



# **Examiners' Report** **June 2023**

**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 2023

Publications Code 9HI0\_1C\_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 the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. 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 the more popular of the two questions in Section A, and produced a range of responses, the majority of which were able to reach the middle and higher levels. Stronger responses focused carefully on the chronological demands of the question, discussing a range of events and issues to provide balance across the full period 1640-49. Such responses also gave consideration to the analytical demands of the question, focusing carefully on factors hampering compromise in the given period, with at least some balance across the actions of Charles and other factors (most typically parliament, the New Model Army, and to a lesser extent the Scots), whilst also carefully exploring how these factors contributed to the failure to reach compromise. Candidates were not expected to mention every event in the period, and responses at the higher levels were effective in their selection of material, e.g. selecting examples such as Charles' involvement in the Army Plots, the attempt to arrest the Five Members, his attitude towards negotiations and the Engagement to explore the given proposition across the period, whereas some responses went into depth, such as the attempt to arrest the Five Members, but lost sight of the question and/or produced responses which lacked balanced coverage.

A significant number of responses made use of material from before 1640; in many cases this was effective, e.g. using it to argue that Charles I's actions in this period created a lack of trust which made compromise more difficult later. However, on some occasions material on the earlier period was not effectively linked or came at the expense of material from 1640-49. When considering Charles' opponents, good understanding of the role of Pym's Junto, the Nineteen Propositions, the competing peace propositions of 1646-47 and Pride's Purge was demonstrated. Some candidates also produced considered analysis of the repercussions of decisions made within Parliament during and after the First Civil War and the impact these had on attempts to compromise, e.g. the impact of the Solemn League of Covenant, the Self Denying Ordinance and the attempt to disband the New Model Army had on relations between the victors in the period after the First Civil War.

The strongest answers made good use of criteria, considering not just the impact of Charles or Parliament's actions but also how frequent, disruptive or sustained the impact was across the period. Strong answers also linked actions of the protagonists, for instance, showing how the divisions present in Parliament in 1641-42 and 1646-47 may have influenced some of Charles' own recklessness and his attempts to 'divide and rule'.

Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2

- ① Charles - Refusal to accept GR + 14P
- Secret Agreement w/ Scots 1648
  - Escape from Carisbrooke Castle 1647 → <sup>War 2</sup> Army 1648
- ② Parliament - Political Pres v Independents in PM
- Demand for Pres national church (1642)
  - attacks on advisers - Pym's Junco + Strafford.
- ③ Army - Heads of Proposals 1645 Agreement of the People
- Leveller influence (Agitators 1647)
  - Pride's Purge 1648

The period 1640-49 was one defined by turbulence; the role of the monarch was especially significant during this time, though it could also be said that the actions of Parliament as well as the army were responsible for the failure to reach a compromise. Overall, based on the fact that his actions were the root cause of other divisions, it is clear that the actions and attitudes of Charles I were the main reason for the failure to compromise.

It could justly be argued that the ~~role~~ <sup>actions</sup>

(Section A continued) and attitudes of Charles I himself were the primary reason for the failure to compromise. For example, he refused to accept both the Grand Remonstrance and the 19 Propositions put forth by the army, maintaining his belief that parliament was an advisory body with the sole function of approving taxation. This was a direct ~~den~~ refusal to even enter negotiations to reach a compromise by Charles, thus suggesting his actions and attitudes to be the most significant. Though it could also be argued that ~~these~~ the demands being made - like Parliament having ~~and~~ ~~and~~ the education of Charles' children - were outrageous demands to make that parliament and the army never he wouldn't agree to. Furthermore, Charles made an escape from Carisbrooke Castle in ~~late~~ <sup>mid</sup> 1647, disrupting the Putney Debates, and reigniting the Civil War. Thus, it can be seen that Charles' ~~adamant~~ adamant refusal to accept a settlement, rooted in his belief of divine right, was a significant factor in the failure to reach a compromise. ~~to addition,~~

(Section A continued) Following Charles' escape, he made a secret peace agreement with the Scottish in 1648, guaranteeing a Presbyterian national church. The fact that he made an attempt to bypass official negotiations shows that it was his own persistence to ~~concede~~ win the civil war and not concede any of his monarchical power that proves he was the primary reason for the failure to compromise. Overall, therefore, it is abundantly clear that the actions and attitudes of Charles I were the primary reason for the failure to compromise, as it was his ~~persistent~~ persistent character which led to tensions in parliament and heightened the growing desire to remove him as king.

However, it could also be argued that the actions of parliament (PM) were the main reason for the failure to reach a compromise due to their overzealous attempts to restrict the power of Charles. For example, ~~the~~ following the end of Personal Rule, PM, ~~is~~ in particular Pym's Junta, made hostile attacks on Charles' advisers - namely,

(Section A continued) Strafford. When the Long PM was called in 1641, the Junta began impeachment proceedings followed by the Act of Attainder to have Strafford executed. Not only was this an attack on Charles' advisers, but an attack on his divine right, as he had the right by God God to appoint whomsoever he saw fit, without the PM's approval. Thus, it was the actions of PM that led ~~to~~ to the failure to compromise as they - from the get go - refused to cooperate with Charles on the basis of his advisers being overly significant. Though, it could actually be said that Charles was the root cause of this failure to compromise, as he had ruled alone for 11 years with the help of his advisers, something which harmed his relations with PM significantly. In addition to this, there were significant divisions in PM itself. There were the Political Presbyterians who wanted to establish a national Presbyterian Church, and the independents who wanted greater freedom in religious worship. This division meant that a religious settlement

(Section A continued) would have been difficult to achieve, thus suggesting that PM is to blame for the lack of compromise due to the fact that if they could not agree with one another, they would not be able to reach a settlement with Charles. However, it could be said that the divisions within PM had limited impact due to the fact that they reached ~~not~~ internal compromise in 1642 that a Presbyterian national church<sup>without the elders</sup> would be trialled for a few years, to appease all involved. Therefore, it seems apparent that although PM had significant divisions in the early years of the civil war, their role in the failure to compromise is minimized by the fact that it was not long-term, while Charles' refusal to accept ~~at~~ any negotiations or settlements was a consistent theme throughout the 9-year period. Overall, therefore, the actions and attitudes of Charles I were more significant than the role of PM in the failure to compromise as it was more long-term, and many divisions within PM arose from tensions with Charles himself.

(Section A continued) Finally, it could be argued that the role of the army was significant in the failure to reach a compromise in the years 1640-49. The publication of the Heads of Proposals, calling for regular elections and wider toleration <sup>substant</sup> was significant in the failure to reach a compromise as it led to a moderately widespread desire for greater political and religious equality. However, this was largely ignored, and thus was less significant than the <sup>relationship</sup> role of Charles and PM, which was at the forefront of negotiations until the Army became politicised in 1647. They elected their leaders to be the Agitators, and they became political rivals to the existing dynamic of PM. The Putney debates in 1647 is a clear example of this as they highlighted the lack of cooperation and unity in the army. Thus, a compromise could not be reached as the army could not necessarily be called on to aid either side of the political fight, especially since they had their own demands. Furthermore, Pride's Purge in 1648 was conducted by

(Section A continued) the army, excluding any and all MPs with Royalist sympathies. Clearly the army had a significant role to play in the failure to reach a compromise during this period as they were directly involved in the creation of the Remonstrance, and thus in the events leading up to the execution of the king. Overall, however, the army did not have long-term significance in the failure to compromise as they only became significantly prominent in the years after 1647, as well as this, their actions of political defiance were largely in response to the actions and attitudes of Charles I, proving him to be the root cause of the failure to compromise.

To conclude, it is abundantly clear that although the actions of the PM and the army had some significance in the failure to compromise, this was largely limited to a small scope of a few years, while the actions of Charles I not only spanned the entire time frame but are the

(Section A continued) clear root causes of the tensions in both the army and in PM.



**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. One of the strengths of this response is the deployment of specific exemplification – the response offers a range of examples which are used to examine the various reasons for the failure to compromise. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned judgement, weighing the relative importance of the various causes.

## Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses targeted how accurate it is to say that relations between the Crown and Parliament did not improve in the years 1660-85 and included an analysis of links between key factors and a clear focus on the concept (change/continuity). Sufficient knowledge was used to develop a range of arguments, e.g. the extent to which settlement was achieved over issues such as control of the militia, indemnity, finance and religion, and whether these saw a deterioration over the period. Other commonly covered issues included royal attempts to issue Declarations of Indulgence, tension over foreign policy, particularly involvement in both Anglo-Dutch Wars and the impact of relations with Louis XIV's France, the Exclusion Crisis, and the period of 'Second Personal Rule'.

In general, knowledge of the 1670s and 1680s seemed stronger. A minority of candidates went beyond the given dates and discussed relations between James II and parliament in the years to 1688. Higher scoring answers were clearly organised and effectively communicated, and tended to offer more balance, recognising and covering arguments for and against the proposition. Such responses were more likely to consider the positive start to the reign, explore the extent to which this was based on genuine common ground, or what was essentially a sense of relief after the collapse of republican rule.

Stronger responses were more likely to effectively explore and evaluate the extent to which episodes where king and parliament were at odds marked a significant deterioration, e.g. the extent to which the opposition seen in 1672-73 was overcome by the appointment of Danby and other placatory measures, or whether this left residual difficulties which contributed to the – usually seen to be more serious – problems at the end of the 1670s. Others were very effective in examining whether the positive relations seen in 1685 when the 'Loyal Parliament' was called were a genuine improvement, or a result of the measures taken by Charles II to undermine opposition in the early 1680s. In such responses, judgements made were reasoned and based on clear criteria.

Less successful responses tended to offer limited knowledge of relations in the years 1660-88, or a narrative of the period under discussion, or in other cases, attempted to use material which was not convincingly related to the question's analytical demands, e.g. material relating to the Clarendon Code. In general, responses tended to be skewed more towards the proposition in the question, although responses in the upper levels were effective in considering the counter argument.

Chosen question number: Question 1  Question 2

~~Charles' actions and attitudes were slightly responsible  
the main reason <sup>me</sup> ~~king~~ and his opponents could not  
reach a compromise ~~was~~ because of his elongated  
negotiations with parliament and the New Model Army  
(NMA). However, other factors must be considered  
like the role of the~~

Relations between crown and parliament did not improve  
due to Charles II's actions that resulted in him  
working closely with Louis XIV and France. However,  
the role of parliament being more willing to  
compromise due to the Republic must also be considered.  
It is most convincing to argue that relations between  
crown and parliament did not improve.

It is accurate to say that relations between crown and  
parliament did not improve due to the financial  
problems faced 1660-85. When Charles II came to the  
throne in 1660 the Cavalier parliament were  
much more willing to give him financial freedom  
so granted £1.2 million annually in tonnage and  
poundage as well as introducing the hearth tax.  
Although this did seem to be a generous settlement

(Section A continued) It was not enough for the expenditure of Charles II. This led to Charles being reliant on parliament for extra subsidies which limited his prerogative, and led him to calling to his cousin, Louis XIV of France, for extra financial subsidies.

Charles' close relations with France created extreme suspicion of a pro Catholic agenda within the political circle and therefore created a sense of instability during his rule. It is clear that parliament wanted to improve relations with Charles II but due to results of miscalculation he ~~was~~ had to go and raise his own finance. This evidence makes it clear that relations between crown and parliament did not improve due to financial aspects of the restoration settlement.

The political aspects of the restoration also suggest it is accurate to say relations between crown and parliament did not improve. In 1660 Charles' Declaration of Breda it was clear he wanted to stabilize Britain after the interregnum so offered pardon for those involved in the civil war except for those who signed the regicide of Charles I. So relations should have improved but the actions of Charles created fear and therefore relations did not improve. After the second Anglo Dutch war when Clarendon was

(Section A continued) replaced it was again made clear Charles II was much more willing to work with parliament, but the Cabal that replaced him again created tension. The Cabal consisted of many different religions and pushed for toleration which the cavalier parliament rejected and therefore led to the Clarendon Code which angered Charles so relations did not improve. It was made clear further that ~~the parliament~~ parliament rejected Charles' policies in the Rye House Plot of 1683 which saw a group of Oliver Cromwell supporters attempt to kill both Charles II and his brother, the Duke of York, and replace them with the Duke of Monmouth. This clearly shows that even with the desire to establish ~~legitimacy~~ stability, relations between crown and parliament did not improve. More evidence that relations between crown and parliament did not improve is that Charles dissolved parliament in 1681 after the exclusion crisis of 1678-81. Charles saw this as an attack on ~~his~~ his prerogative and divine right so dissolved parliament before the bill could reach the House of Lords. This evidence clearly shows that even though there was ~~at~~ a desire to establish stability the crown and parliament were still unable to work together and therefore relations did not improve.

(Section A continued) In terms of religion it is also clear that relations did not improve. In 1660 part of the Declaration of Breda stated that Charles would grant religious toleration which the convention parliament agreed to so it is clear that there was some attempt to improve the relations between crown and parliament. However, the introduction of the Clarendon Code prevented this with the Act of Uniformity imposing ritual and outward worship and the Corporation Act limiting any dissenters from holding office. It is clear toleration was not granted. Charles attempted to limit this with the Declaration of Indulgence in 1662 but the 60's saw the harshest punishment of any dissenters in the whole 17<sup>th</sup> century. Charles also had a lot of Catholic influence around him with his Catholic wife, Catherine of Braganza, which created fear of a Catholic takeover largely due to the history of his father and the troubles his Catholic sentiment brought. This damaged the relationship between crown and parliament and led to the exclusion crisis which as stated saw Charles disallow parliament. In the 1672 Declaration of Indulgence also made this worse as it was seen Charles was only doing this to fit in with his pro Catholic foreign policy, and resulted in the Popish Plot which again shows the turbulence

(Section A continued) within the political nation. This evidence clearly shows that religion was a great cause in the power relations between crown and parliament so therefore relations between crown and parliament did not improve.

Overall, it is ~~clear~~ ~~from~~ accurate to say that relations ~~and~~ between crown and parliament did not improve in the years 1600-85. Charles II had the same problems as his father in terms of finance, politics and religion and this caused poor relations. However, it must not be ignored that in 1660 there were some attempts made to improve relations but these were not significant enough to say relations improved.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates most of 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 the extent to which relations did/did not improve, although this could be developed further. The response is effectively organised, with logical argument.

### Question 3

This was the less popular of the two questions in Section B and produced a wide range of responses. Most candidates were able to produce responses which achieved Level 3 or above, although it was evident that this topic seemed to present difficulties for some. Responses in the lower levels tended to offer limited knowledge of the topic.

A number of responses attempted to include knowledge on topics such as agriculture, urban development, the cloth trade, population, inflation and poverty. Whilst much of this had some relevance, the extent to which candidates were able to shape this towards the demands of the question. In some instances, responses gave the impression that they felt the need to expand their responses by including such material regardless of how well they could focus this, i.e. they offered some sections which were focused on success, and made good use of knowledge about the actual poor laws, showing they understood what the question required, but also included less focused sections, and so produced at times fairly lengthy responses, but with mixed success. This was in contrast to some shorter but more focused responses, which concentrated on the given question. Such responses did often include relevant contextual material, e.g. concerns over the growth of vagrancy amongst the landed classes, but made effective use of this by clearly relating it to the success of the poor laws. Stronger responses were able to make legislation, namely the Acts of 1601 and 1662, central to their arguments, and demonstrated detailed knowledge of the legislation.

A reassuring number were able to use statistics to demonstrate the extent of poverty and the relief available. Students enjoyed talking about the limitations of the Poor Laws, particularly talking about the inconsistent approach taken to vagrancy and ways the system was exploited. Astute points were also made which gave critical consideration to what defines success, e.g. providing relief or alleviation of poverty, or in reducing the potential threat of social disorder.

With regards to the legislation, most candidates had a broad understanding, although some seemed to struggle with how to relate legislation in place before the Stuart period to the question, although many recognised the significance of the Elizabethan Poor Laws as providing the fundamental basis for subsequent government approaches. There was also some confusion over what distinguished the Settlement Act and the certificates that were issued. A good number also offered good analysis relating to the significance of the Book of Orders, issued under Charles I.

Chosen question number: Question 3  Question 4

The poor laws between 1625-88 were partially successful. It's success can be judged by how much each of the three (1601, 1631, 1662) poor laws enacted social change, punished vagrancy, and went far towards the poor, and their popularity.

The Elizabethan poor law was introduced in 1601 but was still highly relevant to the Stuarts as it was continued on until 1631. It provided the initial distinction between the deserving (people that were unable to work) and undeserving (people that were able to work but chose not to) poor. It also provided the basis of poor relief which although was low (£20,000) proved partially successful in improving the living conditions of many some vagrants across England. Although poor relief was beneficial to many, it was largely

\* with the Book of Orders in 1534 1631

(Section B continued) unpopular with the majority of the population as they felt that they shouldn't be paying to support others, especially because the distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor was not clear enough and undeserving poor people were receiving money which they didn't deserve. ~~Therefore~~ This poor law was less successful as it was unclear ~~what~~ and didn't punish those that would be classed poor relief that were undeserving.

In 1631 the poor laws were amended by Charles I under his policy of thoroughness, making the poor laws more rigorous. ~~and~~ Charles ~~increased~~ ~~the~~ improved the distinction between the different types of poor people - giving Justices of Peaces more power and authority over the treatment of an idle poor. \* This distinction proved to be more successful than the previous poor law due to its popularity among the population and the deserving poor as well as improving its fairness, as well

(Section B continued) Due to its increased popularity Charles was able to increase the amount of poor relief from £20,000 to £188,000, this proved both more and less successful. It was successful in that it was able to fulfil its role of supporting the poor financially more effectively, but it proved quite unpopular among the ~~the~~ English taxpayer who was forced to pay more to support the poor. The ~~the~~ average during this period the average labourer only earned £100 per year which was ~~not a lot~~ much to support themselves and a family, let alone other people, therefore making the poor law more justifiable. To combat this Charles I had to make sure that the provisions, for the undeserving poor were harsher, therefore he made vagrancy illegal and those who would beg could be arrested or heavily fined. This made it more successful due to its popularity among the population, however more unjust and unpopular among the poor themselves.

(Section B continued) as often the Justices of Peace wouldn't tolerate the deserving poor either and they were treated like criminals, despite having done nothing wrong. Overall Charles' policy of thorough was more successful than the Elizabethan poor law ~~in that~~ through its increased poor relief, ~~firmness~~ to increased punishments of the undeserving poor and its increased popularity among the population. It was only limited by its firmness to be deserving poor. However Charles' policy of thorough was not maintained in 1662 Charles II tried to remodel the poor law once more ~~as~~ by his sympathy towards the poor but ruled his fear of <sup>revolt</sup> revolution, which meant that if he had more sympathy towards the poor it could have been more successful.

In 1662 Charles II tried to remodel the poor laws once more, ~~as~~ under the Settlement Act. Charles II aimed to be harsher on the undeserving poor,

(Section B continued) whom he believed were the reason for the poor laws limited success so far. ~~In turn he decided to introduce a settlement act~~ Following the death of Cromwell in 1658 there was an economic depression in England, wages were increasing by only 2% each year, whilst inflation increased by 4% each year. This meant that people were becoming poorer and were being forced to pay taxes for poor relief. Charles decided that to improve the poor laws success and popularity that there should be stricter laws on the punishment of the poor. Charles II introduced settlement statutes which proved you original parish to see if you were eligible for poor relief. This was successful in clamping down on vagrants who would travel to other parishes to claim poor relief. It was successful as it meant that vagrants had to remain in the same parish for 40 days with no complaints before receiving their poor relief. ~~It solved~~ Although it solved the issue of vagrants

(Section B continued) rivalry between paupers for poor relief (which was hugely successful), the system was largely corrupted and unjust. Having no complaints or a vagrant or one pauper for 40 days was hugely difficult especially if the pauper was sick. This meant that many of the deserving poor did not receive their entitled poor relief which they were entitled to - making the system largely unjust and unpopular amongst vagrants. It was successful however amongst the general public who felt more assured paying for the poor relief tax that they knew their money was going and being spent well. Additionally the vagrants only received £10 per each poor relief after every 40 days. This was not much much to survive off, which ultimately led to more beggars begging and therefore more complaints, therefore the poor were stuck inside a loop which provided no social mobility, therefore rendering the poor Settlement Act unsuccessful.

(Section B continued)

In conclusion the poor laws were only partially successful during the years 1625-88. The Elizabethan (1601) poor laws provided the foundation for poor relief and the distinction between deserving and undeserving poor to help and those that deserved it and punish those that didn't. It was limited in its success because of its small scale, ~~however~~ Once Charles I introduced the policy of ~~thorough~~ ~~the~~ on 1631, the poor laws became more successful as they were more reformed and a bit harsher towards the poor. The only limitation of it was its unpopularity with the taxpayers and the unfairness of treatment. The ~~poor~~ Act of Settlement Act of 1662 provided clearer and harsher punishments for poor which were successful in solving issues that arose from the policy of thoroughness. But ~~it~~ <sup>it</sup> ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> limited in its success through the corruption which trapped poor people in a loop allowing for no social mobility. Overall the poor

(Section B continued) laws were only partially successful.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question, allied to effectively deployed material, used to explore key issues. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned judgement, weighing the relative importance of the various causes.

## Question 4

Question 4 was the more popular of the two in Section B and produced many good answers. The majority were able to reach the middle and higher levels, demonstrating an understanding of the demands of the question. The majority were able to shape material around the significance of North America and Jamaica in the development of British overseas trade. The majority set this against other factors, most typically selecting two or more from the Navigation Acts, the triangular trade or the East India Company, as well as issues such as the development of London, cloth trade, or banking and insurance.

What distinguished between responses at the higher levels tended to be one or more of the three following issues. Firstly, the quality and deployment of knowledge, e.g. candidates who were able to use precise detail to quantify and qualify the development of trade, in say, sugar from the Caribbean, tobacco from the North American colonies and profits from the East India Company were better placed to explore and assess when, and to what extent, these were significant in developing trade. Secondly, the extent to which issues were carefully developed towards a consideration of the development of overseas trade. Most responses offered valid material on the relevant factors, but those who consistently related this to the specific analytical demands of the question were more successful. Thirdly, the extent to which responses offered a comparative analysis and evaluation of the significance of North America and Jamaica with other factors. Some of the strongest responses had a clear understanding of how well-developed trade in different regions or goods was at given points across the chronology, or the interrelationship between different factors.

Chosen question number: Question 3  Question 4

Although North America and Jamaica colonies were significant for the development of British overseas trade 1625-88 due to the exports from the colonies and the increase in production.

Ultimately, Transatlantic trade was more significant as transatlantic trade was very profitable and ensured there was keep labour to tend to the colonies. Other factors such as the success of <sup>banking and insurance</sup> ~~Navigation~~ as well as the development of the East India Company also contributed to the development of overseas trade 1625-88.

North America and Jamaica had significant and contributed to the development of overseas trade. Jamaica in particular was very lucrative for England due to the ~~creation of~~ <sup>production of</sup> sugar plantations. Sugar was becoming increasingly more popular within England in tea and coffee for example. As a result of the Caribbean colonies such as Jamaica sugar production production rose significantly from 150 CWTs to 400,000 CWTs in the years 1670-1700 and

(Section B continued) was worth an estimated 630,000.

This revenue was significant in the development of overseas trade as it encouraged further development and investment within colonies.

Additionally, the North American colonies

continued to be development of overseas trade and expanded to 12% of all

domestic exports by 1680. North American

Colonies was associated with small trade numbers and attracted many more

migrant puritas as it is estimated over

80,000 puritas emigrated to North America

in the 1630's. Furthermore, North American

Colonies were also associated with tobacco production and the production of tobacco

increased from 1.2 million tonnes in weight in

1619 to 22 million tonnes in weight by

1700. This increase in production and

exports revenue was significant in overseas

trade as it increased Britain's trading with the rest of the world this is

evidenced as trading with the rest of the

world increased from 6% in 1640 to

33% by 1700. There is enough evidence

such as Jamaica and North America had

significance, the production and profits were

(Section B continued) dependent on slave labour over the  
It was only as a result of the increase in  
triangular trade and the transport of slaves  
to and from the colonies, that the colonies were  
so successful, therefore triangular trade was  
more significant in the development of overseas trade  
than the colonies.

Triangular trade was the most important factor  
contributing to the development of overseas trade.

This is because the slave trade was very lucrative  
and managed to attract lots of investment. For  
instance the Royal African Company founded in  
1672 in London ~~was~~ attracted lots of  
investors and in London alone 15 mayors,  
25 sheriffs and 38 aldermen had shares  
in the company between 1660-1690. Furthermore,

Triangular trade was mainly responsible for  
the development of overseas trade as the  
increase of slave labour facilitated  
cheap production and a increase in productivity  
thus increasing profit margins and  
encouraging further investment. It is evident  
that Britain had access to a wide pool  
of slave labour as it is estimated the  
Royal African Company shipped around



(Section B continued) The East India Company was very profitable as due to its location Britain had access to lucrative goods such as cotton, silks and spices. As a result of this Britain's trading increased and the East India Company accounted for 13% of all domestic imports during this period further increasing its significance. In addition to this the success and profitability of the East India Company is also highlighted as during the company's first year of operation it made a profit of £600,000 in profits annually therefore this was more profitable than countries such as Jamaica and North America combined. The East India Company was so important to Britain that they even agreed to trade in areas which they was initially reluctant to do. Ultimately Britain's access to goods such as silks and spices made them more trade competitive this can be seen as English trade did increase during this period as merchants trading significantly increased from 300,000 tonnes in 1600 to 1700 emphasising the development of overseas trade.

(Section B continued) However, the East India Company although significant could never break Dutch dominance in trade in the east Indies thus showing England was still inferior in that area. However, the British arguably trade with dominance in the slave trade / triangular trade as it is estimated that Britain controlled <sup>50%</sup> half of the entire slave trade.

Furthermore, Banking and insurance will have an impact in the development of overseas trade. Improvements in Banking and insurance during this period allowed for an increase in investment overseas US 1000s firms of money became accessible for a wider range of people. For instance the development of money lenders who organised lending / lent money abroad developing during this period. A famous money lender Samuel Abbot had around £1.13 million go through his accounts during 1752-55 and emphasises the primacy of loaning / lending money and most of this lent money contributed to investments / development in overseas trade. Additionally, Goldsmiths

(Section B continued) became adept at running cash during this period and by between 1670 - 75 the number of goldsmiths increased from 32 to 44 in London. Therefore this investment in banking aimed for longer access to funds to afford voyages overseas / develop overseas trade. Financial development in Marine insurance encouraged more overseas trade, the first insurance / cover house was opened in 1680 in Oxford. Marine insurance essentially covered any cargo for merchants and therefore by extension influenced merchants to have, longer, riskier and more frequent voyages, and therefore developed overseas trade. However developments in banking and insurance in relation to overseas trade were only necessitated as a result of existing success of triangular trade and the colonies for example hence why the ~~the~~ Triangular trade was more significant in the development in overseas trade.

In Carthage although the Jamaican and North American colonies were significant

(Section B continued) In the development of overseas trade, triangular trade / the slave trade improved their efficiency by giving the plantation owners access to cheap labour thus increasing profits therefore making triangular trade more significant. Furthermore a number of other factors such as the creation of the East India Company and the improvements regarding banking and insurance had a impact / significance of which triangular trade was more profitable in the long term as well as the presence of triangular trade carried on into the next century hence why triangular trade was the most significant factor contributing to the development of overseas trade, in the years 1625-88.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates 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 relative significance of a range of issues in the development of overseas trade. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

## Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses developed a clear extract-based analysis of the extent to which the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new'. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts, e.g. using Extract 1 to examine the limited nature of much of the Bill of Rights and the constraints on royal prerogative, or exploring Extract 2 in relation to the practical developments during William's rule, and the negotiations and concessions with Parliament across the period, or the legislation that had been passed by 1701.

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 the changes that took place in 1689 were shaped in response to a constitutional crisis and thus were not driven by a desire to introduce anything 'new' beyond what was necessary, but how this, and the subsequent demands of war, the enhanced position it gave to groups such as the Whigs and William's willingness to essentially trade prerogatives to achieve his ends did result in changes over the period. 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 Glorious Revolution debate and put forward a reasoned judgement on the given issue, referencing the views in the extracts. Weaker responses showed some understanding of the extracts but tended to select quotations, paraphrase or describe, without proper reasoning. At this level, material from the extracts were used simply to illustrate. 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. Alternatively, some made limited use of the extracts, attempting instead to answer the question relying almost exclusively on their own knowledge. Some did offer valid and at times specific contextual knowledge, but which was not convincingly linked to the views in the extracts. 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.

Historians have disagreed about the extent to which the Glorious Revolution introduced time that was dramatically new. The historians, such as Miller in extract 1, building on the revisionist argument, argue that little was dramatically new, as the events of 1688-1701 were merely a response to the abuse of Charles II and James II, and therefore did not significantly challenge divine right or the power of the monarch. However, those such as Scott in extract 2, building on the King Historian view, argue that the Glorious Revolution was a major turning point in British history, overturning divine right, increasing the power of parliament at the expense of the monarch, and ultimately turning parliament into a central and essential branch of government.

Finally, it could be argued, as Miller does in extract 1, that the Glorious Revolution introduced time that was dramatically new, as its purpose was to "prevent a recurrence of the misgovernment of Charles II and James II", meaning it did not directly challenge divine right. Miller argues that "the significance of the change of men was limited", indicating that the Glorious Revolution did not bring in a new form of parliamentary government, overturning divine right, but rather ~~argues~~ saw simply a change of King necessitated by James II.

abdication. Moreover, Miller states that the "Bill of Rights contained little that was new" and "The Declaration of Rights was ... a limited and conservative document." These assertions are supported by the fact that the Declaration of Rights was <sup>very</sup> vague, resulting in little concrete change, and that the elements of the Bill of Rights can be seen as direct responses to the actions of Charles II and James II. The desire for free elections was to prevent another personal rule, as enacted by both kings, as well as to prevent power manipulations of monarch Charles. Cases of Ecclesiastical Commission were shut down to prevent abuses of the royal prerogative, as was the concept that the king could not collect taxes without parliament. The king could not suspend the law, as James had done in Godden vs Mole. Therefore, as Miller argues, the Glorious Revolution could be seen as a limited response to the royal abuses of James and Charles, and therefore nothing new.

Moreover, in extract 1, Miller argues that the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was dramatically new as it did not impose significant restrictions on the power of the monarchy. Miller argues that the "restrictions imposed ... on the royal prerogative were limited". He was still "able to choose his ministers, direct the administration, and formulate policy". This is supported by the rise and fall in <sup>the</sup> 1690s of the Junto Whigs, demonstrating the significant power the king's power still held. Moreover, it is indicated in Britain's involvement in the 9 year war: William war, as monarch, still able to formulate a British foreign policy that functioned to protect his country of origin, the United Provinces. In addition

Miller argues that despite the Triennial Act, William was still able to "call and dismiss parliament at will", demonstrating that they did not have significant powers in comparison to him. Britain was still an ~~absolutist~~ non-constitutional monarchy. Therefore, as Miller argues, the Glorious Revolution could be seen as introducing little that was dramatically new.

However, it could also be argued, in contradiction to Miller in extract 1 but agreement with Scott in extract 2, that the Glorious Revolution did introduce dramatically new features in that it overruled the principle of divine right and applied Locke's ideas to British government. Miller does acknowledge in extract 1 that the Toleration Act "was needed a clear break from what had gone before", demonstrating that Locke's ideas on religion as expressed in his letter concerning toleration in 1689 had been applied. Scott however takes his <sup>argument</sup> further, stating that the ideas of Locke's social contract theory, ~~as~~ stated in the Two Treatises on government in 1689 were being applied in the Glorious Revolution. A "strong parliamentary monarchy" was created, undermining the principle of divine right, meaning the monarch ruled "according to the laws agreed on in parliament". These changes were consolidated in the creation of a joint monarchy for William and Mary, which undermined divine right, and by the statement of the convention parliament that James II had broken the contract between the king and people, leaving the throne empty. Moreover, these changes were consolidated in the Act of Settlement of 1701, which named George of Hanover as the next English King, undermining the principle of

divine hereditary succession. Therefore, as Scott argues, the Glorious Revolution did introduce a dramatically new form of government that was not based on the principle of divine right.

Moreover, whereas in extract 1 Miller argues that the powers of <sup>monarchy</sup> parliament were ~~more~~ <sup>still</sup> significant, in extract 2, Scott argues that that power of parliament increased significantly at the expense of the monarchy, transforming parliament into a central part of government for the long term. The "new financial settlement" of 1690 was limited, with custom tax only being granted to the monarch for 4 years, forcing the monarch to call parliament regularly to get finances. Moreover, parliament now had "control of the army" as asserted by the Mutiny Act of 1690, with the monarch also needed to call parliament for, so that it could be renewed each year. In addition, the Act of Succession "removed the power of royal appointment pardon regarding parliamentary impeachments", demonstrating the growth of parliamentary power at the expense of the monarch. It also "subjected the king to parliamentary oversight", demonstrating his position as a public servant not a divinely appointed one. The importance of the changes is supported by the fact that parliament has been called every year since 1689, showing their long term effect. Therefore it can be argued as Scott does in extract 2 that the Glorious Revolution did introduce dramatically new features that resulted in the growth of parliamentary power in both the short and the long term.

In conclusion, although the revisionist view presented by

Miller in extract 1 is somewhat convincing, the Whig historian view presented by Swift in extract 2 is far more so. The student is arguing that the Glorious Revolution introduced much that was dramatically new. It was not simply a response to the abuses of Charles and James.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

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 (whether the Glorious Revolution introduced little that was 'dramatically new') 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

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 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 – 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>

