

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE History 9HI0 31

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_31_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Candidates across the ability range continue to be able to engage effectively with A Level Paper 31 which deals with Rebellion and Disorder under the Tudors, 1485-1603.

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, although a very small number did not complete their response to Section C. There continues to be an increase, year on year, in the number of scripts that posed problems for examiners because of the legibility of handwriting; some scripts were almost entirely indecipherable. Centres are reminded again that examiners are only able to give credit for what they can read. There continues to be some evidence this summer of a number of candidates abbreviating words that should not be abbreviated in formal written English, e.g. the use of gov instead of government or HVII for Henry VII. This is not a development that is welcomed though it has been less noticeable this year.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries 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. Some candidates continue to use their contextual knowledge to describe events, sometimes with only tangential links to what is in the source, in great detail, rather than using it to illuminate and to discuss the sources. This sometimes resulted in candidates not dealing with the source adequately. In other cases, candidates might offer up no contextual knowledge to support their arguments and analysis. It is disappointing to note that a number of candidates did not explicitly address the focus of at least one of the enquiries or that candidates overlooked some element of the question. Some responses were seen where candidates dismissed one of the enquiries as having no material available for it. This will never be the case - both enquiries always have some relevant material, even though it is not necessarily always balanced.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question and shaped their responses appropriately to meet the demands of the question. It continues to be the case that a number of responses were seen that had a tendency to only deal with one side of an argument; some of these were very impressive in dealing with that one side, showing the links between the issues that were raised, but it is essential that candidates acknowledge the existence of a counter argument, where appropriate. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology. Equally, the evidence that is presented should come from within the timeframe of the chronology of the question.

In Section C, most candidates were able to engage with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. This is a breadth question and the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded again that this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at 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. 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 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.

Question 1

There were again responses across the ability range to this question with many very good responses. The stronger answers drew inferences from the source to address both enquiries and developed them using a range of precise contextual knowledge, though most were more comfortable with addressing the first enquiry with regards to the measures Henry VII took to secure his throne. Therefore, for example, most candidates made reference to Henry's early marriage to Elizabeth of York and his appointment of a Council and many also identified Henry's rewarding of his allies as another key issue, adding some impressive knowledge with regard to the limits he placed upon himself as far as the latter was concerned. With regard to the strength of the Yorkist opposition, a variety of constructions were placed on the evidence of the source, with some arguing that it amounted to nothing and was dismissed with skill, while others, aware of the later challenges of Simnel and Warbeck, argued that it remained considerable. As far as the provenance of the source was concerned, there was frequently a good discussion of the uses and limitations of Vergil's evidence, with many focusing on his absence from England at the time of the events he is describing and having been encouraged to write his account by Henry himself.

Weaker answers often lacked precise knowledge of the period beyond what was in the source, and mined it for information rather than developing inferences from it. On occasion, a great deal of general background information was added, without being linked precisely to the source material. In attempting to evaluate the source's use to the enquiries, some responses often fell back on stereotypical assumptions about Vergil being a priest and/or his nationality. A significant minority of candidates did not address the utility of the source at all, which would have cost a number of marks.

- 1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the measures Henry VII took to secure his throne following the Battle of Bosworth and the extent of the threat still posed to his dynasty by Yorkist opponents in the years 1485–86.

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

(20)

This source can be considered quite useful for revealing the measures Henry VII took to secure his throne and the extent of Yorkist threats after the Battle of Bosworth. When assessed in alignment of own knowledge, and taking the source's provenance into consideration, it can be argued that the source is somewhat valuable; however, its origins may limit its utility when considering the source's reliability, and render the source more valuable for the first enquiry than the second. //

Firstly, the provenance of the source must be considered. Polydore Vergil was a well-known historian of the contemporary period; however, did not live in England until 1502, a considerably later than the Battle of Bosworth and its aftermath. Although Vergil often used first-hand accounts to write the *Anglica Historia*, it is important to consider that many of these accounts would have been from supporters of Henry VII, as the initial Yorkist threat had been dealt with following Henry's coronation. Furthermore, Henry VII encouraged Vergil to write his history of England; while Vergil was an accurate historian, this may have inclined him to write more favourably of Henry VII; therefore, this source is

potentially limited in value by its origins, due to influences over the author and the time in which it was written.

The source is valuable, however, for insights into the measures taken by Henry VII to secure his throne. Vergil explains how Henry VII "wed King Edward's daughter, Elizabeth" and united Lancaster and York "into a single house". Elizabeth of York was the daughter of Edward III and cousin to Richard III; Henry VII married her in order to appease the anti-Ricardian Yorkists who had supported him, creating the Tudor ~~the~~ rose as a symbol of connecting the two Houses, ^(minimising Yorkist discontent). Furthermore, the source explains how the king "rewarded his friends"; such as granting Jasper Tudor the title of Duke of Bedford, and making John Morton ^{the} Archbishop of Canterbury. As well as rewarding allies, Henry VII seized lands ^{those of} from opponents through Acts of Attainder, such as Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk, which the source does not mention; perhaps to keep Henry VII's victory in a positive tone, due to his influence over Vergil's writing. Finally, the source mentions Henry VII's decision "to visit the remaining parts of his realm": a royal progress beginning in 1485, particularly to the North as a Yorkist power base, as a display of military strength and royal grandeur. As a 'usurper' who spent a large portion of his early life in France, Henry VII used the progress so the commons and Yorkists could see both him and his power: helping to consolidate his position. Ultimately, the source is very useful for revealing the measures taken by Henry VII to secure his throne in

1485-86, due to its range of content and ~~very~~ accurate information; however, may be considered limited due to its exclusion of certain events, possibly influenced by the source's origins.

On the other hand, the source is less valuable for an insight into the extent of Yorkist threats to the Tudor Dynasty following the Battle of Bosworth. The source does refer to "~~the~~ Richard's supporters, Lord Lovell and Humphrey Stafford", who were "stirring up treason", who, alongside Thomas Stafford (Sir Humphrey Stafford's younger brother) and John de la Pole, Earl of Lincoln, attempted an uprising shortly after the Battle of Bosworth, however explains how Francis Lord Lovell, "either not trusting in himself or terrified" had secretly left his army in the night", and "all his followers quickly begged for pardon". Although briefly mentioned, there is little detail surrounding the Yorkist threat and its extent; furthermore, the tone of the source is evidently anti-Yorkist, referring to Henry VII as having "saved the kingdom from tyranny" and that "everyone rejoiced" - a statement contradicted by the attempted rising of Lord Lovell and the Staffords*. Vergil's diminishing of the Yorkist threat and pro-Tudor writing - influenced by the sources available to him, having not been in England at the time, and Henry VII's encouragement of his writing ultimately limits the value of the source when considering the extent of Yorkist threats following Bosworth, due to a lack of information and ~~the~~ pro-Tudor influences.

In conclusion, the source is more useful for revealing measures taken by Henry VII to secure his throne in 1485-86 than it is for revealing the extent of Yorkist threats following the Battle of Bosworth, due to both the ~~errors~~ range and historical accuracy of information, as well as the influence of the source's provenance; which limits the value for both enquiries, though the second in particular.

* dismissed as 'terrified' or simply 'stirring up treason' rather than an actual threat to Henry VII.



Here, the candidate analyses the source material, demonstrating a sense of interrogation of the evidence provided. This can be seen where they evidence how the source can be used to illustrate a number of ways in which Henry secured his throne after the Battle of Bosworth. Here, in addition, contextual knowledge is used to illuminate what can be gained from the evidence of the source, with respect to the significance of Henry making a progress to the North and making 'a display of military strength and royal grandeur' in areas hostile to his rule. There is some unevenness between the candidate's use of the source for the two enquiries, however, with there being less attention to Enquiry 2. The candidate makes a series of valid comments on the weight of Vergil's evidence to the enquiry, reasoning that he took his evidence from supporters of Henry VII, and that he was likely inclined to write favourably of the King. They conclude that the source is therefore 'potentially limited in its value by its origins... influences over the author and the time in which it was written.' Such a view is applied to the evidence of the source later in the answer, where it is noted that the claim that 'everyone rejoiced' at Henry's victory is contradicted by Lovell and Stafford's rebellion. It can be noted that the candidate also distinguishes the degree of certainty with which aspects of the source can be used as the basis for claims. Overall, this answer received a low L5 mark.

Question 2

This was the less popular question in Section B. Many candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding of crushing of Kett's rebellion to access Levels 4 and 5. The best responses were aware of a range of reasons for Warwick's success, for example his previous military experience, the presence in his army of skilled mercenaries and the merciful way in which he handled the aftermath of Dussindale. Against this, many candidates raised the military ineptitude of Kett's peasant army and Kett's error in abandoning Mousehold Heath. The stronger answers also took into consideration the lack of noble or gentry support for the rebels, also its geographical isolation and lack of support more widely.

In general, weaker answers lacked detailed consideration of these issues and others attempted to shoehorn the actions of the Duke of Somerset into their answers. As the Mark Scheme shows, this could have been a valid approach but was mostly done to little effect.

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 the Earl of Warwick played a substantial role in the defeat of Kett's rebellion, it can also be argued Kett's ~~re~~ failures and the lack of noble support also played a role. To assess which factor is the most significant we will look at each in detail.

When looking at the Earl of Warwick, it is clear his actions were very influential of the defeat. Warwick was initially cautious regarding the rebellion however, took decisive action to quickly crush it. With 'enclosures' being the main cause of the rebellion, Warwick defeated the rebellion and ~~concern~~ over these. Warwick was a strong military leader and this helped lead to the defeat.

However, this was not the only factor deciding the defeat. Robert Kett's failures also led to the defeat. For example, Kett was not a strong ~~bad~~ military leader like Warwick was, he did not have the strategic skill to win battles. Kett instead preferred peaceful alternatives however, these were ~~was~~ unsuccessful in creating the

threat of the rebellion. The rebellion also lacked a widespread goal, without a clear direction it was hard to pose a real threat.

Furthermore, the rebellion lacked support of nobles or the gentry. The rebels consisted mainly of commoners without any power or influence. This meant the rebellion posed no real threat as the influence of the rebels was small. Despite Robert Kett having some money through land ownership, the vast majority did not have this. ~~therefore, the~~

To conclude, Robert Kett and his followers lacked the military decisiveness and strategy to pose a substantial threat of the rebellion.

Due to this you can say it played a influential role in the defeat. However, the Duke of Somerset, who became Edward VI's Lord protector in 1547, had many failings when dealing with the rebellion. This may ~~refer~~ portray the threat of the rebellion being substantial despite ~~Robert Kett's~~ backing.

Due to this, as I believe the Earl of Warwick's decisive action played the most substantial role in the defeat of Kett's rebellion. ~~Due to this~~

Hence, I agree to a full extent.



Here there is some analysis of, and attempts to explain, links between relevant key features and the question, for example consideration of Kett's role in the defeat of the rebellion and the lack of noble and gentry support. However, the knowledge used in support lacks depth and development, particularly in the section on Warwick's role. In the final paragraph particularly the candidate does establish criteria for judgement and attempts to link the overall judgement to them, but this is weakly substantiated. Overall, the general trend of the argument is clear. As a result, this answer was given a top L3 mark.

Question 3

This was the most popular essay question in Section B and it was often answered very impressively. Many candidates argued that, despite its potential, the revolt never posed a significant threat to Elizabeth I, citing its confused origins and organisation and its lack of support outside the north for example. In emphasising this line of argument, candidates often went on to add that Elizabeth's government handled the revolt decisively, notably by removing Mary Stuart well away from the rebels' reach. However, a significant number argued, validly, that by threatening her religious settlement and calling into question the succession, the revolt could have posed a much more serious challenge to the Queen, if only events had developed slightly differently. Less strong responses tended more to describe the causes of the revolt or to assert that it was or it wasn't a threat, often with a lack of precise or detailed knowledge.

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 ☒

To suggest that the revolt of the Northern Earls in 1569 was never a serious threat would suggest or imply that Elizabeth's throne was not at a risk. 'Never' must be fulfilled if at no point during the revolt was there the possibility of Elizabeth being removed from her post and losing support (this is what I would constitute as a 'serious threat'). To analyse this I will look at the role of Mary, Queen of Scots, the religious implications of the revolt and the actions of the Earls of Westmorland and Northumberland themselves. Overall, I will conclude that this statement is completely false as at multiple times the revolt posed a real and perceived risk of removal of Elizabeth.

Firstly, you could say that the involvement of Mary, Queen of Scots meant that the revolt took on a serious tone which provided a significant possibility of diminishing Elizabeth's control. The arrival of Mary after her escape from Scotland by Protestants with the Earl of Moray provided an influential, Catholic leader with an arguably more legitimate claim to the English throne. She had an heir, a son James who had a claim to the French throne and hence could

provide England with a stable monarchy which Elizabeth could not since she heavily refused marriage and had no named heir. The initial plan by the earls was to have Mary marry the Duke of Norfolk and (in the more extreme suggestions) either assassinate or usurp Elizabeth. So, the existence of Mary, Queen of Scots made the revolt more of a serious threat because it provided them with a replacement and a figurehead with which their Catholic army could support. This satisfies my criteria that the notion that it was 'never a serious threat' to Elizabeth's rule is false because it provided a real plan ~~for~~ for removing her from power. However, you could weigh this up by saying that in reality the northern earls didn't get anywhere near Mary, Queen of Scots in order to use her as a replacement to Elizabeth. Originally comfortably imprisoned in Taunton, ~~the~~ Mary was not rescued by the rebels even when they were a mere 40 miles away. Then, when they did try to get to her Cecil had already moved her location. The lack of direct contact with their supposed replacement meant that Elizabeth arguably kept control during the revolt and hence it was not a serious threat as there was no realistic movement of the rebels to harm Elizabeth. Overall though, I would say that it is still stronger to argue that the statement is false. Just because the

Earls and rebels did not manage to rescue Mary and directly harm Elizabeth does not discount the fact that just her existence and the formation of the plan to replace her with Mary still had the possibility. This threatened her rule as it drew support by Catholics away from Elizabeth and towards somebody whom they deemed a more legitimate heir with important foreign connections.

It is also arguable that the religious motivations directly posed a serious threat to Elizabeth's rule. As head of the Church, ~~Elizabeth's~~ any opposition to her 1559 religious settlement and 'media via' can be construed as opposition to her rule directly. The first measures of the rebels and the Earls was to capture Durham Cathedral, holding a mass and destroying protestant symbols which had been implemented by the new Archbishop. The heavily Catholic tone to the revolt showed that the people still perhaps had a very strong allegiance to the Pope over Elizabeth despite the break from Rome having been over 30 years beforehand. So, by my criteria this presented that the revolt of the Northern Earls was a real threat to Elizabeth's rule, especially in the North where she lacked control as it attracted the possibility of more support for a Catholic ruler or intervention from foreign

Catholic powers (such as Spain who had promised to commit troops). On the other hand, you could say that this was never a serious threat as compared to other Catholicism-motivated risings like the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1537. The numbers of common/gentry support were much lower. For example, 30,000 and more people supported the pilgrimage but only a maximum of a few thousand were mobilised by the revolt of the northern earls. In addition to this, foreign support from Spain failed to materialise. So, this suggests that it was not a serious threat as the scale was never large enough to actually remove Elizabeth from the throne. Overall though, this is a comparatively weak argument as the utilisation by the earls of Catholic sympathies enhanced the threat's perception by Elizabeth and directly meant that she lost support from Catholics who were previously supportive of her religious settlement. So, it was still not 'never a serious threat'.

Finally, you could say that the fact that the revolt was led by two nobility members (and had rumours of involvement from the Duke of Norfolk) shows that there was a 'serious threat' posed by the rebellion. Despite there having been extensions in the powers of Protestants in the North, nobility

like the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland still had wide estates of which they were supposed to control. Elizabeth relied on these men for local government and the fact that they led a revolt against her signifies that there was a threat to her rule because it diminished her control in the already remote and difficult north. In addition individuals like the Duke of Norfolk held great political influence at court which could be used to remove Elizabeth and claim the throne. So, you could say that this demonstrates a serious threat as the influence of the nobility directly threatened her control of central and local government. Despite this, this argument is limited by the fact that both Earls were extremely poor leaders who could not organise the revolt properly. So, when confronted with a sizable army by the Earl of Sussex they both fled (Northumberland to Scotland and Westmorland to exile). This demonstrates that in reality perhaps there was 'never a serious threat' as the revolt was too unprepared and weak to do anything more than march around in the north. Overall though, my criteria suggests that it is still too absolute that there was 'never a serious threat'. The mere idea of the nobility leading the revolt provided it with a perception of respect and influence which persuaded people to join. Hence, it still lost Elizabeth

significant support and had the possibility of threatening her control in the North.

Q In conclusion, it is clear that the statement is too absolute to be completely agreed with. Whilst each element of a 'threat to Elizabeth's rule' I have identified ultimately did not lead to her removal, the perception that it provided the possibility was enough to, especially at the start of November 1569 present the idea that it was a serious threat - The existence of Mary, Queen of Scots for rallying Catholic support was a substantial political threat to Elizabeth's own claim to the throne and this should not be overlooked.



In this answer, there is a sustained analysis of the relationships between key features of the period. This can be seen where the candidate discusses the role of Mary Queen of Scots in the northern rebellion and the degree to which this made it a threat, serious or otherwise, to Elizabeth's rule. There are similarly focused sections also on the threat to Elizabeth's religious settlement and to the part played by leading nobility. Throughout, the answer maintains a focus on the seriousness of the threat. In terms of knowledge, sufficient is deployed here to respond fully to the demands of the question. The odd blip aside (Mary was not held in Taunton) the candidate demonstrates, in every paragraph, full command of the historical context and the relationship between key points. The argument is 'logical and coherent' from start to finish. Finally, in the first paragraph, the candidate establishes criteria for judgement and applies these to their evaluation throughout the essay. The last paragraph is as engaged as the first with the degree of seriousness of the threat of the rebellion to Elizabeth and the conclusion, that the potential of the threat posed by the rebels, rather than the outcome, is sufficient to disagree with the premise in the question, is signalled in every paragraph. As a result, this essay was given full marks.

Question 4

There were very good answers to this question and a variety of approaches were taken. Many candidates had detailed knowledge and understanding of the Lord Lieutenants and their roles in the government and administration of England across this period. Therefore, most argued convincingly that by their gradual introduction for example, and their role mostly in raising the militia in times of difficulty, they played only a lesser role, especially in comparison with the JPs or the Privy Council. Other candidates concentrated solely on the Lord Lieutenants themselves, and sought to track their influence on government and administration across the time period. Either way was valid.

However, a significant number of candidates had little real appreciation of the Lord Lieutenants and/or tried to answer solely with reference to other factors. A number did not concentrate sufficiently on the government and administration of England, attempting to turn the question into one about religious change, which frequently did not convince. Again, candidates are reminded of the need for precise knowledge and attention to the detail of the question when dealing with issues of such complexity.

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 ☒

Whilst the Lord Lieutenant was important in the Government and Administration of England during the Tudor Period I do not think it most most important as the Council of the North seemed far ~~for~~ more significant. Despite this Lord Lieutenant was still more significant than Secretaries in this time period.

One reason why Lord Lieutenants were significant was because they were used to raise an army for the Tudor monarch in case of battle. This is increadably important especaly under Queen Elizabeth when she was fighting against the Spanish as it allowed her to raise an Army almost instantly for any occassion. However Lord ~~the~~ Lieutenants are made slightly less significant as they were only made perminant under Elizabeth. ~~Des~~ despite having been Henry III's idea. This damages their longevity as under

Mary I Lord ~~Li~~ Lieutenants disappeared completely under her rule, making them less significant as they do not have a long longevity. Therefore whilst Lord ~~Li~~ Lieutenants had an important role during war when there was no war they were not needed making their longevity small and therefore making them less significant as they were not a vital part of Tudor Government or administration therefore only making them partially significant.

I think the most significant Government and Administration in Tudor England was the Council of the North because it had a profound job looking after a huge quantity of people in the North of England. The purpose of the Council was to communicate with ~~the~~ Parliament as they were allowed to send two MP's to discuss issues and keep a line of communication despite being so far from London. ~~However they lost~~

~~significance during~~ However they lost significance during Elizabeth's time as rebellion broke out and changes were needed in order to stop this happening again. This shortened the longevity of the Council because they did have to adapt to change however is not a hugely significant problem. Therefore showing how the Council of the North was the most significant due to the profundity and quantity of people it was in charge of.

And finally the least significant government and administration in Tudor England was the Secretary. Despite it having an important job of communication with the rest of England it is the least significant because of the lack of profound change. During Edward VI and Mary's reigns the role of Secretary barely changed and despite the longevity being huge as it was created by Henry VIII it ~~did~~ lacked any profound changes.

leaving it out of date ~~and~~ for much of the Tudor's time.

Therefore despite it having an important job the lack of profound change under Edward and Mary I meant it was the least significant government and administration in the Tudor time.

In conclusion despite Lord ~~and~~ Lieutenants having an important job as well as Secretaries longevity I do not think ~~Lord~~ ^{Lord} Lieutenants are the most significant because of the Council of the North that had a profound job looking after a large quantity of people. Therefore I disagree and think the Council of the North was the most significant government and administration in Tudor England.



In this answer there is some analysis of, and attempts to explain, links between relevant key features and the question—for example, consideration of the role of the Lord Lieutenants, the Council of the North and the Royal Secretary. However, the knowledge used in support, whilst mostly accurate, lacks sufficient depth even for an answer to a breadth question (Section C). In the final paragraph, though also elsewhere in the essay, the candidate does establish criteria for judgement and attempts to link the overall judgement to them, but this is weakly substantiated. As a result, this answer was given a top L3 mark.

Question 5

This was the most popular of the essays in Section C and what was most noticeable was the variety of approaches used by candidates to answer it. Many candidates used their knowledge of Tudor impositions, such as the Councils in the North and Wales, together with the harsh reaction to revolts across the period, to argue that force was the default choice of all the monarchs despite the evidence of the widespread use of patronage and royal progresses, or the expansion of borough representation in the Commons. Others used the evidence of the expansion of the role of the JPs or the more emollient attitudes towards the poor later on in the period to argue for the monarchs preferring cooperation to force. In general, candidates used their knowledge creatively and thoughtfully to fashion a response, and all valid approaches were credited.

Of the weaker responses, many tended towards a very brief and assertive treatment of each of the monarchs in turn, without precise or accurate evidence. As a result, these answers tended to lack conviction when reaching a judgement.

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 ☒

On a whole it can be argued that Tudor monarchs preferred using cooperative methods such as the ^{Justices of the Peace (JPs)} ~~Council of the North~~ or Borough Representation, as these methods were likely to lead to less resentment and therefore increase the amount of control monarchs had over ~~these~~ ^{the} localities. However, when dealing with major issues such as poverty and vagrancy, monarchs normally used key legislation to force control as these issues needed urgent control and therefore forcing change was the quickest way to gain control.

I strongly believe that methods of cooperation were far more preferred as they were more likely to ~~receive~~ receive less resentment and therefore more successfully secure control over the entire kingdom. For example, increasing Borough Representation was widely used by all monarchs in securing control cooperatively. Borough Representation helped strengthen the ~~fees~~ relationship between locality and centre, by allowing

localities to air their grievances, therefore reducing the risk of a rebellion. For example, during Edward's VI reign the borough of York was able to present a local issue through parliament. Therefore, by cooperating and passing a law in York's favour, which prevented woodland within 25km of the being chopped down, Edward VI was able to prevent York from rebelling and therefore the peaceful cooperative method proved extremely successful by controlling the locality. This can further be seen as by Elizabeth's reign there were 191 boroughs and therefore the monarchs were able to impose authority throughout the whole country without needing to use force and could effectively control areas far away from London, such as Wales, by offering them representation. However, it can be said that increasing the number of boroughs came with consequences, suggesting that cooperative methods weren't that successful. This is because, they couldn't ensure that the MPs would then actually help enforce the monarch's policies. Such as the case in York, as although the MPs were very interested in

the issue of the woodland they weren't too concerned in return in enforcing Edwards' Book of Common Prayers in York. Therefore, since most of the MPs weren't actually local to their borough, with by the end of Elizabeth's reign only roughly 14% coming from the area itself. This limits the overall usefulness of using cooperative methods over force and therefore although normally being the preferred method they could not solely rely on it.

On the other hand, methods of force were used throughout in order to tackle key issues such as poverty. In order to control poverty, Tudor monarchs would force legislation on to localities in order to control the issue. For example, the 1598 Act for the Relief of the poor, forced local parishes to introduce compulsory relief payments and appoint an overseer of the poor who would deal with the administration. Implementing poverty legislation was very important at the time as it remained a problem throughout the period. For example Henry VII would force locals to put vagrants

in Stocks ~~unmist~~ and the issue was exacerbated after the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII, because this removed the main source of welfare for the poor. Therefore, it can be argued that because every single Tudor monarch used poverty legislation to force control over localities it can be argued that due to its wide-reach into each parish and its institutionalised usage meant that methods of force were a preferred method as they were seen to be more effective. However, the fact that poverty continued to be an issue even by the end of Elizabeth's reign, with the population rising by around 4 million it can be argued that the unsuccessfulness of the forced legislation made it not the most preferred method. This is because although the monarchs enforced the legislation the actual implementation into localities was very uneven. This was mainly due to the harsh nature of the Acts which meant that they weren't as widely enforced as intended. For example, the ~~1547~~ ^{under Edward VI} vagabonds Act forced vagrants to be sold as slaves and the 1597

Act for Relief of the Poor, included whipping vagrants. Therefore, although the Acts were robustly enforced in wealthier areas, such as London, much of the rural localities didn't enforce the legislation as harshly. Therefore, it can be argued that methods of force weren't as preferred as on a whole it can be argued they were far less successful, with poverty legislation not being able to force full control over the localities. Therefore was less preferred as methods of force were more reacting to a problem, rather than being proactive like cooperation methods e.g. JPs.

In conclusion, I believe that the Tudor monarchs preferred securing their ~~the~~ control over the localities through cooperation rather than force. This is because, although methods of force, such as poverty legislation, were widely used they were often met with resentment and even at times sparked unrest e.g. being a cause for Kett's rebellion. Whereas, methods of cooperation, despite having limitations were more preferred as on a whole they proved far more successful in ensuring control on a large regional scale, such as borough representation which was

used in every area of the kingdom.



Here, the answer is focused on key issues relevant to the question (the use of cooperation or force by the Tudor monarchs to secure their control of the localities) by discussing the increase of borough representation in the House of Commons in the period and legislation directed to the issue of the poor and vagrancy. The essay does cover the chronological range, using material from the reign of Henry VII through to the Poor Laws of 1598, and provides knowledge to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and meet most of its demands. The candidate does establish criteria for judgement. This can be seen in the paragraph on borough representation where they argue that cooperative methods weren't always successful for the Tudor monarchs and that, consequently, force was necessary at times. However, the overall judgement is only partly supported. Overall, this answer was awarded a high L4 mark.

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 enquiries.
- Candidates should not simply paraphrase the content of the source. They should develop valid inferences with reference to the question, supported by material contained in the source.
- Candidates should avoid generic evaluation, e.g. 'it was written for publication so it may be sensationalised to sell more copies'.
- There is no requirement to argue that the source is better suited to one enquiry than the other. Any comments made in relation to this will be rewarded according to how they fit with the three strands of the mark scheme.

Sections B and C

- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach. This undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Planning of essays will help candidates develop an analytical approach.
- Candidates must be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, so that they can address questions with chronological precision.
- Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions.
- Subject-specific terminology should be used precisely and accurately.

Grade boundaries

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

