



Examiners' Report

June 2023

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/resultspplus. 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 2023

Publications Code 9HI0_1B_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Introduction

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. This was most evident on Section C, as would be expected. Whilst the impact of this cannot be fully mitigated against, and the best advice is thus to plan time accordingly in the first place, the responses that appeared to experience such timing issues yet overcame them to some degree were those who offered more direct responses. Those who wrote abbreviated question 5 responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given views, rather than offering extensive explanations and quotes, were more likely to still produce a reasonably effective response than those failing to reach any comparative analysis and evaluation. Finally, examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge.

Question 1

Question 1 was a 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 to some degree and reached the middle and higher levels. What distinguished within responses at level three and above tended to be down to two issues: how precise the focus was, and the quality of knowledge, particularly on the given issue.

On the former, stronger responses had a clear focus on religious change, and were also clear in distinguishing the beliefs of individual monarchs from other factors. Less successful responses tended to drift to some degree towards description of Henry's desire for an annulment and the Break with Rome, or equating Henry wanting something to mean his personal beliefs shaped religious change. More astute responses clearly identified and explored the extent to which this was driven by dynastic and diplomatic concerns, often tying this to effective argument drawing on knowledge of Henry's reversal of some aspects of the Reformation to demonstrate his religious conservatism. Whilst candidates could have some success with discussing the growth of Protestantism as a by-product of Henry's desire to secure his succession, it was those who could clearly connect this to the impact it had in religious terms, such as arguments that were put forward relating to Cromwell's use of this in advancing the reformist cause. Many also commented on the influence of Anne Boleyn, Thomas Cranmer and especially Thomas Cromwell. There was also good use made of knowledge of the 'Collectanea satis copiosa', the Royal Injunctions of 1536 and 1538, and the Dissolution of the Monasteries.

Candidates were very confident on Edward, with most emphasising his personal beliefs despite his age, referencing such things as the abolition of the Chantries, the 42 Articles and the Prayer Books, whilst also noting the influence of Somerset, Northumberland and especially Cranmer. Mary's Catholicism was cited by the vast majority, discussing issues such as the restoration of papal authority, heresy laws, and the reversal of previous legislation, although a number also argued that she took account of political considerations, e.g. through not restoring the monasteries. With regards to Elizabeth, most candidates showed understanding of her own Protestantism. Arguments that religion under Elizabeth amounted to a 'middle way', shaped by political concerns were popular amongst many, although some showed a more nuanced and arguably more up-to-date view, along the lines that Elizabeth's personal views were significant in shaping a religious settlement that ultimately sought to reject many aspects of what Catholic bishops and more radical Protestant influences would have preferred.

In the years 1529-63, the ~~changes~~ are that the beliefs of individual monarchs played in shaping religious change can be assessed by comparing its relative significance with the ~~role that~~ ^{consolidation of} influence of principal ~~servants of the crown~~ ^{power and stability} as well as other factors such as ~~and a monarch's desire for stability~~ ^{and a monarch's desire for stability}. ~~the popular beliefs of the nation~~. These factors can, in turn, be assessed by judging whether they played a consistent ^{or long term} role throughout the period, ~~and~~ whether this role was underlying or directly motivating or a short term trigger.

Overall, the ~~beliefs of individual monarchs~~ can be seen to ~~overall, a desire for stability and~~ ^{overall, a desire for stability and} ~~firstly, the beliefs of the~~ have been the ~~most consistent~~ ^{most consistent} ~~motivations throughout the period~~ ^{power lasted from Henry to Elizabeth's reign} ~~whilst a desire~~ ^{whilst a desire} ~~for social stability was perhaps more influential in~~ ^{for social stability was perhaps more influential in} ~~Elizabeth's reign~~ ^{influential in the years 1547-1558.}

~~Firstly, the beliefs of Henry VIII were certainly significant~~ in influencing the religious change seen in his reign.

Firstly, in the reign of Henry VIII, it can perhaps be argued that it was not his personal religious beliefs that played the most significant role in influencing change to religion, but his desire to consolidate power for ~~the~~ himself and the relatively newly

(Section A continued) established Tudor dynasty. This can perhaps be evidenced in the fact that Henry was personally quite religiously conservative, as reflected in his writing 'In Defence of the Seven Sacraments' in 1521 and as well as his publication of the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition^r of a Christian Man' in 1534 which retained Catholic elements.

Indeed, Henry was made 'Defender of the Faith' in 1521 ~~was~~ by the Pope. Despite this, the period 1529-47 saw the extensive undermining of Catholicism in England, as epitomised in the 1534 Act of Supremacy which (Broke with Rome) and the 1536 and 1539 dissolution of the monasteries. Arguably, these radical changes can be seen to be motivated by a desire for power, as seen in Thomas Cranmer's 'Consecration of the Sacrament' of 1530 which saw the contribution of the research of European scholars to support the English monarch as the head of the Church, thus indicating Henry's interest in Erasmian kingship. Furthermore, many of the religious changes in this period can be seen in tandem with changes which strengthened the power of England - as reflected in the Restraint of Appeals (1533) in which Cranmer ~~each~~ clarified England as an empire free from foreign intervention. Put simply, this dual motivation of religious change and strengthening England and the Crown is epitomised in the dissolution of the monasteries, which enhanced England's power by undermining links with sister monasteries in Europe and also had a

(Section A continued) Significant financial move as seen in the Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1535 which assessed the wealth of the monasteries, and the fact that they raised £300,000 for the Crown by the end of the reign. Thus, the motives consolidating power played in motivating religious change, as opposed to personal belief can be seen to have been significant under Henry. To

Furthermore, ^{desire for} ~~this~~ can be seen to have been a primary ~~under Elizabeth~~, the ~~desire for stability~~ influence of issues of state as opposed to personal faith can be seen to have continued to be a ~~significant~~ priority, showing its ^{longevity} ~~ambiguity~~ over the period. Whilst Elizabeth can be seen to have had mixed religious beliefs in retaining candles in her private chapel, employing the Catholic musician Thomas Tallis but also walking out of the Catholic Eucharist of the Host during Mass in 1558, balancing the varying religious beliefs of her country can be seen to be the priority, as reflected in the religious settlement of 1559. The difficult religious context in which these religious changes were made, and thus the need for stability and moderation, can be seen in the fact that a half of the Lords were conservative and opposed to religious change (including Thomas Thomas Goddard, Bishop of St Asaph, as well as 5 others) and particularly notable parts of the country were still very Catholic - mainly the

(Section A continued) Thus, although 40% of dissenters remained Catholic into Elizabeth's reign. At the same time, Elizabeth was forced to balance this against the presence of Neale's 'Puritan Choir' of radical Protestant MPs (although only 4 of whom had returned from exile in 1559). The significance of this motivation for moderation and stability can be evidenced in the compromise made in the 'Device for the Alteration of Religion' with the bill being split into two acts, and each containing compromise. For example, the moderate Supremacy Bill established Elizabeth as Supreme governor as opposed to Supreme head of the Church, and additionally, the Uniformity Bill, which enforcing the radical 1552 Prayer Book and a 12d fine for non-attendance of Church services, retained the 1549 wording in the Mass, thus being deliberately ambiguous with regards to the ~~Mass~~^{Eucharist} to allow for Catholics to interpret it as transubstantiation having taken place. Furthermore, this concern for moderation, whatever her personal beliefs may have been, is reflected in Elizabeth blocking religious change in 1563. With ~~Cont Her~~, Convocation ~~passed~~ the Whist dismissing ^{the} 39 Articles, passed the radical Article 29 under Puritan pressure (which would have made it allowable not to kneel during Communion). Elizabeth's suppression of this evidences her fear of not being too radical. Indeed, Clough argues that Elizabeth's moderation of Catholicism in order

(Section A continued) To remain stability was so important to her that it led the leaders of her new religion to fear that it would be "loosely imposed".

Hence, this focus on the cult of the state can't be seen to have had been the most significant influence in the reign of Edward and Mary. Edward's devout Protestantism is evidenced in his writing to Mary in 1551 to order her to stop hearing the Mass and is explained by his education by the humanist scholar John Cheke. Indeed, the influence of his religious beliefs is reflected in the changes to religion in his reign despite his youth. He was responsible for encouraging the presence of European reformers such as Martin Bucer from 1549 as well as in co-authoring the radical 1552 2nd Book of Common Prayer with Thomas Cranmer which went as far as changing the doctrine of transubstantiation to become the denial of the Real Presence, in tandem with the loss of wooden to stone altars to reflect this. His influence was greatly felt in the 42 Articles of 1553 which would have clarified the English Church as Calvinist but were not enforced as a result of his death. Similarly, Mary's reign saw religious changes which were motivated by her devout Catholicism, such as the

(Section A continued) establish the Acts of Repeal of 1553 and 1554 which undid both the Henrician and Edwardian Reformation, reversing Catholic practices of ritual worship. Hence, even in Mary's reign, a need to maintain stability prevented a Catholic reformation, as evidenced in the fact that she was unable to restore monastic land in 1554 and also that she and her Parliament placed an emphasis on a top-down reformation characterised by synods (which had limited success in only establishing 1 seminary out of the desired 12) instead of gaining the help of the Jesuits. ~~Other~~

Thus, whilst there is evidence of the religious beliefs of the monarch motivating religious change, as seen under Edward, this factor was only underlying in the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth. Desire for the consolidation of power and stability can thus be seen to have been the most consistent and significant motivation.



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 personal beliefs were the main factor in shaping religious change. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned, if not fully developed judgement.

Question 2

Question 2 was the less popular option in Section A. It produced a range of responses, although the vast majority were able to access the middle and higher levels. The majority were able to discuss the reasons behind the decline in resistance, and beyond the given proposition of religious factors, candidates tended to cite alternatives such as Elizabeth's actions, including propaganda, her spy network and punitive legislation, the length of her reign, developments in methods used to control the nation, the impact of foreign threats and the development of patriotism, and the impact improvements in the economic climate had on the willingness of the population to take part in resistance.

Less successful responses were generally still able to reference the lack of resistance and link it to religious measures such as the Act of Uniformity but tended to offer less material on the wider issues. Some responses sought to make contrasts with previous examples of popular resistance, e.g. the Pilgrimage of Grace, the Western Rising and the Northern Rebellion, in order to establish the role played by different reasons, although the effectiveness of this did depend to some extent on whether responses stayed focused on the question, or became sidetracked in detailing events outside of the question's timeframe.

Candidates were able to explore the given issue of religious factors with reference to the Elizabethan Settlement, with many arguing that her Settlement was effective in removing a source of grievance for many, and also relating this to the effect that the passage of time had, along with exploring the relationship between religious factors and perceived foreign threat. Others did challenge the proposition by citing examples of both Puritan and Catholic opposition to the Religious Settlement and how other factors acted to limit the scale and effectiveness of such resistance.

To a large extent, it can be

✓	X
religious factors → older gen died out (2) +	passage time → more comfort, 44 yrs (2) - less hardship, fairly stable - Article etc (1) - control in the regions (2)

To a ^{small} extent, it can be argued that ~~the~~ the decline in resistance can be attributed to religious factors such as the older generation of Catholics dying out and tolerance of the monarch. However, there are more important factors such as the passage of time, a period of stability and control in the regions. It will be made clear that a period of stability is the most important factor in the decline of resistance in the Tudor rule 1570-88.

To a small extent, it can be argued that the decline in resistance was due to religious factors. This is because Elizabeth was a fairly tolerant monarch and preferred compromise - as evidenced by her the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559 and the suppression of article 29 in 1563, which would deny the presence of the Eucharist if passed, as she did not wish to

(Section A continued) make windows into men's souls. The fact that she was a moderate Protestant meant that she could compromise with both Protestants and Catholics, ensuring that doctrine was moderate so as not to upset the other faith and cause an uprising. Indeed, it can be argued that religion led to a decline in resistance as there weren't any ^{religious} rebellions and both Protestants and Catholics had a tendency to see themselves as Elizabeth's subjects first. Moreover, the fact that the older, conservative Catholics died out meant that there was less resistance to any religious changes passed by the Elizabethan government, therefore resulting in a decline of resistance as both faiths were more tolerant. However, religious factors weren't significant, nor are they the main cause. It can be argued that a period of stability was more important as in the past, most rebellions tended to be ~~to~~ be in response to socioeconomic issues a factor is the anticlerical grant of 1525 almost led to a rebellion due to the imposed tax. Socioeconomic stability is more important as than religion as it tended to affect all levels of society. As conditions stabilised, there was a period of stability.

It can be argued that ~~was~~ a period of stability led to a decline in resistance and is therefore the most important factor. This is because by the 1570s, there was economic and social stability. No taxes

(Section A continued) socioeconomic factors. The passage of time is more significant than religion as Elizabeth ruled for 44 years and ~~the~~ society wasn't subjected to upheaval. As time went on, ~~the~~ people were more likely to conform to Elizabethan policy and thus they were less likely to rebel. However, it is clear that ~~the~~ stability was the main factor in the decline of resistance. As the socioeconomic situation was prospering and stable, there were less issues to rise for, leading to the decline of resistance as ~~the~~ all levels of society were fairly satisfied in their conditions. This is more important than control in the regions ~~so~~ this is because there was less discontent over policies in the regions and thus, the Councils did not have to stamp rebellion out.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

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 these. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated, with confident and substantiated judgement being offered as to the extent to which religious factors were most important. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 3

Question 3 was the more popular choice with candidates in Section B 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 to higher levels.

The more popular topics to feature were the role and authority of parliament. The significance of the Reformation Parliament featured strongly, with many referencing the development of the notion of 'king-in-parliament' but also arguing that the enhanced role of parliament of the 1530s was not enduring and was essentially used as a tool to pass Henry's legislation rather than become powerful in its own right.

Other themes which featured in a significant number included developments to regional government, such as the Council of the North and legislation in Wales, and changes to the Privy Council, although the detail to fully substantiate arguments was lacking in some of these. A smaller number of responses addressed matters such as innovations in finance, the Court of Star Chamber or Justices of the Peace and the role they played in local government.

Stronger responses tended to offer sufficient range and balance, and explore the extent of change throughout, confidently harnessing the material used towards an analysis and evaluation of whether there was a revolution in government. Less successful responses tended to be limited by difficulties in focusing on change, or less secure material. Candidates should also be minded to address the question carefully – in a small minority of what were some otherwise well-argued responses, a one-sided response was offered, which did not give sufficient consideration to arguments and evidence which challenged the conclusion reached.

Although there were many changes in the way England was governed in terms of religion, finance, legal systems, and governmental structures, to the extent that this constituted, under Henry VIII's reign, a 'revolution', as the ~~express~~ state of government in 1547 was unrecognisable to that in 1509 (the criteria for a revolution).

It could be argued that there were not revolutionary changes to England's religious government from 1509-47; parliament arguably maintained a visible role in religion across the period, such as when in 1512 they passed the Act to limit the benefit of the clergy and clerical privilege in separate, Church law-courts, which suggests that their later Act for the Supplication of the clergy in 1532, and role in passing the laws to legitimise the Break with Rome and ending of papal power, was a mere continuation of this precedent.

However, it is more convincing to acknowledge that, by 1547, ^{government} parliament's religious power had grown ^{in an} unprecedented manner, ~~and as had that of the monarch~~ meaning there was an ~~unrecognisable~~ unrecognisable and revolutionary change. This can be supported by the fact that, whereas in 1509 the papacy had complete control over religion in England including religious practice, reaffirmed in 1534 by Henry's 'Defence of the Seven Sacraments', by the 1534 Act of Supremacy and 1538 papal excommunication, this had been completely destroyed. The new 'Supreme Head' of the Church was the monarch, ^{by the 1530s} which was a state unrecognisable to that in 1509, and the government had power over religious policy, shown by the 1536 and 1539 Acts of Ten and Six Articles, in which parliament was used to enforce new religious policy. There was, therefore, a revolution in the religious government of England, from the papacy to the secular government, which was an unrecognisable change.

(Section B continued)

Another argument is that the changes in England's government were limited, not revolutionary, in terms of its legal power over the country: although Wolsey's initial use of Star Chamber to prosecute wealthy landowners in the 1510s and 20s had seen a rise in legal cases from 12 to 120 a year, this was largely abandoned after his death in 1530, and ~~was largely~~ thus there was a lack of growing legal importance in England. Moreover, it could be said that, despite efforts to enforce legal order in outlying regions of the Marches and North, the fact of large-scale rebellions like the 1536 Pilgrimage of Grace and, after Henry's reign, the 1549 Ketti and Western Rising, suggests how these changes were ineffective and did not have a large transformative impact on how England was governed.

Nevertheless, it is more plausible to agree that the increased centralisation of government in 1547 was in fact unrecognisable from its 1509 state, and there was thus a revolution in how England was

by 1509

(Section B continued) governed. Under Henry VII, the role of the nobility had been akin to feudal lords, but Henry VIII upon accession transformed this into a 'service nobility' in court, replacing noble power with upper gentry roles like JP's and the Councils of the North and Marches, which ^{making it clear and} ~~radically~~ transformed the governance of England. ^{uninterrupted} This can be seen also in the fact that the reforms to the Councils ^{in the 1530s} greatly expanded royal control as had never before been possible: the 1536 Act of Union brought Wales under the ^{English} ~~British~~ legal system, transforming it ~~unrecognisably~~ from an outlying and uncontrollable region beyond royal control, to one governed by London sheriffs like Rowland Lee, who fiercely enforced the law and made Wales ~~fully~~ fully integrated into English government. Likewise, the 1537 restructuring of the Council of the North transformed it from an area, like Wales, largely controlled by local lords, to one with a Star Chamber style court, organised measurement and ~~off~~ trade system, and thus under English legal order, making it by 1547 unrecognisable from its earlier, disordered state which had led to the 30,000 man Pilgrimage of Grace; the fact of no further rebellions following restructuring indicates further how the effectiveness of the ways in which England was

(Section B continued) governed were transformed ^{to an} unrecognisable state by 1547, as England moved from lacking centralised control to being fully under it, reinforced by the 1536 Act of Union which took control of former ^{such as that of the Bishop of} Northumbria, creating a widespread revolution in how England was governed. ~~was~~ royal power was extended in an unprecedented, unrecognisable manner across the country, contrasting the 1509 state of feudal, noble control.

It could be argued that there was not a revolution in how England was governed because the financial systems remained largely the same: parliament retained the power over passing taxes and raising funds for the Crown, a continuity which can be seen in the fact that they were used by Wolsey to introduce the new subsidy taxation in 1512 as well as the original fifteenths and Tenths, and that the 1524 attempt by him to raise an 'Amicable Grant' without parliament failed due to widespread passive resistance, indicating how parliament retained ultimate

(Section B continued) authority over taxation and finance. This can be seen ~~as~~ ^{remedy as} having continued even following the break with Rome, as parliament was used to pass the 1536/7 Acts for the Dissolution of the Monasteries which transferred £1.3m of monastic lands to the king, revealing a maintained role of parliament in how the finances of the England were governed, and thus suggesting a lack of revolution by 1547.

A more plausible argument, however, is that there was in fact a transformation as the bureaucracy of governing finances, and governmental control, expanded hugely in the period, making it by 1547 unrecognisable from 1509: As the break with Rome gave new and unprecedented financial power to government, as the Act of First Fruits and Tenths transferred clerical payments to government, while the dissolution of the monasteries likewise transferred a vast sum of money to Henry, requiring Cromwell's 1536 Court of Augmentations and 3 accompanying financial courts in the 1540 - this reflected an unrecognisable new authority of government to handle those finances previously controlled by the Church, something revealed further by the 1536 Poor Law which licensed beggars and introduced requirements to provide the poor with means to work.

(Section B continued) ^{rather than Church} creating a new state role in the country's financial issues of poverty which was a transformation to that in ~~the~~ 1509. ^{and a revolution in government} Similarly, the 1541-51 debasement of the coinage created government and the king's new ability to control the country's economy and even their currency in order to fund war with France; ^(by passing parliament) revealing further how the new power of government over finance was a revolution in the ways England's finances were governed, and an unrecognisable change from the power of the church and parliament in 1509.

Overall, therefore, while some aspects of government, such as the power of the king, remained the same, the governance of religion, finance and governmental control over the country was unrecognisable by 1547, ^{to 1509} as a revolution had taken place, as government now had extreme power in these areas, largely catalysed with the loss of church power during the break with Rome, transferred to the king and government.



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 of change. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 4

Question 4 was the marginally less popular question in Section B of the exam, but nevertheless produced a range of responses. The vast majority of the candidates were able to recognise focus to some extent on the analytical demands of the question, and the majority were able to reach the middle and higher levels. However, some responses were limited in the range and depth of knowledge they were able to offer, and in some cases relied upon knowledge of limited relevance, or of potential relevance, but which was not always carefully used. For example, some candidates wrote fairly extensively on the impact of the Dissolution of the Monasteries, the financial burden of Henry's wars, poverty and enclosure, at times losing sight of the focus of the question.

Stronger responses tended to have more secure knowledge of issues that they could develop whilst keeping a clear focus on the question, e.g. the cloth industry, 'new draperies' and the impact of foreign textile workers, the centrality of London to trade, the opening up of overseas markets, balancing arguments concerning change with the recognition that much of the goods and services there were resulting from increased trade continued to be almost exclusively the preserve of the wealthiest in society, or that large sectors of the Tudor economy such as agriculture saw a great degree of continuity. Such strong responses were more likely to tease out fluctuations and variations within economic change.

Some responses tended to focus on explaining the main areas of change without offering much by way of an examination of the extent of this or shaping material more towards the reasons for change. Thankfully, the majority of candidates were able to make good use of what material they were able to draw upon, with the main discriminating factor in the quality of responses being the quality of material offered.

Chosen question number: Question 3

Question 4

There is no doubt that there were ^{major} ~~significant~~ changes in the Tudor economy. The influx of foreign workers, ~~trade~~ the increase of trade, ~~the dissolution of the monasteries~~ and the growing population all made ~~changes~~ sig both significant and permanent changes. However there is evidence which suggests major changes did not occur ~~which~~ ~~su~~ as some changes were more permanent than others.

The influx of foreign workers ~~was~~ significantly changed the Tudor economy ~~in 1509 the main product used~~ ^{by diversifying the trade market.}
In 1509 the main product traded was worsted yarn, which was aimed at cooler climates ~~through~~ this product brought in over £100,000 per year under Henry VIII. The arrival of foreign dutch workers from 1566 ~~it~~ introduced new draperies which were aimed at ~~the~~ warmer climates like the mediterranean. This diversified the textile trade market significantly by ~~expanding~~ expanding it to areas outside England. In addition this boosted the economy in regions ~~still~~ still dealing with harsh socioeconomic conditions because the draperies required alot of labour to produce. This suggests it was significant because the draperies

(Section B continued) diversified the textiles industry while simultaneously reducing poverty. By the end of Elizabeth's reign the draperies brought in over ~~£700~~ £750,000 a year which ~~proves~~ stands in stark contrast to worsted yarn which brought in a meagre £150,000 under Elizabeth. However ~~there is~~ the impact of foreign workers on the economy was only significant in regions where they settled ~~which suggests~~ ^{which suggests} their impact was not wide reaching. Nevertheless, the new draperies led to new industries such as linen in Maidstone and Norwich which reinforces its significance in boosting the Tudor economy.

In addition the ~~temp~~ ^{increasing} role of London as a market for goods boosted trade throughout Europe which ^{in the economy.} suggests that was a major change. London was the base for both international and domestic trade - from the mid 1550s onwards it ~~was~~ became increasingly important as it was the base for merchants, fishmongers and tailors.

The high population of London (over 200,000 by the late 1590s) ~~referred to~~ boosted the trade ~~in~~ from places outside London - cattle ~~and~~ was taken from Essex and ~~the~~ vegetables from the Midlands. ~~In addition the present~~ In addition there ~~comes~~

(Section B continued) was remodelled in the mid 1500's which boosted trade to the Baltic seas. ~~How~~ This suggests London's changes in the economy as England was able to boost trade ~~from a~~ to a range of areas. However, the presence of the wealthy elite in London suggests there weren't significant changes in the economy. The monarchs and the gentry increased the need for luxury goods ^{SUCH AS SILKS} throughout the period 1509-88. Nevertheless this need definitely increased after ~~B~~ exploration and trade in the mid (late 1500s). Overall, ~~throughout~~ ^{London's growing population} London's poverty rates (5 to 9 percent in the 1550s) ~~and~~ and its presence as ~~at~~ the base for international and domestic trade changed the economy by increasing trade both domestically and internationally.

Perhaps the most significant change in the economy were foreign explorations ~~and~~ in the late 1500s which established permanent economic changes. In 1509 ^{international} trade ~~had not~~ was dominated by Spanish and Portuguese competition for 'new world commodities'. A drastic change occurred when Francis Drake embarked on a voyage in 1571 to find a new sea route to Asia. This failed, however this led to the start of ~~the~~ ^{in 1601} establishment of the East India Company which permanently shifted ~~the~~ ^{the} Tudor economy by

(Section B continued) further diversifying ~~is~~ trade markets.

This led to further changes such as the establishment of the 'Russia' company in 1555 and the Turkish Company which provided Persian carpets. A more significant change came from John Frobisher who voyage took a voyage to North America which eventually sparked ^{colonisation} ~~the expansion~~ of the USA.

These international changes ~~changed~~ permanently shifted the economy by expanding trade markets beyond Europe. Although not all voyages were successful and were ^{they} extremely costly, the colonisation movement ~~to~~ eventually became extremely valuable to the Tudor economy, which ^{explains why there} ~~explains why there~~ were significant economic changes.

In conclusion there is no doubt that changes in the Tudor economy were major. The impact of foreign workers as well as the role of London and international trade permanently shifted wealth. Although this wealth was not equal throughout the Tudor ^{Society} ~~economy~~ the shift was eventually felt throughout. The impact of London as a market for goods and international trade meant that by 1588 the Tudor economy was very different in comparison to 1509.



This response demonstrates the qualities of level 4. There is a clear awareness of the demands of the question. Sufficient material is used to examine a range of relevant issues, and in doing so, the response explores key economic changes, although this could be developed further. The response is effectively organised, with logical argument.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses developed a clear extract-based analysis of the extent to which faction and succession were growing issues which Elizabeth struggled to deal with. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts, e.g. using Extract 1 to examine the issue of succession as being a concern as Elizabeth aged, the secret correspondence with Essex together with his increased ambition and resentments, and the tensions and factions existing with the government which Cecil's death brought out into the open, and, on Extract 2, the broad range of courtiers who offset the factions that had developed, the fact that Elizabeth continued to dominate and was in control of decision-making, the cautious response of James, and the desperate nature of Essex's revolt.

Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views put forward in the extracts, e.g. the extent to which Essex's actions were an outlier and a failure, or placing Elizabeth's handling of succession in the broader context of her rule to argue that despite her age and childlessness, the issue was not significantly disruptive, and the succession to James proved to be a smooth one. Such knowledge was obviously most effective when firmly linked to the analytical demands of the question and the extracts.

Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question rather than the more general debate on the last years of Elizabeth's reign and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts. Less successful responses showed some understanding of the extracts but tended to select quotations, paraphrase or describe, without proper reasoning. At this level, material from the extracts were used simply to illustrate. Such responses often revealed limited recognition of the differences between the two extracts and sometimes drifted from the specific question. Responses in the lower levels were more likely to rely heavily on the extracts as sources of information and engage less with these as interpretations. Some did offer valid and at times specific contextual knowledge, but which was not convincingly linked to the views in the extracts, e.g. attempting to include material related to other issues such as war with Spain and socio-economic problems, which tended to drift from the demands of the question. Stronger responses were more effective in deploying contextual knowledge to clearly discuss the arguments and issues arising from the given interpretations, typically reaching confident and developed judgements on the merits of these.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, in the years 1589–1603, faction and succession were growing issues which Elizabeth struggled to deal with?

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

9.50

(20)

Historians have long debated whether faction and succession were growing issues which Elizabeth failed to deal with in the last 1589–1603. Castor takes the view that faction and succession were growing issues ^{which} Elizabeth struggled to deal with, while Williams takes a different stance and takes the view that faction and succession were not growing issues for Elizabeth. It will be made clear that the ~~inter~~ view in the question is incorrect, which more so aligns with the interpretation of Williams.

Both historians spoke about factions' correspondence with James VI of Scotland. Castor argued that "James was in secret correspondence with those at Elizabeth's court whom he believed could help his cause", ~~Williams,~~ ~~on the other hand~~ which can be taken to mean that James was in correspondence with the factions in order to enhance the likelihood of his accession to the English throne after Elizabeth's death. Williams, on the other hand, takes a different approach, and

mentioned that Essex wrote a letter to James 'attacking Robert Cecil', which can be taken to mean that Essex was in secret correspondence with James in order to secure his own ~~place~~ power and position in government after Elizabeth's death. The basis of the arguments made by the two historians differ because Castor has based their argument on the succession being undetermined and so a source of conflict where James VI of Scotland aimed to secure his place, whereas Williams has based their argument on the succession being a 'forgone conclusion' where the only rivalry was infighting at court. The context of the time seems to side more with Williams, in that, of the potential successors to Elizabeth, James was the strongest, in that he was Protestant and the son of Elizabeth's cousin, Mary Queen of Scots. ~~Another~~ Another potential candidate was the Infanta Isabella, who was heir to the Spanish throne. Context sides more with Williams than Castor because the evidence of Lord Mountjoy writing to James telling him to raise troops in Scotland and he would be ~~supported~~ ^{supported} by Mountjoy raising troops in Ireland and Essex in Ireland, ~~shows that~~ but James responded cautiously. Thus that James was not the source of tensions of the issue of succession. Instead it was the Catholics.

Therefore, Williams has the strongest interpretation because historical context supports the basis of their argument and the evidence they ~~used~~ ^{provided}.

Both historians spoke about Essex in the topic of faction and succession causing issues for Elizabeth. Castor argued that "Essex believed he had a right to involve himself" in matters of succession and military matters, which can be taken to mean that Essex used faction and the succession issue to enhance his own power and that made it a challenge for Elizabeth. Williams on the other hand, took a different approach and mentioned that "The Essex rising should simply be seen as a desperate attempt of an unbalanced and disappointed royal favourite", which can be taken to mean that Essex's rising was unsuccessful so Essex did not cause an issue that Elizabeth struggled to deal with. The basis of the arguments of the two historians differ because Castor has based their argument on the view that tensions in government were already causing difficulty so Essex exploited the ongoing instability to enhance his status. ~~Williams~~ Alternatively, Williams has based their argument on the idea that Essex was unable to command power without Elizabeth.

⁹⁵⁰
support ~~so~~ and his rising was not strategic. The context of the time seems to side more with Williams, in that Essex's Revolt of 1601 ~~was~~ involved a mere 170 troops because Essex was unable to ~~commandeer~~ muster more troops, especially not in the localities. Context weakens Cashor's interpretation in that Essex was powerless without Elizabeth's support, as seen when, in 1600, Elizabeth refused to renew the monopoly she had granted Essex on sweet wines in 1588, and he ~~shortly~~ fell in to debt shortly after. Therefore, Williams has the strongest interpretation because ~~their~~ historical context more so supports their ~~argument~~ argument than Cashor's.

A final theme that both historians ~~take~~ about is the control and power of Elizabeth. This is an area of common ground between the two historians, as Cashor argues that "Elizabeth refused to speak about the issue herself, or allow any of her subjects to discuss it", and Williams states that Elizabeth was "dominating the political scene". Both of these can be taken to mean that ultimately, despite the ongoing issues surrounding faction and succession, Elizabeth remained ultimately in control. Where the basis of the ~~historical~~ arguments made by the two historians differ

It is that Castor saw the issue of succession as becoming increasingly "more urgent", while Williams argues that "no decision could be made without her consent" so the issue was controlled. The context of the time seems to agree more with Williams, ~~to~~ and disagrees with Castor, in that Elizabeth skillfully managed the issue of succession by ~~using~~ using propaganda to create the image of the 'Virgin Queen' from the late 1570s. Therefore, Williams has the strongest interpretation.

Overall, it is clear that the view in the question is incorrect, which more aligns with the arguments and evidence provided by Williams. The most convincing aspect of their argument is when they state "men and women were made and unmade by her will" when discussing Elizabeth, because this shows the lack of serious threat to stability caused by faction and succession because ultimately Elizabeth was able to deal with it. Where Castor falls short is by stating "that Elizabeth was increasingly infirm" because historical context disproves this as Elizabeth was still able to handle and manage her country right up until the end of her reign, for example as seen by the 1601 Golden

Speed Williams uses a more nuanced basis of argument and this makes their argument the strongest, whereas Cator bases their argument on an exaggerated negative political situation, which is not the best approach. Therefore, it is clear that the main question is incorrect and Williams the more so aligns with Williams, who has the strongest interpretation.



This Question 5 Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths:

- It offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on the two competing views.
- It uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views.
- It is focused on the precise issue (were faction and succession growing issues Elizabeth struggled to deal with) rather than the general controversy concerning 1688-89
- It offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which references the views given in the extracts.

Paper Summary

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 (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- ◆ Explain 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
- ◆ Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- ◆ Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- ◆ An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- ◆ Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. 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
- ◆ Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- ◆ Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- ◆ 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, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- ◆ Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- ◆ Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- ◆ Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- ◆ Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- ◆ Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- ◆ Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- ◆ Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- ◆ Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- ◆ Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- ◆ A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

Grade boundaries

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

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

