's view by demonstrating that this was a reluctant compromise to prevent religious issues, and shows that the elite within Parliament still maintained a strong sense of Anglicanism. Moreover, Miller puts forward that there was limited scope of the Toleration Act as "there was to be no freedom of worship for Catholics, Unitarians or Jews", suggesting that Toleration was only extended to certain dissenters. Bucknoll in Extract 2 supports this by stating "Catholics... remained subject to extensive legal restrictions". Evidence of this continuing anti-Catholic sentiment can be found with the Act of Settlement (1701) which excluded any future Catholic monarchs - this demonstrates that public and Parliamentary opinion

still viewed Catholics with suspicion, <sup>strengthening</sup> ~~weakening~~ the claim that toleration remained limited. Miller also argues that the lack of repeal after limits the Toleration Act's significance, by claiming "the laws against dissenters holding office... were to remain in force". The Test Act was not repealed by the act, meaning Anglican communion had to be taken to hold public office. This evidences the idea that Anglican supremacy in society and status remained. Overall, the evidence that the Toleration Act was limited in scope and did not extend to society makes ~~the~~ Miller's view that the Toleration Act did little to weaken Anglican supremacy more convincing.

Robert Buchholz' argument in Extract 2 claims that Anglican supremacy was weakened. He argues that "virtually all Protestant Churches were to be tolerated". The Act made all Protestant dissenters swear an oath of loyalty to the crown and denounce Catholicism, which then allowed one to attend dissenting Protestant Churches, suggesting that the Act marked the end of the Anglican Church trying to bring others under its influence <sup>and the end of a confessional state</sup>. However, not all Protestant dissenters were allowed, such as non-Trinitarians being excluded from the Act's provision, as Miller acknowledges, showing a lack of scope of toleration. Buchholz himself argues that Catholics were also not tolerated under the Act, showing that toleration was limited to only the sects that the Anglican MPs were

willing to allow. Bucholz claims that the Test Act, which limited the ability of non-Anglicans to hold public office, "could be overcome by the practice of occasional conformity". In order to hold public office, the Test Act stated that no person must take Anglican communion, which meant that people could simply ~~take it~~ take part in an Anglican service a few times a year as no proof of attendance at Anglican Church was required. However, the existence of this requirement and failure of the Toleration Act to repeal this ~~led~~ shows that non-Anglicans were still deemed legally inferior, even if there were ways to avoid these rules, highlighting the retention of the notion of Anglican Supremacy even after 1689. Bucholz also suggests "the Toleration Act freed not only Dissenters... but also the sceptical, the lazy, or the plain sleepy", which was paired with a weakening of "the Church's ability to demand obedience". This would ~~so~~ imply that the Act reduced religious influence over people's lives as a whole. However, in reality non-attendance at Anglican Church was still meant to be recorded, and as Miller correctly asserts, Dissenters "had to keep their doors open during meetings". This suggests that the Toleration Act only extended to ~~that~~ ending the congressional state and not ~~the~~ the unequal treatment of Dissenters. It was in fact the changing public attitudes and reluctance to report non-conformity that had a greater impact on toleration, because people did not wish to report dissent as they could be attending another Protestant sect's Church.

Therefore, the evidence suggests that although Bucholz is correct to suggest Toleration did undermine the supremacy of Anglican worship, it did not relax legal restrictions or extend to all sections of society. The differing views of this interpretation could be due to the focus on worship, rather than how Miller focuses on legal restrictions that remained in place and the Parliamentary Anglicanism.

To conclude, Robert Bucholz submits the argument that the Toleration Act ended the Anglican supremacy, with a focus on worship and ways to overcome legal opposition. This correctly asserts that the Toleration Act marked the end of a confessional state and allowed the number of dissenting worshippers to grow by the end of the period. However, Miller's argument is more convincing as it acknowledges that legal measures like such as the Test Act remained in place and that the Toleration Act was only passed as a compromise - this demonstrates that in society and public office there was a continued sense of Anglican supremacy, which was legally enforced. Both extracts also acknowledge that Toleration did not extend to Catholics, or certain Protestant sects like Unitarians, showing that toleration remained limited due to retained Anglican power over Parliament and public <sup>a</sup> fear of Catholicism. Consequently, Miller's argument is more convincing as it argues little was done to weaken Anglican supremacy in society and among

the elite in Parliament. In light of this, it can be said that the Toleration Act was significant in weakening the Anglican Supremacy within worship, but not in society and legally.

\* The Toleration Act ~~was~~ had a significant impact by reducing the opposition to dissent, which allowed the numbers to flourish to 400,000 in England by 1714.



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 Toleration Act of 1689 weakened Anglican supremacy) rather than the general controversy concerning 1688-89, and (4) It offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the Bucholz/Key and Miller extracts.

## 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 of detail and analysis 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 and consequences, 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 or 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
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these 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>

