

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <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_30_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was pleasing to see that candidates were able to engage effectively across the ability range in this series of exams with A Level paper 9HI0/30. The structure of the paper has Section A focusing on source analysis and evaluation (AO2), Section B assessing depth of knowledge and understanding through essay responses (AO1), and Section C requiring candidates to demonstrate breadth of understanding across a longer chronological range (AO1).

Across the option, most candidates appeared to manage their time effectively, with the majority completing all three sections. However, a small number of candidates did not complete Section C, which may have impacted their overall performance. A recurring concern noted by examiners was the legibility of handwriting. In some cases, scripts were extremely difficult to decipher, which inevitably limited the credit that could be awarded. Candidates are reminded that examiners can only reward what they can read. Additionally, the use of informal abbreviations such as “gov” for government was noted and should be avoided in formal written responses.

In Section A, the strongest responses demonstrated a clear ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries. These candidates evaluated the source thoroughly, using both contextual knowledge and an understanding of the source’s nature, origin, and purpose. Candidates who understood the political motivations behind Mancini’s account were better able to assess its value. However, a number of candidates either failed to address one of the enquiries or offered only a superficial analysis of provenance. Some responses relied heavily on narrative contextual knowledge with only tangential links to the source, while others failed to use contextual knowledge at all. A significant number of candidates treated the source as neutral or factual without sufficient evaluation. The best responses integrated provenance analysis into their discussion of the source content, rather than treating it as a separate exercise. In both papers, weaker responses often misunderstood the nature of the source or failed to distinguish between fact, opinion, and claim. Some candidates misinterpreted the implications of Edward IV’s will or failed to substantiate their evaluation of Mancini’s reliability.

In Section B, candidates generally demonstrated a good understanding of the second-order concepts being assessed, such as causation, consequence, and significance. Stronger responses were analytical and evaluative, engaging directly with the wording of the question and offering balanced arguments. For example candidates who addressed the term “easily” in the question about Henry IV’s ability to deal with threats were more likely to reach the higher levels. However, some candidates only addressed one side of the argument or failed to engage with the conceptual focus of the question. There were also instances where candidates ignored the chronological parameters of the question or introduced irrelevant material. The best responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the period and used precise evidence to support their arguments. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive or overly reliant on pre-learned material, while stronger answers were characterised by precise contextual knowledge, thoughtful engagement with provenance, and clear evaluative structure.

Section C continues to be the most challenging for many candidates. This section requires a breadth response that covers a period of at least 100 years. To access the ‘fully met’ demand of the mark scheme, candidates must address at least 75% of the chronological range of the question. To access bullet point 2 at 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

However, many responses were limited in their chronological coverage, often focusing on the beginning and end of the period (“bookending”) without sufficient analysis of developments in between. The best responses in this section demonstrated a clear understanding of change and continuity over time and used a wide range of evidence to support their analysis. Candidates are reminded to read the question carefully and to plan their responses to ensure they address the full scope of the question. The most successful responses were those that engaged directly with the conceptual focus of the question and used a thematic approach to structure their argument. Candidates who relied on a purely chronological narrative often struggled to demonstrate the analytical depth required for the higher levels.

Overall, the performance across both papers was encouraging, with many candidates demonstrating a strong grasp of historical knowledge and analytical skills. However, there remains room for improvement in the integration of provenance analysis in Section A, the precision of argument in Section B, and the breadth of coverage in Section C. Centres are encouraged to continue emphasising the importance of careful reading of the question, planning of responses, and the use of precise and relevant evidence. Candidates should be reminded that success depends not only on knowledge but also on the ability to apply that knowledge analytically and evaluatively in response to the specific demands of each question.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1

Most candidates were able to engage with both aspects of the enquiry, drawing inferences about Richard III's character and his acquisition of the throne. Stronger responses developed multiple inferences and supported them with contextual knowledge, particularly regarding the Woodvilles, the princes in the Tower, and Richard's prior role in the North. There was also good understanding of the death of Hastings and the political manoeuvring that led to Richard's usurpation. Some confusion was noted around Buckingham's rebellion, but many candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of Mancini's background, including his limited English and potential bias due to Anglo-French tensions. The best answers integrated provenance analysis into their argument, noting that Mancini may have skewed events for his French audience, while also suggesting that his account reflected contemporary public opinion. Weaker responses tended to summarise the source without interrogating its content or provenance, and some failed to distinguish between fact, opinion, and claim. The most successful candidates substantiated their evaluation of the source's reliability with specific examples and avoided treating provenance as a separate, isolated paragraph.

- 1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the character of Richard III and the manner in which he acquired the throne in 1483.

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

(20)

The character of Richard III is presented by Dominic Mancini in the source as someone who intended to protect young Edward V after his father's untimely death, Edward IV. It is clear that in assessing the character and manner in which Edward Richard III acquired the throne the nature of his reign was a solemn desperation to seek to reinforce power although the source explores it to be a 'sinister rumour' which was yet to be confirmed. Thus, it is important to assess the complications of legitimacy leading up to Richard III's reign which may have created tensions and further implemented the views many had of Richard III's intention in taking the throne. In assessing the extent of conflict within the domestic realm, the nature of the extent of tensions regarding legitimacy and the consequences caused by Edward IV's untimely death, the source is ~~incredibly~~ very much of value when revealing the nuanced nature of kingship and Richard III's justifications for taking the throne, revealing different views of the populace.

briefly, The source from Dominic Mancini reveals the character of Richard III to be an act of ~~salvation~~ selfless intent in order to protect the realm from a possibly disruptive and harmful ~~succession~~ succession of childlike tyranny. "~~Duke of~~ "Richard (I) rushed in with "Richard secretly sent Buckingham to the HOL. There, Buckingham argued that it appeared unjust that Edward V, who was illegitimate, should assume the office of kingship". It is made clear that Dominic Mancini reveals light of the ~~the~~ situation in the domestic realm that Richard III is acting to uphold the lawfulness tied closely with kingship. This is evident through the context of Titulus Regius in 1483 wherein Edward V was officially rendered illegitimate. Therefore the source true of legal justice pedestal Richard III to have acted in an attempt of bringing our realm of the realm had already endured consecutive reigns of instability. Thus, Edward V also taking on the responsibility of being at such a young age: "Buckingham argued that it appeared unjust" reveals to that not only is Richard III showing an ardent commitment to the legality of the realm in order to restore stability but also shows that the manner in which he intends to acquire the throne in 1483 is a matter of last resort. It can therefore be argued that through the various connotations of "unjust" it means mirrors in fact Richard III's loneliness

"to his nephew" as his reign becoming a possibility acted as a mirror of Richard II's reign who had died suddenly after Bolingbroke's usurpation of the crown. Although Rich. However, Although Richard III may be presented to act in the realm's best interest by saving England from another child king but it is also worthy to note the ~~disruptive~~ disruptive nature of ~~his~~ the manner in which he acquired the throne as there was many discussion within the court regarding the urgency to deem Edward V as successor. In the same Dominic Mancini evidently argues that "All who formed the green family voted for this, they who ~~not~~ bore the blame for the Duke of Clarence's death". It is evident to note the context behind Duke of Clarence's death and contribution leading up to the ~~interpretation~~ attitudes towards Richard III's succession as there have been many ~~dis~~ debates among historians regarding the reasons behind Duke of Clarence's death. Thus, the source proves to be of value in revealing the possibility of judicial murder as it can be argued that ~~Pr~~ Duke of Clarence had found out the illegitimacy of Edward V prior to Richard III's succession which the green family had then opted for his death as a barrel of red wine to therefore protect the line of succession due to Edward IV's miscalculation of marrying a peasant, Elizabeth Woodville. Thus, the source also reveals perhaps

The suggestion of Richard III contributing towards the controversial debates of ~~succession~~ legitimacy as the fact that he had sent Buckingham in secret ultimately reveals Richard III's sly nature and cunning character to acquire the throne in 1483 in his benefit by aiding Edward IV in eliminating Clarence as a threat and exposing the truth of debate in court to the lords referring to Edward V as a "Bastard". Thus, although it is evident that Richard III ~~had~~ could be considered as a traitor to Edward IV it is clear that the source does specifically underline Richard III's succession to have been possibly authorised by the words "among whom Richard should be the chief". Although the value of the source may ~~never~~ act as a source of ~~part partial~~ information by endorsing King Louis XV of France showing his commitment towards ~~not~~ Edward IV it is clear that Richard III is displayed with a manner of cunningness when it comes to acquiring the throne which helped to reveal the tensions of legitimacy which existed within the domestic realm.

Additionally, the source may also reveal Richard III's tactical or character when it comes to support and control of the kingdom. Dominic Monaghan ~~underlines~~ mentions that "Richard's arrival in

London, a similar rumour spread that Richard had brought Edward V into his power to gain the crown for himself". This source therefore helps to reveal the nature of London's support which were mostly dominated by Yorkists. Therefore the manner in which Richard III may have ~~acquired~~ acquired the throne could have been a matter of shock to the public ultimately rendering Richard III's as a closed off person with little to no substantial reputation to back him. This is made clearer by his decision to arrive in London which was the center of support for Edward IV which therefore indirectly rendered Richard III as a individual who depended and fed off of Edward IV's reputation rather than having his own physical authority and identity. "Richard had now brought into his keeping the two royal princes [...]. Richard pushed into crime" the regretful tone of the source describing Richard III as a murderer and a character of ~~deceit~~ duplicity ultimately is further entrenched through the emphasis of him "keeping the two royal princes" which may arguably act to reflect the sources advocacy of Edward IV's role and therefore favor Edward V. This furthermore may add not to also reveal and suggest that the manner in which

Richard III acquired his position to the throne in 1483 despite any ~~potential~~ potential best intent to save the nation from a child king had ultimately been undermined as Edward IV's legacy was still very much alive which influenced and effected Richard III's character as that of a worse king than him. Therefore this perception of Richard III's duplicitous nature cannot be ignored as ~~the~~ these reasons mentioned in the source reveals his ~~national~~ his manner of acquiring the throne has effected and caused national discription as Dominic Mancini was an Italian artist working for King Louis XI of France. However, Although it can be argued that the support Richard III managed to hold was Breckingham and the lords which ruled in favour of Edward IV's illegitimacy working in favour for Richard III it is worthy to point out the Breckingham rebellion of 1483 which hindered and effected his support network even further. Thus, The source therefore helps to reveal how desired Richard III is in regards to his character and ~~the~~ the attitudes presented towards him as it is clear that the source helps construct how Richard III's character was perceived and the manner in which he ~~he~~ acquired the throne was viewed as

Edward IV's supporters still existed making it harder for the Richard III to display any other side of his character or intent.

To ~~conclude~~, ~~the~~ The source helps reveal ~~the~~ the multifaceted nature of the attitudes that the population garnered towards Richard III character as it is clear that many supporters of Edward IV and the nobility had gone against the manner in which Richard III ~~regal~~ acquired the throne. This therefore reveals the nature of conflict and tensions within the realm and the struggle of governance to accept Richard III's character as new king.



High-level responses integrate contextual knowledge seamlessly into their analysis. Rather than listing facts, candidates use knowledge to interrogate the source or weigh up the significance of different factors. This is especially evident in this Level 5 response where contextual knowledge is used to test the reliability or weight of the source.



Use contextual knowledge to support inferences and evaluation. Consider the provenance and purpose of the source within the analysis, not as a separate paragraph.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered, with most candidates demonstrating detailed knowledge of the rebellions Henry IV faced, including the Epiphany Rising, Glyndŵr's revolt, and the Percy rebellion. Some also referenced Scrope's rebellion and foreign challenges from Scotland and France. Stronger responses engaged directly with the word 'easily', evaluating the extent to which Henry's hold on the throne was secure. These responses often considered the impact of Henry's usurpation, financial difficulties, and diplomatic efforts. A few candidates misread the question or ignored the date range, discussing Henry VI instead, which limited their marks. The best answers established clear criteria for what constituted ease in maintaining power and used this to assess the seriousness of each threat. They also explored how Henry's legitimacy and relationship with Parliament influenced his ability to respond to challenges. Overall many candidates demonstrated both breadth and depth of understanding, which was pleasing to read.

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 2 ☒ Question 3 ☐

It is highly accurate to state that Henry IV easily maintained his hold on the throne in the years 1399-1405, due to successful crushing of rebellions, foreign policy and his support from Parliament and the nobility in England. Despite facing threat throughout his reign, Henry IV was successful in taking action and defeating any enemies, while building strong alliances both inside and outside of England.

It is highly accurate to state that Henry IV easily maintained his hold on the throne in the years 1399-1405, due to his successful foreign policy. For example, Henry IV used many acts of diplomacy in order to reinforce his stability in England, due to a feeling of vulnerability after usurping Richard II. Henry IV used The Order of The Garter in order to build strong alliances with other foreign powers, successfully maintaining his hold on the throne by inviting significant monarchs to a special group of allies. This was significant because this allowed Henry IV to feel more secure from invasions due to building good relationships with powerful countries. It could also be argued that if Henry was to face significant threats of invasion, he would receive money and soldiers from his

allies, without having to pay the expenses of a treaty. Another example of successful foreign diplomacy was the marriage of his daughters to powerful countries, some involved in his successful alliance of The Order of The Garter. For example, his eldest daughter Blanche was married to the King of Norway, significantly strengthening Henry's stability in England from the threat of invasion due to the support from a significant power. This maintain of his hold on the throne was increased by the marriage of his other daughter to the King of the Romans. This was further a reinforcement of Henry's alliances and stability in England due to his daughter's marriage to the son of the Holy Roman Emperor. These marriages evidently reinforced the lengths of support received by Henry, further establishing his regime and allowing him to successfully maintain his hold onto the throne. Overall, Henry's actions in foreign policy and diplomacy were successful in helping him to ~~achieve the stability to~~ reinforce his Lancastrian dynasty, evidently demonstrating it as a significant reason for his maintain of the crown.

It is highly accurate to state that Henry IV maintained his hold on the throne in the years 1399-~~1400~~ 1405, due to his successful crushing of rebellions. For example, when faced by threat from the Earl of Northumberland, Henry Percy, Henry IV was able to successfully destroy the magnate during battle.

This is because Henry's confident attributes as a warrior and brave leadership allowed him to crush Henry Percy in the Battle of Shrewsbury, maintaining his control of England by demonstrating his powerful and kingly ability to rise up against threat. This was significant in order to set a precedent of his power and could be argued as a display of his support from God, successfully reinstating his support and stabilising his power in England. Another example of his crush of rebellion ~~was the~~ is the Scrope Rebellion, in which Henry faced threat from 3 of his enemies. The reason why Henry faced this rebellion was an attempt to change the state of monarchy and replace England with 3 rulers, splitting into 3. The tripartite agreement between Henry's enemies built threat towards the monarch's regime, however, Henry effectively crushed the rebellion. His notable action was his execution of Archbishop Scrope, seen as a mistake by some, but arguably a statement of his power and a successful way to evoke fear into rebels. This is proved by the fact that Henry did not face another rebellion after this, highlighting his skill in battle and ruthless executions to limit rebel threat and easily maintain his hold on the throne within 1399-1405. Finally, Henry was able to reinstate his significance through the crush of rebellions, effectively stamping out threat towards his Lancastrian dynasty. However, The Glyndwr Rebellion was difficult for Henry to crush as a result of Guerilla tactics used by the Welsh rebels,

arguably a reason why Henry could not stop it effectively in one battle. Overall, Henry's crush of rebellions notably maintained his hold on the throne more significantly than his foreign policy, however Henry still faced large threat from these rebellions. It was Henry's ability to crush rebels which reinforced his power and maintained his hold on the throne.

It is somewhat accurate to state that Henry IV easily maintained his hold on the throne in the years 1399-1405 due to his support ~~from parliament and nobility~~ from parliament and nobility in England. For example, many of the people under the rule of Richard II before his deposition believed him to be a tyrannical monarch and despised his reign. This is evident in his use of blank charters, forced loans and gear through the Cheshire Guard, his group of loyal retainers. This built a strong sense of anti-Richard sentiment in England even after Henry usurped the king, allowing Henry to receive mass amounts of support from both the nobility, parliament and regular people. This is significant because this support gave Henry IV the ability to maintain his throne and not feel overly pressured or threatened as a usurper. When facing the Epiphany Rising, Henry faced the group of magnates still loyal to Richard II, regarded as the counter Appellant. Despite their threat placed onto Henry by rebelling, the rebels received little to no help from other nobles, allowing Henry to not be overly threatened by the

attempt to replace him as king. This is reinforced by the fact that the uprising was successfully crushed by townsfolk who did not want Richard's tyranny to be reinstated in England. This highlights Henry's loyal support to be an effective factor in the maintain of his hold onto the throne, within the years 1399-1405. Another example of support from nobility is the successful support given by Prince Henry, saving ~~enemies~~ rebels in battle in order to reinstate Henry IV as secure in his reign. This is evident in Glyndwr's rebellion, in which Prince Henry fought and defeated 2 Welsh armies as leader of British forces. This notably allowed Henry IV to survive in England, successfully reinforcing his maintain of hold on the throne within 1399-1405. Overall, it could be argued that nobility played a larger role as rebels and threat towards Henry, for example, The Counter Appellant, Percy family and Mortimer family. This means that the support from nobility does not outweigh the threat caused by 'over-mighty subjects', regarding Henry's crush of rebellions as a more significant factor in his hold onto the throne.

In conclusion, it is highly accurate to state that Henry IV easily maintained his hold on the throne in the years 1399-1405, regarding his crush of rebellions as the most significant reason why. This is because of Henry's skill and confidence built through his battles, in which he maintained his control of England successfully.



Level 5 essays do not just list factors—they compare them. Candidates weigh the relative importance of different causes, consequences, or turning points, and explain why one is more significant than another. This comparative approach is sustained throughout the essay, not just in the conclusion. This level 5 response consistently maintains a clear analytical line of argument throughout the essay. The candidate demonstrates a deep understanding of the question and avoids drifting into narrative or descriptive writing.



Plan essays to ensure a structured and analytical approach. Be chronologically precise—know key dates and events.

Question 3

Candidates generally understood the focus of this question and were able to assess the threat posed by the Yorkshire and Cornish rebellions. Stronger responses established criteria for what constituted a serious or limited threat and applied these to each rebellion. Most candidates discussed the taxation grievances and the level of noble support, though only the best linked these factors to the overall scale of threat. Some candidates confused the two rebellions or narrated events without evaluating their significance. A few responses compared these rebellions to other threats faced by Henry VII, which detracted from the question's focus. Knowledge of the Cornish rebellion's connection to Warbeck was limited, and few candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the events surrounding it. The most effective answers analysed the rebels' aims, geographical limitations, and lack of elite support to argue that the threats were indeed limited. These responses also considered the broader context of Henry's consolidation of power and his response to internal dissent.

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 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒

Whilst both the 1489 Yorkshire Tax rebellion and the 1497 Cornish Tax rebellion did certainly destabilise law and order during Henry VII's rule, they did not challenge or threaten his position as King because they were limited in their aims, support and impacts. Unlike more serious threats of Warbeck's challenge and the Simnel conspiracy, these tax rebellions were more significant to reveal popular discontent and were mainly limited by a lack of noble involvement.

Both rebellions were fairly limited in the nature and scale of the support they received, with ^{significant} no noble contributions to the revolts.

In the 1489 Yorkshire tax rebellion, it began with ~~a~~ a violent outburst from an angry mob of commoners who were later led by Egremont (a disaffected Percy) who provided no ~~ret~~ retinue support. Since the issue of

taxation was confined to the North for this particular issue of defence of Brittany, the rebellion was not on a national scale.

Further, the rebels were easily suppressed by royal forces and the support of ~~support~~^{noble} retainers.

Therefore, the support was on a relatively limited local scale and lacked the involvement of powerful magnates that could have escalated this as a threat to Henry VII's rule. Similarly, the 1497 Cornish tax rebellion was also on a local scale, and saw no noble contribution.

The initial stages of the rebellion were led by two commoners, Joseph and Flamark, and whilst they did gain support from Lord Audley and 24 other gentlemen as they marched to Blackheath, this still was not on a scale that seriously

threatened Henry VII. However, the rebellion did continue after rebel executions at Blackheath as Warbeck joined them in September in an attempt to invade England. Warbeck's rise to prominence through his connection to Margaret of Burgundy, Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian and through his recent marriage to Lady Katherine Gordon in 1496 meant that his involvement in the Cornish rebellion brought significant support

attempted in September. The invasion of Kent ~~in~~ saw c.8,000 Irish supporters joining with Wabech, adding to the scale and threat of the Cornish rebellion. However, this support was ultimately not on a scale that could not be defeated by Henry VII. The Irish men were largely inexperienced and poorly ~~to~~ equipped and so the rebellion was crushed by royal forces. Therefore, in regard to scale and support the rebellions were largely regional and so more easily suppressed, despite the foreign interference that made the Cornish revolt ^{slightly} more significant by September.

Both the Yorkshire and Cornish tax rebellions were also fairly limited in their aims, or had unclear aims that whilst did serve to destabilise England, ultimately never threatened Henry VII's hold on the throne. The Yorkshire tax rebellion was sparked because the tax imposed broke the custom that Northern areas were typically exempt from other taxes like this 'one tenth' tax because they paid separately to defend the Scottish border. Therefore, the rebellion was more of an expression of discontent rather

than a more serious aim to undermine Henry's rule such as the Simnel and Warbeck pretenders who posed a dynastic challenge. In the Cornish rebellion, it was a similar reaction to a tax for the Northern border defence that felt distant to Southern regions. Further, this also reflected discontent with Henry VII's reputation for avarice and greed that undermined popular support for his rule. However, as Warbeck joined the rebellion in September the aims became more unclear as perhaps it seemed to generally disrupt Henry's control of law and order or to highlight Warbeck as a rival claimant to the throne (as he pretended to be Richard of York).

Despite this, the aims or ^{direct} causes of both rebellions can be described as posing a 'limited' threat as Henry's hold on the throne was not challenged by aversion to tax alone.

Both rebellions can also be evaluated in terms of threat to Henry's rule by examining the impacts of the ~~the~~ dissent, as ~~neither~~ both ~~to~~ ~~had~~ ~~to~~ had some longer term implications although these were not overly significant in terms of Henry's rule as a whole. The Yorkist Tax rebellion

involved Henry Percy being lynched by an angry mob at Topcliffe, meaning his position as an important noble for retaining law and order and his role defending the Northern border was de-stabilized. Furthermore, Henry VII made sure not to request taxation that broke custom again and he lost out on the revenue in 1489. However, the financial impacts are limited because royal income rose under Henry's reign since he gained 25k from crown lands alone since he had absorbed many of Richard III's lands upon his ascension to the throne. Therefore, the rebellion was short lived and posed relatively few significant impacts as most of the rebel leaders (except Egremont) were executed by Surrey and the King's men. Similarly, the Cornish tax rebellion also had limited long term impacts, although it demonstrated unpopularity for Henry VII. ~~The~~ In 1497 Wabeck was finally captured and arrested after 6 years of interference and so was forced to confess his real identity and toured around England to demonstrate Henry VII's strength and ^{the} defeat of Wabeck. Despite the swift end to the Cornish rebellion itself, it had coincided with James IV and Wabeck's invasion of partially

England and therefore created a drain on Henry VII's financial resources. However, ultimately the effects of both rebellions was limited because Henry VII successfully maintained his hold on the throne until a natural death in 1509.

Overall, whilst the Cornish rebellion arguably posed a larger threat to Henry than the Yorkshire tax rebellion due to wider support and the timing coinciding with Wakefield's ongoing challenge, neither rebellion actually challenged Henry VII's hold on the throne. This is because the aims, scale and nature of support and the longer term implications were all fairly limited to a local level with no noble intervention that could have escalated the threat. Therefore, whilst the rebels certainly destabilized law and order in England, Henry's reign and hold on the throne was largely unaffected.



Level 5 candidates engage directly with the wording of the question. They avoid generic responses and tailor their analysis to the specific demands of the enquiry or essay. This includes addressing both parts of a two-part question. Conclusions in Level 5 responses are not just summaries—they are evaluative. Candidates revisit their criteria, weigh up the evidence, and offer a nuanced judgement that reflects the complexity of the issue. These conclusions are clearly linked to the analysis that precedes them.



Compare factors throughout the essay, not just in the conclusion. Establish and use criteria for judgement to drive evaluation.

Question 4

This was the more popular of the two breadth questions, and most candidates were able to provide evidence both supporting and challenging the idea that the nobility hindered royal control. While many responses were structured chronologically, thematic approaches often yielded stronger analysis. These responses examined noble-led rebellions, local disorder, regional governance, and the provision of troops. Stronger answers defined what effective control entailed and evaluated the nobility's role accordingly. Some candidates misunderstood the question, focusing instead on how the nobility attempted to control the monarchy. The best responses highlighted both the disruptive potential of overmighty subjects and the stabilising role of loyal nobles, such as Gloucester and Hastings. They also considered how monarchs like Henry VII curbed noble power through legislation and patronage. Weaker responses lacked evaluation and tended to assert rather than argue. Overall, the strongest answers demonstrated a nuanced understanding of the complex relationship between the crown and the nobility across the period.

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 4 ☒ Question 5 ☒

Throughout the years 1406-1509, the nobility can be seen to both challenge alongside ~~see~~ enhance the crown's ~~control~~ effective control over the kingdom.

In the case of overmighty nobles, the crown's efforts of control can be seen to be challenged since their disloyalty consequently caused ~~there~~ chaos across the ~~rest of~~ realm.

Yet, ultimately, through their role in retaining alongside their authority and influence in government, overall, the nobility did not challenge the efforts of the crown to control the kingdom, instead supporting it.

The nobility can be deemed as a challenge to the efforts of the crown to control the kingdom effectively as factionalism within court intensified local rivalries.

Initially seen ~~with~~ under Henry VI with York's protectorate in 1453 following Henry's mental collapse allowing an increase in the power of York's ~~nearest~~ ally, Warwick. This subsequently intensified the Percy vs Neville dispute in the North due to the changing nature of each noble's power. With 710 Percys named in the fight that ensued Maud Stanhope's wedding in ~~1543~~ 1454, the nobility can be seen to undermine ~~the~~ the crown's

effort in controlling the kingdom as they intensified local disorder making it harder for the crown to maintain control. Similarly, the turmoil caused due to Warwick's later rebellion in 1469 not only prevented the crown from controlling the country effectively due to constant a constant state of war alongside a lack of direct leadership, but also intensified local disputes concerning the patron. In the duke of Norfolk seizing this opportunity to besiege Caister ~~at the~~ castle, alongside the duke of Suffolk besieging the patron ~~manor~~ manor of Drayton and Hellidon, the political turmoil due to overmighty nobles is ~~clearly~~ reflected within local affairs. This evidently was the result of a lack of crown control across the kingdom as law and order broke down across the realm. Yet, specifically in the case of York and Warwick's growing ambitions under ~~Henry~~ Henry VI, this can be seen as a repercussion of an already fragile crown control due to the weak nature of Henry VI as a monarch thus ~~confirming~~ implying that it was not nobility that caused this ~~break~~ breakdown in crown control but rather the strength of the monarch himself.

On the other hand, nobility can be seen to support the crown's effort to control the kingdom.

Effectively through their role in retaining. With a move from land to cash payments ~~was~~ seen under Barstard Feudalism, affinities loyalty to ~~not~~ the nobility increased in importance. This subsequent enhancement to the crown's control due to retaining can be witnessed under Henry V's French campaigns. ^{Since his} ~~the first~~ initial expedition to France consisted of an army of approx 10,000 men gathered from nobilities retinues, this size of an army can be ~~be~~ considered greatly influential to his success in Agincourt in 1415 alongside his capture of Rouen in 1419. Although this does not directly affect the crown's control at home, it ~~so~~ consequently strengthened the position of the monarch thus allowing greater control of the kingdom at home due to enhanced ~~of~~ respect for Henry V; it created content amongst the public thus allowing for smooth control. This importance of retinues can be seen in the 1475 and 1492 conquests to France. With these resulting in the treaty of Picquigny and treaty of Etaples providing the monarch with £10,000 pension and £175,000 correspondingly, this enhanced the crown's control of the kingdom. This is due to the increased financial stability of the monarch meaning the lack of need to ~~expropriate~~ take taxation from the public thus creating further content within the realm. These affinities were also called upon to subdue ~~between~~ internal opposition as seen in the response to the tax rebellion of 1489 and

1497. Therefore, in this way, the nobility can be seen to actually augment the crown control as the importance of retaining in regard to creating content at home alongside subduing opposition at home ~~was~~ allowed for increased crown ~~control~~ control. Since these affiliates were loyal to ~~the~~ the noblemen, their support is evidently essential in order for these ~~new~~ affiliates to be used ~~in the~~ for the crown's best interests. Therefore, it is clear that the nobility actually ^{supported} ~~supported~~ ~~only~~ crown control.

Furthermore, the nobility did not challenge the crown's effective control of the kingdom since their power and influence could be utilised through regional ^{or} councils. With Edward IV developing ^{or} 105 regional councils, each headed by various members of the nobility, the nobility's importance in ~~maintaining~~ maintaining control on a local level is perceived. Seen within the appointment of Richard, duke of Gloucester, as leader of the council of the North in the 1470's, this use of the nobility evidently increased crown control. This is particularly ~~seen~~ seen within this example as it had previously proved difficult to maintain control of the North ~~since~~ since it was situated so far from London. With Gloucester heading the Northern council, it was much easier for the crown to both ~~control~~ control

and be aware of events in the North. Furthermore, the power of the nobility is accentuated through the reversal of attainders actually benefitting the monarch. This is seen under Henry VII reversing the attainder that ~~had~~ had been placed upon Thomas Howard in 1489, meaning that Howard was then indebted to Henry VII further helping Henry swiftly subdue to ~~York~~ ~~the~~ Yorkshire tax rebellion later that year in 1489. In this way, the nobility's influence was crucial to the crown's control as it was with the support of the nobility that monarchs were able to quell internal opposition alongside coordinate control from a central base in London.

Thus, to conclude, it is clear that the nobility did not challenge the efforts of the crown to control the kingdom effectively throughout the years 1406-1509, ~~since~~ instead supporting this control. This support culminated in the role of ~~regiments~~ retainers which were loyal to the nobility alongside the nobility's power and influence present within regional councils and suppressing rebellion. Although ~~the~~ the nobility could sometimes be a curb to this crown control in the case of overmighty subjects such as Warwick and York, this ~~is~~ ultimately stemmed from the weak nature of the monarch. Since crown control was already crumbling

under Henry VI it can be argued that the rebellions of these members of the nobility actually created a greater crown control as a consequence since their aftermath created a greater leadership capability; this monarchic authority ^{was} reflected within crown control. ~~in that way the nobility saw~~ Instead, the nobility enhanced a monarch's power through military success alongside control over the localities, thus creating this 'effective' control since it meant that the crown was better coordinated across the realm. This efficient control that was established with the help of the nobility therefore legitimised that the nobility did not challenge the efforts of the crown to control the kingdom effectively in the years 1406-1509, instead ~~propped they~~ they propped up this crown control.



High-level answers are clearly planned. Introductions outline the approach and criteria, and the structure follows logically. In Section C, for example, candidates often organise their essays chronologically or thematically, ensuring full coverage and a coherent argument. To reach Level 5 in breadth questions, candidates must cover at least 75% of the time period specified. Strong responses avoid 'bookending' the period and instead provide a well-distributed analysis across the full range. They also avoid clustering evidence in one era and demonstrate understanding of long-term developments.



Be chronologically precise—know key dates and events. In Section C, cover the full chronological range (at least 75%) to access higher levels.

Question 5

This question was less popular and produced a wide range of responses. Many candidates struggled with the definition of 'retaining', with some interpreting it as the monarch retaining power rather than the practice of nobles maintaining private armies. Most responses discussed the statutes against retaining under Edward IV and Henry VII, and some noted the use of retainers in rebellions and as a source of military support. However, few candidates directly addressed the question of whether the role of retaining as a prop to royal power remained unchanged. Stronger responses traced the evolution of retaining practices and evaluated their impact on royal authority. These answers considered how retaining could both support and undermine the crown, depending on the monarch's ability to control it. The best responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept and used a range of examples across the period to support their argument. Weaker responses tended to generalise or focus solely on whether retaining was helpful or harmful, without addressing the issue of continuity.

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 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Retainering was the act of Nobles having their own private ^{armies} ~~army~~, often based off of their land or just paying them to be apart of ^{their} ~~your~~ army. The importance of retainering peaked in the 1450s and 1460s due to the woss of the rose, at this point retainering was a carb on the royal power, though the role of retainers as a prop to royal power did change in the years 1399 - 1509. To assess this it will be judged by the criteria of helping with extend woss and internal woss and then addressing the introduction of the status of retainering and how this greatly retainers.

First retainering woss consistently used in the year foreign woss across the period. First Henry IV had no foreign endeavors as woss being serving the internal threat due to usurping the throne. However up until

1402 relations with Scotland were uneasy
therefore Henry Hotspur's claims were
incredibly useful as the peers supplied
Henry with a large army to use that
was already poised well to deal
against the Scots. & Henry V's
policies and his endeavours in
France included many nobles
retainers, notably the Duke of
Gloucester and Clarence and the
earl of Warwick all had
separate armies in France,
allowing for more land to be
conquered. In the early years of Henry
VI Somerset and York both led
armies in France. Therefore it is
clear that retainers were consistently
useful ~~on~~ ~~with~~ when it came to
dealing with foreign wars. However
after 1453 there were no ~~more~~ more
war between countries, and from
Scotland which the peers consistently
defended the borders of. Most of the
kings were too preoccupied internally
to turn towards ~~per~~ attacks
against other countries. Therefore

retaining for a long time was only really beneficial for the first half of the century.

Secondly, retaining could be beneficial or detrimental when it came to internal wars. Again, Henry IV utilised Henry Halper and his retainers as well as other nobles to defend the Welsh border against Owen Glyndwr. In the 1450s, however, it got more complicated. The death in government meant some ~~of~~ retainers for example the Duke of Somerset of the earl of Northumberland were beneficial to the king. However others were equally more detrimental. The Duke of York and Earl of Warwick, ~~so~~ both overnight nobles with ^{huge} ~~large~~ retainers, especially after Warwick was named captain of Calais, actually damaged the crown and it resulted in the removal of Henry VI as king. Edward IV was then displaced twice by the earl of Warwick and Edward IV only

6 months later despoiled Norwich.
Though the constant changing of power
was undeniable, a huge negative
for the crown and this was possible
because of retaining, these retainers
could either be a pro or a con
however ultimately if a noble can have
enough power that they can depose
the king then it is a coup & the
crown. This occurred across the whole
period, Henry IV gained his throne
from rebelling and utilizing the retainers
of nobles, despite himself not having
one due to exile. The last king of
the century Henry VI also utilized retainers
as he gained the throne by winning
the battle of Tewkesbury. The switch in
sides of the Stanley Brothers during the
battle highlights how retaining was
not a positive for the crown as
retainers could just as quickly aid
the king as they could kill him.
The lack of control the kings had over
retaining meant they had to manage
problems. Overall it is clear that
although retainers were used to help the

crown fought internal ~~was~~ ^{years} they were also used to fight the crown. Therefore across the whole period the role of retaining was not a prop to royal power.

Finally, the introduction of statutes against retaining show how retaining was a prop in the second half of the century as even the crown recognised the need for it to be controlled. The first statute was introduced in 1468 and it made retaining for military purposes illegal. In 1487 this law was revised as it had allowed a lord to claim as many men as they wanted for domestic service to get around it. So in 1487 the word retaining was revised and a maximum was added. In 1504 the new law was introduced $\Rightarrow$ retaining now required a licence and if given below the law there was a fine of £5 a month. Lord Berghery below the law and received a fine.

of £7000. The introduction of the laws did help control the nobility especially the 1304 law. It stopped overnight nobles like the earl of Cornwall as that was when retaining was on the rise. The king allowed Henry III to keep an eye on nobles and prevent them from getting too powerful however still allowed retaining so they could be used by him. The laws were explicit and allowed retaining to be used as a prop for the king rather than a carb. In the early years retaining wasn't such a problem, it was used more benevolently than negatively. However the exploitation of the retainers during the wars of the roses meant they were no longer a prop to the crown, leading to the introduction of the statutes against retaining. Overall this means that the introduction of the statutes against retaining show that the purposes of retainers for the crown changed across the period so

were released in the middle of the century.

Overall retainers were a prop for external wars however only really the first half of the century due to the lack of foreign endeavors after 1453. Therefore the use of retainers as a prop did change in this aspect. Secondly the use of retainers to fight internal wars was consistent however the internal wars were only caused by the presence of retainers, so overall this retainers was a negative to the crown especially in 1450s-60s where the use of retainers caused multiple kings to be deposed. Finally the presence of the statute against retainers show acknowledgement by the crown that retainers were not benefiting them and needed to be controlled. As they were effective it did mean that retainers were more beneficial at the end of the period. Therefore it is clear that the role of retainers as a prop to royal power was not consistent across the period, 1399-1509.



Strong responses covers at least 75% of the chronological range specified in the question. The candidate demonstrates a clear understanding of long-term developments and avoids clustering evidence in one time period. This Level 5 essay is well-structured, often organized chronologically or thematically, with each paragraph contributing to the overall judgement. High level candidates establish and apply clear criteria for judgement throughout the essay. They compare turning points or developments across the period, weighing their relative significance.



Compare factors throughout the essay, not just in the conclusion. Plan essays to ensure a structured and analytical approach.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Read the question carefully to ensure both enquiries are addressed.
- Go beyond comprehension and summary by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed.
- Read the caption and make full use of it when evaluating the source.
- Use relevant contextual knowledge to support inferences and evaluation. It is not the quantity of contextual knowledge that is key, but the use to which it is put.
- Integrate analysis of provenance into the discussion of the source content, rather than treating it as a separate paragraph.
- Avoid generic comments about reliability and instead consider the specific nature, origin, and purpose of the source in context.
- Distinguish clearly between fact, opinion, and claim when evaluating the source.

Sections B and C

- Plan essays to develop an analytical approach.
- Read the question carefully to ensure the response addresses both the focus and the chronological parameters.
- Avoid a narrative or descriptive approach; this often undermines the analysis required for the higher levels.
- Ensure that Section C responses range across at least 75% of the chronology to access the higher levels.
- Engage directly with the wording of the question and ensure that arguments are evaluative and balanced.
- Use precise and relevant evidence to support arguments and avoid introducing irrelevant material.
- Consider using a thematic structure in Section C to demonstrate change and continuity more effectively.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
link:<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-bo>

