



Pearson

Examiners' Report
June 2017

GCE History 9HI0 30

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_30_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with the new A-Level paper 30: Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII, 1399–1509.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1). Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated. Examiners did note that more scripts than has been usual posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability, in both parts of the enquiry, to draw out reasoned inferences developed from the source and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important that candidates appreciate that weight is not necessarily established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the source. However, commentary on all the things that the source might have contained, but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight.

Candidates are more familiar with the Section B essay section of Paper 3 and 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, although weaker candidates often wanted to engage in a main factor/ other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; many candidates lacked any counter argument at all. 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 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, most candidates were well prepared in terms of their contextual knowledge of individual elements within the period, but not all candidates fully engaged with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. Candidates do need to be aware that this is a breadth question and that the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. This has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access Level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question.

The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. In some, there was little significance that related to relevant key events, development and changes for part of the specified chronology in the precise question. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of

any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed.

To access level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question.

It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology.

Question 1

The majority of candidates were able to pull out and identify the two enquiries and either discussed or described character and opposition. The stronger candidates were able to link the source to their own knowledge of the historical context and make reasoned judgements. They also recognised that the question calls for contextual knowledge to underpin comments on the source rather than including stand alone sections of their own knowledge. Stronger candidates were also able to explain the context of the Chronicles and make valid inferences about what this meant for the utility of the source in relation to the two enquiries. Many candidates split their answer into three sections: a paragraph per enquiry and a paragraph on the value of provenance; before concluding. This meant that provenance was stated rather than linked to the specific terms of the two enquiries, and did not allow candidates to assess whether the source was more valid for one enquiry than the other. Many answers also got caught up in a discussion of Richard's character, in terms of expressing opinion or straying from the focus of the source. Weaker candidates struggled to integrate historical context with the content of the source and to focus their answer accordingly, which held answers back. Sometimes knowledge was provided that was detailed and accurate but not particularly relevant to the question. For example, some candidates wrote lengthy details about Shakespeare and his denouncing of the Yorkists via his plays. This was not directly tied to the question and therefore remained irrelevant. Students tended to struggle with discussing the origin of the source, simply outlining basic source information. Assessing value proved difficult for many, and the weakest part of the response was usually the evaluation of the source's utility, with very few answers addressing this fully. Many candidates couldn't move beyond "Tudor propaganda" as a reason to dismiss the validity of the source and simply used terms such as 'hindsight', 'bias' and 'propaganda' to assess utility. Sometimes limitations were explored, though there were misconceptions around what qualified as a limitation that could impact upon the weight of the source. These answers focused on what was missing, which often led to listing of events that had been omitted. It was incredibly common for students to apportion weight based on what the source had omitted and this is largely not how weight should be addressed.

Study the source in the Source Booklet before you answer this question.

- 1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the character of Richard III and opposition towards his kingship.

Explain your answer, using the source, the information given about its origin and your own knowledge about the historical context.

(20)

The source is quite useful for revealing the character of Richard III highlighting his tactical nature and questionable morals. However, the source is limited by the fact it was written during Henry VII's reign so may not be wholly accurate (pressure to present Richard in a negative ~~way~~ way). The source also has weight in highlighting some reasons for opposition, his northern power and circumstances of succession, but doesn't give much information regarding events of opposition. Therefore, the source is quite useful for both areas in different ways.

One thing the source reveals regarding the character of Richard III is his tactical nature. Immediately after his coronation in the summer of 1483 he went on Progress visiting "Windsor, Oxford and Coventry" and ~~at~~ "came at length to York". This allowed him to bolster his support,

especially in the North where people were naturally Yorkist but were loyal to Edward IV. This ~~was~~ therefore highlights his tactical nature in trying to gather support. Another way the source indicates he is tactical is by making his only son "created Prince of Wales". Indeed, this was customary in the period for the heir to the throne to take this position, thus publicising that Richard's son had taken the position tactically reinforced his position. The source's tone gives a negative view of Richard indicating this tactical nature is almost sly, creating a more in depth image of Richard's character.

However, it is difficult to know the truth of his inference since the source was written during the reign of Henry VI, thus has a tendency to paint Richard in a negative light to appease the ruling monarch. Regardless, the source reveals, reinforced by contemporary events, that Richard was tactical in nature, thus giving the source value.

Another way the source reveals about Richard's ~~own~~ character was his immorality. Most importantly in evidencing this is the Princes in

Tower i.e. "The presumed deaths of the Princes". Not only did Richard usurp the throne from the 12-year old Edward, who'd had no chance to rule, so had not proven inadequate or tyrannous, but he also, it is commonly believed, ordered their deaths. To make this even less moral, these two princes were his nephews. This immorality, proven by this action, is evidenced by the fact. Some may argue Richard's morality is portrayed badly since Mark wrote the scene, who's likely to have higher moral standards. However, this does not detract value for the scene since the murder of two nephews and the unjustified usurpation were clearly immoral actions by all standards. This immorality is further reinforced by the fact he "had taken possession of everything that his deceased brother" had earned. Indeed, his brother trusted him, hoping he'd be the Protector until his son came of age when he would "ensure the succession". Yet, Richard abused this trust ^{and} took everything, along with usurping the throne, written in Henry VIII's reign the scene doesn't give any contributing factors to Richard's behaviour other than

his immorality, like the woodrilles making it unsafe/difficult for him to act as a noble. Regardless, the source clearly highlights the moral nature of Richard III, which is supported and convincing, thus giving the source reasonable value.

The same highlights are reason for opposition towards Richard's kingship was due to his focus on the North. Indeed, the North was naturally more supportive of the Yorkist as made evident in Edward IV's reign and the majority of his key support e.g. the Nevilles being from the North. The source then highlights that Richard went on progress to the North and gave "splendid and expensive feasts and entertainments" in order to gain the "affections of the people". This favouring of the North is indicated by his reliance on ~~Lord Hastings~~ ~~and~~ Northerners e.g. Sir Richard Ratcliffe, ~~and~~ Lord Hastings and the Council of the North.

In addition, this favouring of the North led to opposition in the South "various southern counties" and plans to "rebel". This is partly due to their natural leanings towards the Lancastrians, but they didn't pose more issues

for Edward IV than the rest of the country, and ^{partly} predominantly due to Richard's favouring of the North. Indeed, it is the fact that uprisings occurred in the South, ^{however,} ~~that~~ the ^{source} ~~source~~ may present them as more personally opposing Richard's kingship than in reality since his would appeal to Henry VI. Overall though, ~~the source~~ the same correctly indicates one reason for opposition to Richard's kingship was due to his favouring of the North, giving the source some value.

*for example "Henry, Duke of Buckingham... organizer of" a rebellion in Wales in 1483 that failed due to not being able to cross the River Severn, as well as general uprisings in the South in October 1483.

Another thing the source reveals about opposition towards his kingship is that it was largely motivated by the circumstances of Richard's succession. Indeed, the source presents the circumstances of Richard's succession in ~~the~~ an incredibly negative light; Richard ruled "to ensure the succession of his [Edward's] son" by usurping a 12-year old and presumably

killing the two princes. Despite their having been numerous usurpers in the years before Richard's reign including Henry IV in 1399 and Edward IV in 1461, they had justifications that the previous king was unsuitable. Although Richard attempted to justify his usurpation by saying Edward IV was illegitimate and then that his son was illegitimate because Edward's marriage to Elizabeth Woodville wasn't valid, these claims were widely discredited since they were false. The source indicates ^{the weaknesses of Richard's} ~~Richard's~~ area motivating factor since it says they needed to "find someone new to be their king and challenge Richard". Indeed in 1484, there was a rebellion in favour of Henry Tudor and, throughout Richard's short reign, opposition became more focused on replacing him. Therefore, the source correctly reveals a reason for opposition to Richard's kingship.

☑ Naturally, a source written during the reign of Henry VII would want to ensure the king Henry had usurped from seemed to have an invalid claim to the throne. However, again, value isn't detracted from the source due to his some contextual knowledge reinforces the source's claims.

was circumstances of his succession, giving value to the source.

In conclusion, the source has ^{some} value in creating the character of Richard III. The A reveals his tactical and moral nature, however the ^{extent of} negative tones may be due to when the source is written slightly detracting from value. The source is also useful in revealing reasons for opposition to Richard's usurpation, ^{namely} ~~namely~~ his preference of the north and the circumstances of his succession, but is limited in creating the events of opposition, overall, meaning the source has some value for his criteria.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response clearly interrogates the evidence in the source, selecting details to support discussion of both enquiries and makes reasoned inferences throughout. Historical context is used to both illuminate the comments made on the source and to discuss the limitations of the source material. The candidate is aware of the need to interpret the source material in the context of the early Tudor period. The source is fully evaluated throughout and the candidate makes pertinent comments on weight. A comprehensive judgement is reached. This is a Level 5 response.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make sure you offer a judgement on the value of the source. When you note characteristics which would suggest a value or limitation, clearly link these back to the question. Make sure these judgements are based upon the source itself rather than your broader knowledge of the period.

Question 2

This was the most popular of the depth questions and was generally well answered. Most candidates were confident with the range of challenges faced by Henry IV and most were also able to produce a decent counter argument, so focus on the question was strong. Candidates tended to split this essay up into a chronology of rebellions, the more sophisticated picked themes to also include financial security and foreign relations. These answers tended to be more critical and have a clearer criteria for judgement. Alternative ways by which Henry asserted his hold were mentioned by many (dynastic marriage etc.) and the level of detail was also generally good. Stronger candidates were able to reach a judgement on these key issues and discuss the fact that they posed little challenge as Henry was able to put the challenges down quickly.

Weaker responses described how Henry IV struggled to hold power and described key events of challenge such as Wales, Scotland/North, and France. However these weaker candidates were not able to define the term 'struggle' and did not provide criteria by which to assess these threats. The links between factors were not always noted or fully explored in this question and this was surprising given the clear correlation between some of the events (rebellion and state of finances or rebellion and foreign policy). Some answers focused too much on description, rather than analysis. Narratives about Henry were quite common, displaying a depth of knowledge but an inability to transition to analysis. This was particularly true of students who got caught up in discussion about Henry's status as a usurper, his relationship with his son or the fraught relations between him and the Duke of Orleans.

Henry IV's usurpation of his cousin Richard II marked a new period of instability for English monarchy and people. By disrupting the hereditary claim usually dominant when passing on the English crown, Henry was forced to spend the entirety of his reign defending his position, because if he could ^{usurp} ~~usurp~~ the throne, what was to stop another over-mighty noble doing the same? His hold on the throne was threatened by a number of rebellions, which Henry had to respond to with quick and precise action - these included the Epiphany Rising, Glyndwr's Welsh Rebellion and the Percy family - including Hotspur.

Finally, it is critical to assess how Henry first consolidated his power; being a usurper caused him to be incredibly fragile on the throne. This was because many people, including Richard II's

Supporters did not think Henry was rightful king, additionally, Richard II was still alive, but under Henry's control, this opened the possibility of his supporters putting him back on the throne. Another immediate problem for Henry was his claim to the throne - whilst he was heir by male lineage through Edward III, Edward Mortimer had a more direct ~~king~~ lineage - but through a woman. There was therefore ~~with~~ a ~~wide~~ range - some believed Henry was just to take the throne, especially as Mortimer was a child, and Henry a seasoned military commander and experienced noble, to the contrary ~~supporters~~ ~~of~~ people could argue Mortimer should have the crown - not Henry. These factors therefore accumulate to a possible conclusion that yes, Henry did struggle to maintain the throne, due to the fact there was so much in the way of him keeping it in the first place.

However, Henry was wise with his initial actions and put measures in place to make his position more secure. Firstly, he named his young son the Prince of Wales - thus securing an heir for himself (this reduced threats to him ~~as~~ ^{as} he appeared to have a stable dynasty). Also he was lenient with Richard's supporters, if they promised him loyalty he would not punish them for their roles in Richard's campaign to maintain control. He also kept a careful eye on Edward Mortimer in an attempt to reduce his threat to Henry's crown. Therefore, these actions meant initially Henry was secure and had successfully become king of England. These first measures were not drastic, instead sensible and easy

to carry it, so on an urge, initially at least, Henry IV did not struggle - despite the threat posed by Richard, Mortimer and opposing nobility.

However, this well created security was not to last as Henry faced his first rebellion less than a year after taking the throne. The Epiphany Rising was led by nobility who were furious by Richard II, not due to Henry's ascension to the throne those lost considerable ~~money~~ ^{money} and power. The Nobles including Kent and Salisbury met a Westminster to discuss their plot; they would kill Henry and replace him with Richard II, thus re-enslating their power. The plot was leaked however so when their forces arrived at Windsor on the Epiphany, the King was not there - rather he ~~was~~ ^{had} raised a force ready to combat the rebels. Consequently the rebellion failed and the leaders were arrested and executed under convictions of treason. This rebellion shows Henry was not as secure as it seems - since his ~~known~~ ^{known} leniency ~~to~~ ^{towards} Richard's supporters was not enough (they rebelled anyway) and having Richard alive meant the rebels could use him as a figure head, thus gaining people support from commoners ^{who} believed Richard was the rightful king. This rebellion therefore indicates Henry did struggle staying on the throne since its aim wasn't the usual medieval tactic of forgetting 'evil councillors', a would to kill Henry. It also required a large force from Henry to quell it, this strong response ^{points to the fact} ~~shows~~ that Henry certainly saw it as a threat.

However, this rebellion was clearly not a success. Henry maintained his position without any real possibility of losing it since he was pre-warned of the attack. The rebels fled and ~~many~~ ^{many} executed. Significantly, after this uprising Richard II was found dead - likely under Henry's orders. These ~~points~~ ^{may} suggest that whilst the epiphany rising required force to stop it, and its aim was to kill the king, ~~Henry~~ it was only a potential threat and Henry quelled it before it escalated - so he maintained his throne, and if it was a struggle? One could argue ~~a~~ ~~was~~ ~~rebellion~~ ~~due~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~quick~~ ~~failure~~, ~~the~~ dealing with this threat wasn't a struggle. Henry made the mistake initially of leaving Richard remaining - to be a figure head - but he soon realised this - also his response put a future suppress of the Richard.

Another factor to consider regarding Henry's position on the throne at the start of his reign is the Glydwr rising. The Welsh resented England's control over them, and having an English king. When Henry usurped the crown he was not only ruling over Wales, but doing so ~~and~~ open to accusations of not ~~being~~ having the right to be ~~there~~ there. Thus, a key Welsh noble Glydwr tried to kill Henry and ~~remove~~ remove all English influence in Wales. ~~His~~ His plans were revealed to Henry who challenged him to a battle - but Glydwr refused, adopting guerilla tactics. Henry's solution was to pass a number of Parliamentary

acts; banning public meeting in Wales, people not allowed to sell ~~the~~ supplies to a Welsh person (food, arms or weapons) and massive restriction on Welsh people in England. This succeeded in stopping the uprising and Henry made a treaty with Glyndwr. One can argue this was a struggle for Henry Henry, since again it was aiming to overthrow him personally so was a direct threat to Henry, also it had large values of Welsh supplies. He also had to take drastic measures after diplomacy and violence failed, using parliament to shut it down. So whilst ~~it~~ was unsuccessful, this rebellion attracted much attention from the King and required a response - showing Henry did struggle to maintain the throne.

Again it must be considered that Henry was not conquered so he maintained some stability, but there is no doubt the Welsh uprising was a struggle for Henry Henry as his first tactics of diplomacy and violence failed and he had to ask parliament for help.

finally, the Percy lords of Northumberland were a significant threat to Henry. As a very powerful family in the North they had supported Henry's usurpation, but they lost favour of the new king; he owed them large sums of money, their help ~~at~~ ~~the~~ a key battle in Scotland was not properly rewarded when Henry would allow them to ransom ^{prisoners} ~~prisoners~~ (key earnings for rebels) and there was dispute because Hotspur one of the pious married a relative of Mortimer, making King suspicious. Tensions ~~expelled~~ themselves in a rebellion in 1400 when

The forces took Edmund Mortimer - potential heir and said he was the rightful king - not ~~Henry~~ Henry. They aimed to kill Henry and replace him with Mortimer. Henry's forces were on their way to aid the forces in Scotland when he heard of Mortimer's plot so went to Shrewsbury to meet them. Battle ensued and when Mortimer attempted to kill Henry, he himself was slain.

This rebellion was certainly a struggle for Henry to overcome. The forces were powerful nobility ~~was~~ with strong support in the North, also their use of Mortimer made them a relevant and potential threat. This was because if someone had killed the king there would be disputes as to who took the crown - ~~the~~ having control of Mortimer meant the forces had a viable option. Since many believed Mortimer should be on the throne anyway. Therefore, as is evident by Henry's need for a violent response in ^{the} battle of Shrewsbury - maintaining his crown against the forces was a threat. They had numbers, a rival heir and people support. It can even be suggested it was ~~the~~ ^{luck} that won the battle for Henry since his forces were losing until Mortimer died at his feet. Additionally, the use of Mortimer shows despite his early efforts ~~Henry~~ Henry had not secured the ^{throne} ~~throne~~ to a great enough extent. So Mortimer and forces rebellion does indicate maintaining the throne was a struggle for Henry; he quelled it effectively, but not without losses on his side.

In conclusion ~~then~~ ^{then} the beginning of Henry IV's reign was certainly eventful. Problems arose from his usurpation which meant others wanted to overthrow him - since he had a weak right to the crown. These problems included the Epiphany rising which had the potential to be a significant threat but Henry did quell it with his troops. His early failings to rid himself of the threat of Robert II did mean the rebels could have replaced Henry however. But, regardless of the potential severity, Henry did put it down with ease so here it wasn't a struggle militarily the ~~thence~~ ^{there}. The same could be said for Glendower; since Henry had to react to opponents help to ~~the~~ ^{stop} ~~own~~ ^{own} Glendower when his first efforts failed. So whilst the rebellion did fail - it was still a struggle for Henry. Similarly, the threat from the papies was significant due to their power and control of rival bar Edward Mortimer. Henry had to fight a battle to stop this threat - indicating it was a struggle for him. Therefore all of these were barriers to a smooth ~~own~~ ^{early} reign for Henry so we can agree he did struggle to maintain ~~the throne~~ ^{the throne}. However, ultimately, he died of natural causes and passed the throne onto his son - so whilst it was a struggle he did successfully maintain the crown.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Key issues are identified throughout the response and are clearly related back to the question. This candidate has excellent, detailed knowledge which demonstrates a clear and focused understanding of the question. Valid criteria by which to assess whether Henry struggled to maintain his hold on the throne are identified in the introduction and referred to throughout the response, before being weighed up fully in the conclusion. This is well structured and well organised - a Level 5 response.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure you are arguing throughout and make clear your links to the question.

Question 3

This question was less popular and was not often well answered. Detailed knowledge about the Yorkshire Rebellion was often lacking and answers tended instead to compare this event to other challenges in Henry VII's early reign, particularly those of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck. Judgements on the significance of the key factor were therefore often weak. Weaker candidates were not able to analyse the event in any depth but described Henry's rule and focused on the different threats to Henry's reign e.g. the Pretenders rather than scrutinise the details of the Rebellion, or they dismissed it entirely. The stronger responses tended to be tackled looking at the event and posed judgements using key issues. These candidates were able to make links between the rebellion and severity. Stronger responses were well supported with clear focus on the serious nature of the threat posed.

Question 4

Most students were able to discuss the role of the Spanish Marriage in strengthening the Crown. The stronger candidates were able to balance this with contextual knowledge and integrate other key diplomatic issues showing connectivity between them. These candidates focused their answer on different diplomatic treaties including the Spanish marriage, Treaty of Piquiny, Treaty of Tours and Treaty of Troyes. Stronger candidates ensured that they had a range of examples from across the period, recognising that this was a breadth question and engaging with it as such. The majority of answers did understand that this question required a YES/ NO; it was other factors (*related to foreign diplomacy*) though some answered 'YES' it was a 'NO'; it wasn't format and these answers severely lacked range. Weaker candidates were able to assert a one-sided approach and try to include other issues, including domestic. These answers did not focus enough on the Spanish marriage (and many did not have strong or accurate knowledge of it) and tended instead to list a range of other factors across the time period. Few realised the financial implications, let alone the details of it. Likewise, most candidates were unable to comment much about the marriage's impact in terms of relations between France and England. Other candidates lacked the knowledge of this issue to answer across the period for this question and therefore missed vital details. There was a lot of description/ narrative for weaker responses and these students struggled with the range of the question. Depth and detail were often lacking, and the lack of focus made for unsupported judgements. Timing was an issue for some candidates whereby a few paragraphs were written or insufficient material given to gain anything beyond Level 2. It is vital that candidates leave enough time for this question.

Diplomacy in the years 1399-1509 was a key part of ensuring the crown's stability and allowing the monarch to govern effectively, perhaps more so than war at certain points. The Spanish marriage, or Treaty of Medina del Campo, has to be argued was an incredibly successful piece of diplomatic legislation, however to state it was the key diplomatic development would disregard other, perhaps more important pieces of diplomacy.

The Spanish marriage of 1499, agreed to marry Henry VIII's son Arthur to Katherine of Aragon, the daughter of the Spanish monarchy. At the time it can be argued Spain was the leading power

and had considerable international status, meriting an alliance with them was incredibly important for Henry VII. This was because, although he had been, and was, a successful king, his realm and reign was somewhat unstable, illustrated by the fact the Spanish monarchy would only agree to marry their daughter to Arthur if the pretender, Perkin Warbeck had been executed. The Spanish marriage provided key diplomatic developments, for example stabilising the crown as it gave Henry an ally against the France and Scotland, secured trade deals with Spain which was important due to the selling wool trade and secured Henry's dynasty; the people were more likely to support a monarch with a secure succession. This shows that the Spanish marriage fulfilled key diplomatic developments for Henry the Tudor in the long term, and this is the key to a successful diplomatic measure; long-term advantages.

However, there ~~were other pieces of~~ is other evidence ^{of} diplomacy in the period, perhaps the most well recognised was the Treaty of Troyes under Henry V. Then Henry was a king who was at the height of popularity and the Treaty of Troyes secured the dual crown, a

great success after the French Campaigns since 1415. This developed the English claim to the French crown and allowed English nobility to gain huge amounts of patronage. Furthermore, it was a useful piece of propaganda for Henry and the Lancastrian dynasty. However, despite its advantages to the English, it cannot be seen as an effective piece of diplomacy that developed overseas relationships. This is because it only had short term advantages and after Henry's death it failed to materialise as he only left a minority. In ~~some~~ comparison to the Spanish marriage this secured a stable and long-term development in Anglo-Spanish relations whereas Troyes merely isolated the Dauphin, Amagnac, and support from the French, which would give weight to the Spanish marriage being more effective.

A key aspect of a successful diplomatic development was its effect on the crown's stability. Henry IV used diplomacy in order to do this and the threats from Hottel, Chyadur and the Tripartite Alliance. As a warrior he was politically unwise to be sought foreign diplomatic developments. His marriage of his daughters to court palatine of the Rhine, and the King of Scandinavia gave foreign support

and secured positive relations to the Hanseatic League. His own marriage to Joan of Brittany allowed French relations to improve and the fact he joined the order of the Garter was incredibly positive for Henry. It could be argued this was perhaps even more effective or a better piece of diplomatic development than the Spanish marriage as it was clear Henry IV faced more hostility than Henry VII did as he was the first usurper. This detracts weight from the claim the Spanish marriage was the key piece of diplomatic development.

~~As the~~ The financial gain from a piece of diplomacy should be positive also in order to judge whether it was an effective development for the crown. Perhaps the most obvious diplomatic treaty that supports this was the Treaty of Picquigny under Edward IV in 1475. This was signed with the French king and was important for the security of the realm after the instability caused by Henry VI and the war of the Roses as it gave Edward a pension of 110,000 per annum and 50,000 for three months. Although it was unpopular with the people, the Treaty of Picquigny can be seen the key piece of diplomatic development because

of the significance of its timing. It came after a long period of turmoil in England where the crown's finances had been diminished, for example Henry VI owed £372,000 at the end of his reign. Financial stability secured Henry's control on the crown and the truce with France reduced the opportunity for a French attack. Although the Spanish marriage was ostensibly important it came at a time when Edward IV and Henry VII had secured the financial stability of the realm, for example Henry's income was £100,000 a year, therefore it was not as important. It is therefore arguable that the Treaty of Picquigny was the key diplomatic development in the years 1399-1509 due to how it stabilised the crown's finances and secured peaceful relations with France and this really strengthened the crown.

On the other hand, perhaps the least successful piece of diplomacy was the Treaty of Tours in 1419 under Henry V. This did not strengthen the crown and in many ways was debilitating for it. Although it secured a marriage to Margaret of Anjou she came with no dowry, (effectively depleting) and the English had to give up the area of Maine. A successful diplomatic development is one that strengthens the crown.

franciscally, positive international relations and has popular support from the people which Tava did not show. In this way the Spanish marriage was far more effective in strengthening the crown, yet it still was not the key development.

To conclude, the Spanish marriage of 1499 was a successful diplomatic development, however it did not strengthen the crown to the extent the Treaty of Picquigny did. It came at a time when the crown was already, in some ways, relatively secure whereas Picquigny came at a time of domestic turmoil. Despite the advantages of Tava and Henry IV's diplomacy, they did not strengthen the crown to the extent Picquigny did, particularly franciscally, which was permanent diplomatic development.



ResultsPlus Examiners' Comments

The candidate clearly engages with the stated factor of the Spanish marriage before comparing this to a range of other diplomatic events across the entire period. There is sufficient knowledge to underpin the points made and to fully engage in the debate. Valid criteria are established, used throughout and evaluated in the final judgement. The answer is logical and well organised - this is a Level 5 response.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make sure that you pick a range of examples from across the period in the question.

Question 5

This was a popular choice and students were able to discuss the over-mighty argument. The focus of the answer was often clearer and many answers offered a decent 'for and against' argument. Stronger responses were able to discuss the claim over the period and reach judgement over other key issues, some linking factors and including analytical judgement. There was often good context regarding feudalism and also the role of various royals as themselves being major landowners. The strongest responses were able to consistently debate the claim with confident own knowledge to extrapolate understanding and explanation. Narrative accounts were common in this question for weaker candidates and some answered in a story format, describing the differing relationships between monarchs of the period. This meant that knowledge was detailed and accurate, but a number of answers were lacking in explanation and analysis. There was a tendency to substitute "major landowners" for nobles and the main focus was on the House of Percy, Neville and the Earl of Warwick; some focused on overmighty nobles whilst very few were able to highlight the significance of the word "major" when assessing the answer. Some candidates clearly lacked the knowledge to answer across the period for this question and therefore missed vital details such as the warring factions under Henry VI. The counter argument was also weak on a number of these answers. This could have been that monarchs were NOT reliant on landowners and/ or that they were more reliant on another factor to maintain kingship. Timing was an issue for some candidates whereby a few paragraphs were written or insufficient material provided to gain anything beyond Level 2. It is vital that candidates leave enough time for this question.

Plan Retainers ~~Council~~ - statutes against them.
Control of localities under Edward IV - Council of Normandy
No - nobility as advisors
No - relied on tax etc... - E's dubious ways?
No - relied on success = power (Henry V vs Henry VI)

Throughout the period of 1399 - 1509, there is clear evidence of different ways in which kings sought to govern their kingdom effectively. Evidently, major landowners were an important factor but ~~it~~ they were by no means the only one as kings tried to use all their resources effectively.

~~It is~~ It is true that major landowners were

used by the king to govern effectively throughout the period. The main way through which they did this was evidently through cardinals, dukes etc., although this wasn't the only way it meant trusted nobles were put in charge of vast areas of land and thus the king wouldn't have to try to be everywhere at once. An example of this would be Edward IV who controlled localities to a great extent, for example appointing Richard, Duke of Gloucester, a trusted brother to the Council of the North. This shows how he relied on him in order to control the Scots etc. ... and is just one example of major landowners taking some stress off the king so he could govern effectively. Clearly the king's couldn't do everything themselves and in order to keep control they did need to rely on landowners, to maintain control of areas further away, ~~such~~ such as the Scottish border with the ~~French~~ Peries.

Another way in which major landowners helped the king govern successfully was with retainers, which allowed nobles to have their own private armies and which the king could call upon if he needed to go to war. In particular this meant that the support of nobles was even more vital for the king as he needed them to be willing to come to his help if there were ever any rebellions or battles. Thomas Stanley refusing to engage his retinue during the Battle of Bosworth could arguably be one of the reasons Richard III lost

as he needed those extra men in order to support him (he had the control of 4000 of Richard's 12000 men).

Thus, we can see how major landowners not only controlled areas but also ~~manpower~~ ~~which the~~ the manpower that came with it which the king needed.

~~Arguably~~ Arguably, this wasn't necessarily though needed by the king as Henry VII in 1504 passed a statute against retaining ~~men~~ making it illegal unless he approved it. His willingness to end this

practice suggests it wasn't ^{really} needed for effective governance and it actually made the king lose control of areas and allowed 'over-mighty' subjects to emerge such as the Earl of Warwick under Henry VI. For these reasons, it is

evident that ~~up to~~ some kings did rely on major landowners more than others to govern effectively as they not only controlled areas for them but also had the control of manpower in their areas meaning they used ~~manpower~~ ^{that} to help the king out at occasions, therefore meaning the king's safety depended on the nobility's support.

On the other hand you could say the kings didn't always rely on major landowners but sometimes on their own military success to keep power. Military success was significant as it made a monarch credible and made the people trust him and want to support him. This popular support was necessary to limit the number of rebels and issues the king faced internally during his reign. It also

affected his ability to govern effectively primarily because a good military leader could ensure the support of his people and thus could impose his laws more etc. as he had political stability. The benefits of a successful military leader were felt under Henry V, whose extraordinary win against the odds at Agincourt in 1415 gained him people's respect as well as parliament's approval, meaning he was successfully able to get more tax granted for his expedition in Normandy. The link between a military leader ~~is~~ and

effective governance is evident as it allowed the king to get backing and led to ^{less} internal problems. The issues faced by a weak military king were made evident under Henry VI whose military actions left a lot to be desired. A king needed to be strong and conquer to gain his people's support, Henry did neither of these things and the fact that by 1455 he'd lost all lands in France but Calais showed his weaknesses and so lost him credibility + support. For these reasons, it seems that a king's ability to govern the kingdom effectively had to largely be down to his foreign policy and military ability. So, although he needed the nobility, if he himself wasn't right for kingship and wasn't good in war the king would barely lose support and thus the ~~ability~~ ability to effectively govern his country.

~~On top of this the king needed to rely on the control of nobility and the role to ensure~~

On top of this, the king needed to rely on nor

just on major landowners, but also on the nobility in general and on controlling those ^{with a good personality} to govern effectively. His ability to deal with threats to the throne internally and also to keep the nobles on side and avoid rebellion was important as it provided much needed political stability. The king needed to keep the nobility on his side and this required a strong personality or it could cause national issues. Henry IV was unable to control the Neville-Percy feud in 1433 for example due to his mental collapse and before that his weak will and this allowed tensions to develop up to a point where they threatened national stability as some of the most important nobles fought against each other at the first Battle of St Albans in 1455. If the king could not personally control the nobility, therefore, he'd be unable to govern effectively as it would lead to insurrection which'd cause problems nationally.

To conclude, it is evident that the king did rely on major landowners to govern effectively as he could not control the whole country himself. Other factors were also important in the king governing effectively but overall it seems clear that if ~~he didn't have~~ ^{didn't have} the support of major landowners then instability would quickly unfold. It was necessary for the king though to have a strong and able personality to ensure these landowners didn't take advantage of their positions as then again they could pose problems. So clearly major landowners were vital

for effective control but needed a good king to work with.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate has considered both the debate in the question (there is a counterargument) and selected a range of examples from across the period. Key issues are identified and knowledge is evident throughout, underpinning the response. The candidate considers the significance of each issue before reaching a substantiated judgement. This is a Level 5 response.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure you consider your counterargument in your plan. This will ensure that your answer has analysis rather than turning into a narrative account.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both parts of the enquiry
- Candidates should aim to develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the source, not merely paraphrase the content of the source
- Inferences can be supported by reference to contextual knowledge surrounding the issues raised by the source
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/ purpose and authorship of the source by, e.g. looking at and explaining the specific stance and/ or purpose of the writer.

Sections B and C

- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range in Section B and lacked range across the period in Section C
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/ descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues in order to make the structure of the response flow more logically and to enable the integration of analysis.

Grade Boundaries

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

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

