

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_1C_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

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

Candidates across the ability range engaged effectively with this Advanced Level paper, 1C. The paper is divided into three sections: Section A offers a choice of essays assessing in-depth understanding of a specific period (AO1), Section B provides essays covering a broader timespan, and Section C contains a compulsory question based on two extracts assessing analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Both Sections A and B target second-order concepts such as cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance.

Most candidates managed their time well, though some did not complete all three responses. Unlike previous sessions, incomplete answers were fairly spread across questions rather than concentrated in Section C. An increasing number of candidates appeared to prioritise Q05. Those who paced themselves effectively were better able to access marks across the full paper.

Answers that leaned heavily on contextual description were less likely to produce higher level responses. In Q04 this was seen in responses that simply described the story of the East India Company or answers to Q03 that explored changes generally (such as agricultural techniques) in the 1825-88 period, rather than focusing on the social structure of Britain. Q05 responses that explored only change or continuity in relation to the Glorious Revolution without close engagement with both extracts, struggled to reach top levels. Stronger responses directly engaged with the question's issue and the views presented in the extracts.

In Sections A and B, most candidates demonstrated readiness to produce analytical answers and showed awareness of the second-order concepts targeted. While some offered substantial knowledge without fully addressing the question's conceptual demands, the majority applied their understanding effectively. Section A questions require greater depth over a shorter period, whereas Section B demands selective coverage across a broader timespan. High-scoring responses evaluated the extent of change or consequence rather than merely describing it.

Candidates should plan to include both an argument and a counter argument to address the question fully. 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. Awareness of key dates and strict adherence to the question's timeframe are essential for candidates to avoid including irrelevant detail.

In Section C, the strongest responses clearly analysed the differing arguments within the two extracts, recognising them as historical interpretations. These answers compared the merits and validity of the historians' views using both extract content and relevant contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic. A small minority did approach the question in a manner which would be more suited to an AO1 (i.e. Section A/B) response, engaging with the issue in the question and showing understanding, but tending to neglect the extracts, or treat them more as sources of information, rather than as interpretations.

Question 1

This was by far the most popular question in Section A. Most candidates answering it showed secure knowledge of the period 1629–42. Many focused effectively on the actions of Charles I, while stronger responses considered a range of factors, including Parliament's role and the significance of religion. Most addressed causes of friction such as Charles' financial and religious policies, especially in Scotland, and how these frictions led to civil war.

High-level responses established a line of argument early and sustained it. These responses often evaluated Charles' responsibility against the role of Parliament -particularly Pym and the Grand Remonstrance - and assessed short-term triggers such as the Five Members Coup. The most effective answers analysed why war broke out specifically in 1642, drawing on events from both the Personal Rule and the early stages of the Long Parliament.

Most candidates showed good knowledge of key issues such as Ship Money, Distraint of Knighthood, Laudian reforms and the role of advisors like Laud and Wentworth. Many argued convincingly that Charles bore ultimate responsibility for their actions. The period 1625–29 was sometimes used to good effect in counter arguments, but some candidates over-emphasised this at the expense of the later years.

Some responses were overly narrative or listed causes without evaluation. A smaller number showed confusion over the chronology, treating earlier events in Charles' reign - such as the wars with France and Spain - as if they occurred after 1629. A minority also struggled to offer counter arguments or to prioritise effectively between long- and short-term causes. A minority of candidates argued only that the actions of Charles I were the main reason for the outbreak of civil war in 1642 without considering other factors.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☐. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☐.

With Charles I embodying L^d Jst 'Personal Rule' in 1629, ~~his~~ ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the significance of his actions are easily tied to the resulting outbreak of the Civil War in 1642 — ~~his~~ ^{playing a} role in ^{the} ~~contributory~~ religious ^{paradoxical} & tumult, ~~and~~ ^{the} ~~polarising~~ ~~fracturing~~ over-reaching of prerogative power and being beholden to a stubbornness and loyalty that lacked a consideration of parliament and the nation's needs. & As such, I would argue it is quite accurate to say Charles' actions were the main reason for the civil war's outbreak, though ~~Parliament itself, and~~ ~~foreign~~ ~~intervention~~ ~~does~~ the acts of individuals ~~like~~ from parliament, within Charles' royal court or even other nation doubtless also contributed.

To begin, one of the most significant factors contributing to the civil war's outbreak was the

(Section A continued) parliamentary discipline for
the use of Prerogative powers
to ~~override~~ ^{supersede} their ~~own~~
~~perceived role as~~ Political Mechanism
between value and purpose -
demonstrated by the ~~the~~ drawing up of the
Petition of Right in 1629,
which called for the limiting of
Charles' prerogative powers as he had
exploited before (Forced Loan of 1626)
and continued to exploit to keep parliament
dissolved out of session as he forced his P.R.
with ship money - the definition of
which was intently expected to
encapsulate even non-coastal, inland towns.
Thus by knowingly ~~causing~~ ^{or even physical threat as in the Star Chamber case,} dissent amongst
parliament through prerogative exploitation, we
could argue that Charles' ~~own~~ actions
were indeed the main reason as
Parliament themselves cited it as a
major grievance for them in the ^{Long P. mts}
204-point Great Remonstrance of 1641. However, given
the initial success of ship money &
until parliament's intervention in
the John Hampden case, we could
see that perhaps parliament, ~~perhaps~~

(Section A continued) Obsessed with their own idealisation of how the country should be, ^{for} ^{Britain and} were too stubborn to accept Charles' economic success despite their sidelining - ^{technically} up-was ^{against} with a relative non-issue. Thus As such, I ~~can~~ ^{could} ~~understand~~ ^{understand} the statement might only be slightly accurate.

~~That since~~
In addition to ~~his~~ ^{Charles's} ~~unavoidable~~ ^{antagonisation} of Parliament, through prerogative rule, we must consider also the role Charles' actions played in forming the religious instability that contributed to the civil war's outbreak due to the ~~mass~~ Catholic hysteria sweeping Britain. For example, there was Charles' marriage to the French Catholic Henrietta Maria. Though at the time this marriage of alliance proved a ^{arguable} success, Charles' continuation to allow her Catholic court to grow displayed an inability to consider optics given the anti-Catholic sentiment present in Britain - Charles in fact suspending certain necessary laws to permit its growth. This

(Section A continued), however, was manageable, until the development of ^{the} ~~the~~ Catholic Chapel and the visitation of the sitting Pope to England - Charles allowing a privately uncomfortable but discreet Catholic presence ~~into~~ transgressing into a public, fearful ~~or~~ display of Catholic sympathy, ~~permeated by~~ with the use of prerogative rights. Coupled with his role in ~~the~~ causing the Bishop's Wars by attempting to impose the Book of Common Prayer in Scotland, Charles significantly rose the heat of the religious conflict sweeping Britain ~~the Irish Rebellion engendered by~~ ~~gave parliament~~ ~~as~~ justification and public backing to campaign against him in ~~the~~ a civil war. There, as Charles displayed a stubborn inability to consider the consequences of his ~~the~~ religious policies and ~~of~~ used further exploitative prerogative rights to wage war, I would agree it is quite accurate to say his actions

(Section A continued) were the main ^{religious} reason ^{contributing} for the civil war outbreak.

However, we must also consider the other ~~contributing factors~~ actors or others during this build-up, in particular the actors of parliament. Not only did they demonstrate a lack of co-operation at the period's beginning, MP's Holles and Pym sitting as Speaker tried to ensure parliament could not be adjourned until the P.O.R. was passed. Flouting parliamentary convention to stubbornly pursue their own ideals, highly antagonising Charles irrespective of if they were justified - or well as at the period's end in the 1640s, the Grand Remonstrance's 204 points containing a being of acts for too strict to ever be gratefully accepted by Charles I and delivered in a public manner to exacerbate his humiliation. Thus, as Pym themselves demonstrated a stubbornness pernicious to the co-operation of Parliament and Charles even the

(Section A continued)

Following of continued procedure, it seems as if it is somewhat inaccurate to claim Charles' actions might have been the main reason.

Furthering this line of argument is the fact that ministers like Laud or Wentworth played in Charles' I's downfall and the civil wars outbreak. Laud, for example, as Bishop of London, and then Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, displayed an insensitivity to the religious climate of Britain in his pursuit of Anglican policies like the 'beauty of holiness' or the return of vestments to - closely related to Catholic doctrine, so ~~while it could be argued~~ helping stoke the anti-Catholic fears that contributed to the war's outbreak. In addition, Wentworth, as deputy of Ireland, spread dissent abroad for Charles - the seizing of land titles from large swaths of Irish gentry

(Section A continued) ~~To conclude~~

This period of ~~personal rule~~ leading up to the civil war can thus be seen to have been one full of unco-operative behaviour, avoidable antagonism and social tumult. Though parliament's stubbornness likely played a role in the civil war) outbreak, its ^{most} moderate members notes it hard to argue they were more significant than Charles' stubbornness and antagonism. Likewise, Leeds and Workman's failures were catastrophic, but could possibly be ~~seen~~ ^{seen} as the failure of Charles to pick an expert and government. Thus, given his also greater contribution to the religious tumult that contributed to the war's outbreak, I would agree the statement is mostly accurate in ~~terms~~ ^{terms} Charles' as the main reason.



This response demonstrates L5 qualities to varying degrees. Key issues relevant to the question (including the actions of Charles, finance, religions and advisors) are explored by a sustained analysis between key features of the period. Note that, despite this being a longer response, the candidate is controlled enough in their writing to keep revisiting the question and the end of every section. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and respond fully to its demands. Range of knowledge is secure here, if depth is less so. There is some slight chronological error around the Petition of Right, but the response is largely factually accurate. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reach and substantiating a judgement. There is range in this argument and Charles's actions are tested in the economic, political and religious spheres. The answer is well organised, despite its length. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision. Again, the determined focus of the candidate throughout this response is clear to see.

Question 2

This question was less popular than Q01 but was still attempted by a number of candidates who offered thoughtful and analytical responses. Most focused on key aspects of army involvement in politics, particularly the Rump's reliance on the army and the rule of the Major Generals, while also exploring other causes of instability such as Cromwell's leadership and the broader religious radicalisation during the period. Some candidates offered perceptive arguments about how government reliance on military support both upheld and undermined political authority, including awareness of Monck's role in undermining Richard Cromwell and welcoming the Restoration.

Some candidates showed detailed knowledge of the Protectorate, drawing on examples such as the dissolution of the First Protectorate Parliament and the role of the army. There was also consideration of Cromwell's decision to refuse the offer of the crown and how his refusal to embrace limited monarchy perpetuated instability.

However, some responses struggled with coverage or organisation, offering narrative accounts or focusing narrowly on the Major Generals without broader analysis of the army's political role. In some cases, the nature and role of the Major Generals was confused. Fewer candidates successfully considered the army's influence over the fate of the Parliament of Saints.

A minority of responses made underdeveloped references to religious and political extremism or treated examples such as James Naylor as illustrative without clearly linking them to instability. In some cases, knowledge from outside the date range (e.g., the Civil Wars) was used but this needed explicit connection to developments during the Interregnum to answer the question effectively.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

The ~~later~~ years of the Republican government, known as the Interregnum, of the years 1649-60 brought about ~~a~~ 11 years of deep instability and short-lasting governments, due to ~~a~~ the involvement of a range of different groups. ~~Despite~~ Although it can be argued that the army's involvement in politics was a prime factor in the instability of republican government due to their unelected nature, the involvement of the ~~other~~ other factors cannot go on ignored as their involvement was also crucial, such as the conservative nature of Parliament, ~~religious and political~~ radicalism, and most importantly, the role of ~~the~~ Cromwell and his ideological ~~the~~ schizophrenia, which proved to be the most vital reason of them all and the main reason for instability.

The army's involvement ~~of the war~~ in ~~the~~ politics played a crucial role in the instability of the Republic government due to their forceful nature despite being an unelected ~~for~~ institution. The army displayed multiple examples of being a coercive force, attempting and also sometimes ~~exceeding~~ succeeding, to bend the ~~rest~~ country's ~~play~~ the political situation their way, creating a sense of fear and unjust rule, which was the exact ~~a~~ problem England was trying to ~~at~~ ~~exit~~ and be free of. In this sense, the ousting of the MPs that were still open to negotiate with King Charles I, was done using the army's force, already creating a ~~sense~~ state of tension with the MPs that were ousted and ~~providing~~ their

(Section A continued) displaying their wish to bend Parliament their way, not in a fair and civil manner but with force. The ~~era of the Inter~~ Interregnum period began and ended in the same manner, with the army forcing Richard Cromwell, Oliver Cromwell's son, to dissolve Parliament in retaliation to Parliament attempting to reduce the army's power and their involvement in Pett politics, ~~highly~~ deserving due to their unelected, therefore illegitimate nature. Furthermore, after the end of the Major Generals ^{in 1656} and the recalling of a new Parliament through new elections to create the second Protectorate, the existing army major generals attempted to sway the election results severely to tamper with the outcome of the elections, and therefore the political plight of the country. This shows a sense of corruption, ~~the~~ and overall ~~not~~ bringing the country further away from their goal of a more restricted ~~to~~ rule and ~~government~~ government, therefore causing instability.

Moreover, the army's involvement in politics also created instability as it ~~caused~~ ~~caused~~ the caused the Parliament to create less change and focus on limiting the army's power. During the ~~first~~ time of the Rump Parliament, the army were frustrated with the Rump's inability to introduce social and political reforms that they wished to be implemented, which caused ~~them~~ to the Council of Officers to draw up reforms they wished to be implemented such as the purging of MP they deemed unfit and ~~free elections~~ new elections where men they believed were right for the job would be elected. This frustrated

(Section A continued) parliament, particularly as the army were unelected and this interference in their matters and job created a disaffection from the real matters at hand, restoring stability in the country, which therefore also played a hand in instability of the ~~the~~ republican period. However, despite the instability the army had caused, it can be argued that the army were only able to hold the power they did and only had the means to create disruption due to Ott Oliver Cromwell himself and him exalting their status. As Oliver possessed the highest rank during this period, he could have suppressed the disruptions caused by the army ~~to~~ and aided in creating stability ~~by~~ and undoing the harm they caused to the Republic, however, Cromwell instead supported their beliefs and actions, as he himself was one of them, therefore showing the Cromwell ~~great~~ was the biggest reason for instability.

The role of Oliver Cromwell and his ideological schizophrenia played a ~~crucial part in~~ highly, arguably the most crucial part in the instability of the Republican government in the years 1649-60. Cromwell's 'ideological schizophrenia' was the term that defined his contrasting ~~need~~ wishes for ~~not~~ maintaining the existing social order, and ~~his wish~~ where the poor serve the wealthy, and the wealthy aid the poor, and his wish to push social justice and a godly moral reform that he believed God asked him to do, like the freeing of the Israelites from the Egyptians in the time of Moses. This wish for moral reform resulted ~~in~~ greatly in the instability of the Republican Government. The

(Section A continued) rule of the major generals from 1655-56 was known as the most disastrous and hated ~~governing~~ body of rule in the Interregnum due ~~that~~ to the ruling by the unskilled army and the ways in which the major generals were instructed to carry out moral reform. the rule of the major generals involved the country being split into districts and being ruled by a major general, which created a militaristic style of government, with which conservative nature already being doomed to be united. As under this rule, Royalists were deeply ~~was~~ troubled, with increasing of local army militias to keep close watch of them and Royalists having to seek permission to leave their home from any general, already creating therefore creating hostility from Royalists. Furthermore, the major ~~g~~ generals were instructed to carry out godly reform from Cromwell, which involved the banning of forswearing, goss-bones and hobbies such as horse-riding and cock fighting, and the closing of alehouses, which caused deep resentment and therefore instability.

Furthermore, the ~~the~~ contrasting views of Cromwell's ideological schizophrenia caused the closing and opening of short lived bodies of government, which was the sole basis of instability. the Remonstrant Assembly had ~~constituted~~ ~~of~~ ~~been~~ created due to Thomas Harrison, a forth Puritanist, ~~opening~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ convincing Cromwell to create a Parliament of 'godly men' therefore ~~at~~ adhering to Cromwell with of godly reformation. However, this short lived Parliament was dissolved due to

(Section A continued) The resurgence of radical political ideas, like the abolishing of tithes, which Cromwell believed would disrupt social order, which was the other side of his ideology. Cromwell's inability to reconcile ~~and~~ between these two sides caused a sense of indecisiveness and therefore ~~instability~~ causing instability in the Republican government.

Another factor that cannot be ignored is the conservatism of Parliament during the time period, which caused ~~to be~~ anger and frustration of Cromwell, the army and religious radicals.

Parliament's conservatism and their inability to create new laws ~~that~~ caused anger from all sides as they did not aid in the country moving onto better social and political change as Cromwell wished. The Rump Parliament had become majoritively ~~at~~ conservatism due to the readmission of old members that ~~have~~ had been excluded from Pride's Purge, however this was ~~Cromwell's~~ Cromwell's own fault as he wished for the Rump to be more credible and trusted by the public. The Rump's Blasphemy Act 1650 and their inability to abide by the change the Hale Commission wanted to create ~~of~~ in the ~~legislate~~ law created ~~deep~~ anger in them. The Blasphemy Act 1650 made it harder for non-conformity to follow their own religion and reduced toleration significantly, and the Hale Commission reforms were ignored due to a vested interest from the lawyer MPs, therefore showing corruptibility. However, it can be argued that the conservatism of Parliament hadn't created as instability

(Section A continued) as the army had throughout the entire period of the Interregnum, and that the Blasphemy Act 1650 had only been used as a way to fight back at the army's involvement as much of the army were religious radicals. The power the army had in the Rump Parliament period was in part due to Cromwell, and his exhaustion of ~~people~~ the people he had fought beside, therefore blaming Cromwell for instability.

To conclude, despite disruptions and the strength of the army and the conservation of Parliament, it is clear that the main reason for instability was Oliver Cromwell and his inability to have a clear ideology.



This response displays Level 5 qualities. The candidate engages effectively with the role of the army as both a source of stability and instability for Republican government between 1649 and 1660. The counter-argument references Blair Worden's view of Cromwell as an 'ideological schizophrenic', demonstrating conceptual understanding. The role of Parliament in generating instability is also considered, contributing to a reasoned overall judgement. The response is stronger conceptually than in depth of knowledge, but it does include some detailed and accurate supporting material.



The use of historians' views is not necessary to reach the top levels of the mark scheme. However, candidates are encouraged to engage with wider reading to deepen their contextual awareness of the periods they study.

Question 3

This was the least popular option in Section B, but candidates from across the ability range were able to engage with it. The best responses tackled the debate around changes to the structure of Stuart society between 1625 and 1688, often citing the Tawney/Roper debate and analysing the relative rise or decline of different social groups. These answers showed a sophisticated understanding of social hierarchy and its fluctuations, particularly in relation to the Civil War and Interregnum. Many traced the fortunes of groups such as the gentry, nobility, poor, merchants, professionals, and women, using clear criteria—such as political, economic and social influence—to assess the extent of change.

Stronger responses also evaluated social mobility and made balanced judgements about the extent and longevity of change across the period. A number of students discussed the rise of the gentry and the merchant classes with confidence. Similarly, there was some nuanced treatment of women, balancing individual examples - such as Brilliana Harley and Lucy Hutchinson - with broader developments, including Interregnum legislation and the roles of Quakers and Levellers.

Weaker responses tended to narrate developments rather than evaluate them, or focused on one group (particularly women) to the exclusion of others. Some made sweeping generalisations about class or feminism, or included material on the Royal Society or Enlightenment thought without clearly linking it to social structure. A minority offered vague or generic comments about women or the poor that lacked specificity to the period.

Most students were able to identify examples of change or continuity within different social groups. Common points included the rise of the merchant and professional classes, or the continuing dominance of the nobility. However, the most successful responses moved beyond simple comparison to assess fluctuation across the period and offered sustained analysis of how far the structure of society itself was reshaped.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

It is only ^{somewhat} ~~partly~~ accurate to say that in 1625-80 the social structure remained essentially unchanged as although by 1688 the old social order was still in place the ranks of the merchants & professionals had grown as much as the wealth of the gentry. However, it is accurate to say that women's place in the social structure remained virtually unchanged. However the civil war & interregnum ~~and~~ ^{the} ~~did~~ ^{did} ~~by~~ ^{by} ~~regard~~ ^{regard} change the social structure until the 1660 restoration.

1625-40 it is ^{staying} ~~staying~~ accurate to say that the social structure remained essentially unchanged as it was still the embodiment of the old social order with the Nobility significantly ~~celebrating~~ ^{celebrating} the gentry in wealth & status, the merchant & professional classes only slowly growing & women with nearly no rights at all. As with most feudal societies the Noble retained the most wealth & status, this was due to 1625 & probably ^{from} 1629 (grand rule) most positions revolved around the royal court of which no commoner nor even landed gentry had access to. The status of the Nobility was also seen in the ^{major} ~~major~~ rise of the House of Lords in British politics. Similarly with rapid population growth (0.5% increase a year roughly) in the first half of the 17th century the Nobles were ~~in a~~ ^{in a} better place to benefit off of the high prices & inflation yet low wages to not only develop their own personal interests but buy up land & businesses of those who couldn't keep up. The place of 'middle sorts' including yeoman, butlers but mainly merchants & professionals

(Section B continued) (difficult as having an annual income of £50-£100) was however growing steadily in size & wealth if not in status, leaving the authority that in this period social structure barely changed. This was due to the fact that with the growing colonial trade, slow & general international trades provided an opportunity for common men to make their fortune & move their way into the upper classes. This is exemplified by the growth of the East India Trading Company, which since its start in 1601 to first shipments from India in 1626, men like Captain James Lancaster were able to make fortunes off this new scope of Trade. This changing & growing middle class can be seen in the growing wealth of cities like Bristol & London, getting rich off sea trade. Despite changes in middle class, throughout all of England women's place in society didn't change with the only notable change being in 1624 when they were given ability to plead court cases to go through church courts, however there's no capital punishment but only for certain very low level thefts, but throughout all class levels they had no rights to property or even their own body. Overall 1625-40 it is hardly accurate to say that British social structure remained essentially unchanged or excepting the steady growth of merchant & professional classes. It

1642-60 it is ~~hardly~~ hardly accurate to say that the social structure was unchanged as the civil war & interregnum, whilst not totally overthrowing social order, made more drastic changes than previously seen. With the 1649 abolition of House of Lords, presided over by mostly noble regicides a lot of the civil war, the nobility lost status & wealth through the civil

(Section B continued) consequences of the civil war, for example the destruction has played on old royalist or supporting Republican government. The civil war & subsequent war on a monarch rising the gentry up to a similar status of wealth & power. For example, Oliver Cromwell a very minor landed gentry through the civil war took the position of Lord protector, even moving into House of Lords in 1657. Similarly many minor gentry moved in the civil war army had risen & held new places of significance in the Republic. The growth of literacy rates ~~for example the number~~ e.g. the 1646 act in Scotland that made paid every community to have a school was dramatically increasing the ranks of the professional class, with ~~even~~ records suggesting that by 1650 many were used to paying for a medical consultation, similarly ranks of lawyers increased with the growing trade as well as others supporting the exponential growth of London (1625-50 went from 200,000 to 600,000 people). Similarly with Cromwell's 'Western Design', the Navigation Act of 1651 & successful 1st Anglo-Dutch war, the merchant class was also booming in wealth & power. Even women were given the opportunity for a small bit of independence with women taking up male roles during civil war, for example Lucy Hutchinson defending castle Corfe from attack. There was also more participation in religion with women like Elizabeth Lytton & Katherine Chidley being leading figures in the Quakers. Quakers had built 4 all girls schools, a top pursuit for

(Section B continued) women's education. However despite changes most ~~parts~~ (for merchants & professional classes) proved to be only temporary with the 1660 restoration undoing the much change, like re-establishing the House of Lords, the end of which now made women return to usual duties still without rights. Overall, despite steady growth of merchant & professional classes many changes were temporary however it is hardly accurate to say things were unchanged as the changes over the 17th century + new ideas were large.

1660-88 it is ^{only} fairly accurate to say that social structure was unchanged as the ~~with 1660~~ the power of the gentry continued to rise along with their wealth, even with the debates regarding some of their uses lost during the 17th century. For example by 1671, Sir Robert Vyner, son of a ~~poor~~ not so rich man from Warwick was owed £400,000 by King Charles. Similarly, Josiah who started as a Brewer ~~became~~, through the use of new offices became a "Clerk of Acts" with an income of £350 a year. By 1680s 1/20 of the adult male population were office holders, people who often gentry or even lower achieved newly large incomes along with some wealth & status. As with the general trend of 1625-88 the professional & merchant classes continued to grow with Gentry in membership (main interest to Royal court) going from 80 to 120 households. Teaching specialists by 1660 were required to teach Greek, Hebrew & Latin & with ~~the~~ continually growing & expanding



This is a Level 5 response that addresses the issue of change over time. The candidate explores different time frames (1625–1640, 1642–1660, and 1660–1688) and evaluates the extent of social change in each. The argument is supported by detailed historical knowledge, including relevant statistics, and is underpinned by an awareness of historians' interpretations, culminating in a substantiated judgement.



In addressing change and continuity questions, candidates are encouraged to recognise that change is not always linear. Some periods will encompass greater degrees of change than others.

Question 4

This was the more popular question in Section B. Candidates from across the ability range were able to engage with it. Many candidates demonstrated wide-ranging and precise knowledge of the factors that contributed to the growth of overseas trade during the period, with particularly strong coverage of the East India Company, the Navigation Acts, the transatlantic slave trade, and the development of trade with the Americas and the Caribbean. The East India Company was often used as a starting point, with students exploring its trading rights, military role, and government support. Stronger answers then compared this to other developments, showing clear awareness of connections and relative significance.

High-level responses used valid criteria to assess importance, such as the creation of new trading routes and outposts, the removal of foreign rivals, and the long-term impact on the development of British ports. Many were able to show how different factors combined to facilitate the expansion of trade, and to trace developments across the whole period. There was also some thoughtful evaluation of the short- and long-term significance of insurance, London's role as a hub, and the commercial opportunities provided by new colonies and cash crops like tobacco and sugar.

Some responses, while rich in factual detail and statistics, lacked the analytical depth to make secure judgements. These often explained factors in isolation rather than exploring interrelationships. A few drifted into a broader discussion of the British economy, touching on agriculture, the cloth trade or banking, without always linking these points securely to the question of overseas trade.

Nonetheless, candidates tended to show awareness of the development of British overseas trade, and most candidates were able to offer relevant knowledge. The strongest responses were well-structured and sustained, showing a clear line of argument supported by precise examples and consistent links back to the focus of the question.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

It is accurate to say that the East India Company played the most significant role in the development of British overseas trade as it enabled Britain to become one of the most successful ^{economic} ~~imperial~~ traders, overtaking the Dutch and Portuguese. Whilst other factors are ~~also~~ ^{certainly} important to Britain's development such as their control of the triangular slave trade, the Navigation Acts and imperial expansion ⁱⁿ ~~the~~ North America and Jamaica, the East India Company undoubtedly led Britain to control ~~one~~ ^a of ~~the~~ most very lucrative part of the world thus developing their overseas trade.

Firstly, the East India Company played the most significant role in the development of British overseas trade because it allowed Britain to take over a part of the world where they could trade in silver and gold. The fact that they were able to do this aligned with Britain's ~~imperialist~~ ^{mercantilist} principles and gave them an advantage over other overseas powers. Furthermore, ^{the} East India ~~Company~~ ^{Company} began trading saltpetre from 1626.

(Section B continued) which was massively important and a desirable product thus helping to develop Britain's overseas trade. On the island of Madras, pepper was also traded, allowing Britain to gain access to new produce that ~~they~~ ~~offo~~ would not have access to had it not been for the creation of the East India company. Perhaps the most important reason that the East India Company ~~developed~~ ~~played~~ ^{developed} overseas trade was the ability to mint coins from 1672. This enabled Britain to trade with ease in India using the Rupee, whilst gradually gaining imperial control. ~~that~~ ^{it} ~~also appeared~~ ^{also appeared} that Britain were still respecting India by doing this. However, it was, in reality, the most fundamental reason why the East India Company began to thrive. ~~and that~~ Therefore, ~~for~~ these factors, it is true that the East India company played the most significant role in the development of overseas trade.

On the other hand, it could be argued that ~~the~~ Britain's control of the triangular slave trade brought about the most significant developments to British overseas

(Section B continued) trade. Britain were principally able to retain control with the use of the Royal African company, which received the royal charter in 1672, along with a payment of £740,000 from King Charles. The Royal African company ~~were able to~~ ^{had their own} military bases in the Caribbean, as well as army and ~~the~~ built places in which the slaves could be bought and sold. Without the creation of this company, Britain would not have been able to own over half of the entire ~~time~~ slave trade. Moreover, Britain had many ~~thinning~~ ports where the slaves could be taken to and from including in Liverpool and Bristol which allowed for easier trade routes and helped to maximise the number of slaves. Furthermore, ~~the~~ slavery was written into law in most American colonies by 1700, which contributes to the widespread acceptance and flourishing of slavery during these years. ~~Prove to and~~ ~~explains~~ how there were over 120,000 slaves by this point. Therefore, ~~the~~ Britain's control of the Triangular slave trade certainly played a significant role in the development of overseas trade due to its nature of cheap

(Section B continued) labour ~~for a huge amount of~~ ^{in return for produce that}

otherwise would be impossible to attain. However, it is not as significant as the East India Company because it took until the latter end of the century for the slave trade to become ~~the~~ completely lucrative.

Additionally, it can be said that ~~the~~ Britain's imperial expansion to North America and Jamaica led to huge developments in British overseas trade due to ~~enriching~~ ^{new} produce and cash-crops. When Jamestown was discovered, it had a large amount of tobacco which was a very profitable product that helped Britain develop its economy greatly. In fact, by 1700, around 22 million lbs of tobacco was exported from ~~there~~ ^{there} which shows the great importance of having control of North America. Further, in 1583, the discovery of Newfoundland opened opportunities for growth in the farming and fish market, yet again enabling Britain to expand its own economy by trading with other countries and exploiting their crops and produce. In addition, expansion in Jamaica was an important decision as it was one of the

(Section B continued) most lucrative areas of the world where Britain could thrive economically. For example in Antigua there were many large sugar plantations which highly benefitted British overseas trade as they could use slaves to do cheap labour for them. Overall, imperial expansion in North America and areas of the Caribbean was ^{highly} important for developing British overseas trade, ~~as it~~ ^{as it gave} Britain access to new, undiscovered and un-cultivated countries that they could profit on.

Finally, the creation of the Navigation Acts in 1651 and 1660 certainly ~~played a~~ ^{played a} significant role in the expansion of overseas trade due to the fact that they limited rivalry, most notably Dutch rivalry. firstly, they stopped any products being carried on foreign ships as well as well as making sure the crew were at least half British. The limitations clearly hindered Dutch performance in overseas expansion and helped Britain grow exponentially. Furthermore, the Acts ~~were~~ ^{were} slightly modified by the 1663 Staple Act. This further secured the British success at sea ~~and~~ ^{as} it ~~enabled~~ ^{made} Britain the 'staple'

(Section B continued) country that all colonies had to come through before reaching their destination. ~~With~~ the combination of the acts, Britain were successfully able to develop and expand their overseas trade by limiting the Dutch at times like the Anglo-Dutch rivalries. Overall, the creation of the Navigation Acts were ~~th~~ of some significance, but it was not the ^{only or} most important reason for British overseas success.

Overall, I agree that the East India Company played the most significant role in the development of British overseas trade because it enabled the Royal mint in 1672 which is arguably the most important way Britain were able to take control in a foreign, but very lucrative area and increase their economy. Whilst it is true that the ^{control of the} triangular slave trade is an equally important factor as it allowed Britain to get new products for extremely cheap, ~~perhaps~~ the ~~most~~ majority of the slave trade had yet to ~~become~~ ^{become} ~~an international~~ the sole way to develop an economy at this time. Therefore, the

(Section B continued) East India company played the most significant role ~~in the~~ by being the leading ^{company} ~~country~~ for Britain to expand and develop their overseas trade.



This is a secure level 5 response. Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis between key features of the period. The candidate opens with focus on the East India Trading Company, then considers this alongside issues including triangular trade, colonial expansion and the Navigation Acts. Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and respond fully to its demands. Range of knowledge is secure here and we have supporting depth "Perhaps the most important reason that the East India Company developed overseas trade was the ability to mint coins from 1672". The notion of the EIC trading in silver and gold, and the connection to mercantilism, is subject to debate. So, there is no reason to disallow it here. Other material on the EIC is secure. Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reach and substantiating a judgement. The candidate considers each theme in turn and weighs this against the question premise throughout the essay "However, it is not as significant as the East India Company because it took until the latter end of the century for the slave trade to become lucrative". The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision. There is a determined focus throughout.

Question 5

This was the compulsory extract-based question; candidates across the ability range were able to engage with the extracts and question. Many were able to identify the arguments made in the extracts and relate them to their own knowledge of the Glorious Revolution. The strongest answers were clearly focused on the issue of *change*, some beginning with a definition of what constituted significant or radical change during the period. These candidates then used this definition as a framework to compare and evaluate the arguments of the two historians.

Many responses successfully explored the key themes raised by the extracts, including the significance of the Toleration Act, the Act of Settlement and the financial changes. High-level answers dealt with these issues thematically, moving between extracts to explore differing interpretations - such as comparing the treatment of religious toleration or the role of Parliament. Many also recognised the different scope and emphasis of the extracts: Coward's focus on attitudes to change and the early years of the Revolution contrasted with Vallance's more legislative and institutional approach, stretching the timeline to 1701.

Stronger responses also demonstrated an awareness of the wider historiographical debate surrounding the Glorious Revolution. They were able to situate each interpretation within that debate, and critically assess the validity of each argument using precise and relevant knowledge. These answers often integrated quotation or close reference from the extracts with contextual evidence - such as the establishment of the Bank of England, William's war financing and the role of the Public Accounts Committee - while also drawing on knowledge of political developments such as the emergence of Whig and Tory divisions. In doing so, they moved beyond simple agreement or disagreement and instead interrogated the implications of each interpretation.

A minority of responses tended to offer a more descriptive approach. They explained the arguments in each extract in turn and attempted some comparison, but this was usually limited or generalised. A significant number of students showed good knowledge but treated the extracts as material to 'fact-check' rather than as interpretations to evaluate. Some did not engage with both extracts equally or overlooked key themes such as the limitations placed on monarchy or the significance of the Act of Settlement.

A small number of students struggled to grasp the nature of the question or attempted a GCSE-style analysis of provenance, commenting on the date of publication or the titles of the historians' works as a reason to prefer one over the other. Others tried to categorise the interpretations into broad schools of thought (e.g. Whig, Marxist or Traditionalist) without showing how these labels related to the specific arguments presented. Some weaker responses focused heavily on pre-1688 events - such as the reign of Charles II or James II's absolutism - without linking their discussion back to the change brought about by the Revolution itself.

Most candidates understood that the question required a comparison of views and an evaluation of the extent and nature of change brought about by the Glorious Revolution. Those who were able to use their own knowledge to critique and develop the arguments of the extracts, and to sustain a reasoned judgement about which interpretation was more convincing, were able to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that, in the years to 1701, the Glorious Revolution brought about significant change?

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

(20)

The Glorious Revolution, which saw the collapse of the Stuart dynasty and the replacement of James II with William III and Mary II in Britain's only joint monarchy was a significant break from what had gone before. Although ~~Vallance~~^{Coward} expresses the belief the revolution failed to bring "the end of personal monarchy" and, in this way, failed to bring about significant change, I am more convinced by Vallance's view that it "introduced a system of parliamentary monarchy" thus generating significant change. Although I acknowledge the constraints of some changes Coward raises I am, on the whole, largely convinced the Glorious Revolution brought about significant change.

There are several reasons to be convinced by this view. Vallance raises

the point that parliamentary power was "strengthened" through its ability to "scrutinise public accounts" and "the impact of the 1694 Triennial Act". The ability of parliament to scrutinise parliamentary accounts makes reference to the 1690 Public Accounts Act that opened the accounts of the monarchy to public scrutiny and investigation by a special commission. This did in many ways cause significant change, not least because the monarch's expenditure could now be criticised, but also because William III did adopt suggestions made. Although this began to tail off as time progressed, this was a significant break from what had gone before. The 1694 Triennial Act Vengeance also mentioned, tightened up on the 1689 Bill of Rights that demanded the monarch have regular parliaments by demanding a ~~new~~ parliament must sit every three years. Arguably of greater significance was the Militia Act which, first passed in 1689, granted the king the right to maintain a standing army. However, the

need for yearly renewal arguably necessitated the regular calling of Parliament more than that of the Triennial Act but, in the end, both had the same effect combined of making parliament regular and thus generating significant change. Religious evolution of this time is something Vallance also picks up on as he describes the 1689 Toleration Act as a "significant retreat of by the Church and State", which is fairly accurate considering the act generated tolerance to dissenters. Even Coward acknowledges the impact, although less strongly, saying it created a "more comprehensive Church of England". Coward isn't necessarily remiss here in his point here that the act wasn't wholly forgiving to all dissenters, considering that Jews, Catholics and Non-Trinitarians were all exempt from the act. However, considering by 1714, Britain had 400,000 openly practicing dissenters which marked a significant break from what had gone before, I sit in

between Vallance and Coward's views on the impact of the act, considering its restraining aints, but ultimately it generated substantial change. On the whole then, considering the evolution of power dynamics and the nature of religious policies throughout the Glorious Revolution, I am largely convinced by the view it caused significant change.

There are, naturally, restrictions to how significant the change of the Glorious Revolution can be considered to be and Coward raises several points in the matter. His highlighting that it "did not end Whig-Tory divisions" is accurate, especially as the period subsequently became known as the 'Age of Party', in which there was increasing political divisions and factionalism in parliament. Vallance's admission that the revolution may not have represented "the beginnings of a parliamentary democracy" is also a good point that highlights the majority of government operations still ran through the King and the worsening Whig-Tory

factionalism Coward points out is arguably the very early beginnings of this democracy which culminates in the introduction of the Prime Minister role in 1721. Coward's criticisms of the 1689 Toleration Act are, as previously mentioned, also quite valid, especially in the claim that it "did not bring about the end of religious intolerance". As said previously, the exclusion of Jews, Catholics and Non-Trinitarians from the act emphasises this as does the ~~the~~ maintenance of the harshly anti-Catholic Test Act until 1834. However, that the act marked the break from a Confessional State is an unprecedented change that certainly constitutes as significant change. Coward's views that the revolution "did not bring about the end of personal monarchy" are arguably, although not wholly inaccurate less convincing. It is true that William III remained able to choose his own advisors, could declare war and peace and was still head of Church of England, all of which marked a continuation of personal

monarchy. However, what Coward fails to acknowledge that Vallance does is the 1701 Act of Settlement, which Vallance claims "ended the threat of oppressive royal rule". The Act of Settlement well and truly sanded the death knell for the idea of the Divine Right of Kings as it wrested the line of succession from inherently primogenetic to parliamentary, slipping 57 potential heirs to arrange for the throne to pass to a Protestant monarch after the death of William III and subsequently Queen Anne. In this light, personal monarchy was ended and very much now dependent upon the favour of parliament that, due to the Militia Acts and Triennial Act, was now a regular form of government. So, whilst some of Coward's criticisms of the restriction of the acts that helped to constitute the Glorious Revolution do highlight the extent to which it was revolutionary was somewhat limited, the changes it did make were regularly unprecedented and in this way, a significant change.

On the whole, therefore, I am largely convinced with the view that the Glorious Revolution brought about significant change and agree more with the views expressed by Vallance in Extract 1 than Coward, in Extract 2. Coward's point, especially about the limitations of the Toleration Act is valid, and a convincing reminder that the Glorious Revolution was not, as even Vallance acknowledges in his admittal it did not truly create a "parliamentary democracy", a complete departure from what had gone before, however, Vallance's highlighting that the combined force of the Public Accounts Act and the 1694 Triennial Act ultimately swayed the balance of power in parliament's favour reminds that although not a clean break from previous systems, the Glorious Revolution was still a substantial change thus meaning I am largely convinced it generated significant change.



This response includes L5 qualities. The candidate interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of the arguments offered by both authors. This is clear from the first paragraph where the candidate states “Although Coward expresses the belief the revolution failed to bring “the end of personal monarchy”, and in this way failed to bring about significant change, I am more convinced by Vallance’s view that it “introduced a system of parliamentary monarchy...”. The candidate gets to the heart of the representation in the extracts and pursues it consistently from this point. The integration of issues raised by the extracts with those from knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments, is clear throughout this response. Significant knowledge is shown with discussion of the Public Accounts and Mutiny acts. Additional contextual is also used to support the candidate’s argument, including discussion of the “rage of party” that lasted beyond the Glorious Revolution. the candidate presents a sustained evaluative argument, reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrates understanding of the nature of historical debate. There is a clear evaluative focus throughout the response. This is particularly clear in discussion of the Toleration Act, mentioned in both extracts “Even Coward acknowledges the impact, although less strongly saying it created a “more comprehensive Church of England...”. Judgement is clearly offered in both the introduction and the conclusion.



Candidates should consider not only where the historians’ views in the extracts contradict one another, but also where there is common ground. They are also encouraged to use contextual knowledge to develop points from the extracts, rather than using the extracts simply to fact-check.

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 of the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors

Clear explanation of judgements – not necessarily abstract or formulaic, but showing reasoned argument in relation to the concepts and topic

Careful focus on the second-order concept targeted in the question

Sensible time management, allowing for completion of all three questions with roughly equal time given to each.

An appropriate level of depth and analysis, in line with the demands of the question — for example, a realistic range of material to support a balanced answer to breadth questions.

Common issues which hindered performance:

Responses that paid little heed to the specific demands of the question — e.g. discussing the topic broadly without addressing the question directly, or reframing questions targeting other second-order concepts as if they were about causation

Limited engagement with the given issue or proposition — for example, exploring other causes or consequences but giving only minimal attention to the focus of the question

Partial responses — such as covering only part of the date range, or addressing the stated cause or consequence without considering alternative factors

Assertions of change or causation repeated formulaically using the words of the question, without genuine explanation or analysis

Judgements that were either absent or not clearly explained

Lack of supporting detail.

Section C responses:

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

Strong focus on the precise demands of the question, rather than relying on pre-prepared material about broader controversies from the specification

Thorough use of the extracts — not necessarily every point, but a clear focus on them as

interpretations of the issue

Confident use of the two extracts together — comparing their arguments, evaluating their relative merits, or analysing their differences

Careful use of contextual knowledge, clearly selected to address the issues raised in the extracts and used to evaluate the arguments in the question

Close reading of the extracts, showing understanding of both individual statements and their role in the wider arguments made

Willingness to move beyond viewing the extracts as wholly opposing — for example, considering the degree of disagreement or identifying areas of overlap.

Common issues which hindered performance:

Limited or imbalanced use of the extracts — for instance, focusing heavily on one while neglecting the other

Minimal comparison or analysis of the differing interpretations

Using the extracts simply as sources of factual support, rather than as interpretations

Arguing that one extract is better solely because it contains more factual content, without real analysis of the interpretations offered

Heavy use of contextual knowledge or seemingly pre-prepared arguments, with limited effort to connect this to the arguments in the extracts

Heavy use of contextual knowledge or seemingly pre-prepared arguments, with limited effort to connect this to the arguments in the extracts

Tendency to see the extracts as total opposites, without considering nuance or partial agreement.

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>

