

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report January 2010

GCE History 6HI01/A

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034.



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022863

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

General comments

Once again most candidates for each option in Unit 1 appear to have been well prepared for the examination. There was, as is to be expected, a wide variety of responses but, as indicated in the Reports for 2009, most candidates approach the questions with some attempt to focus on the question set and to attempt an analytical response. Considering the time limit for the examination it is commendable that candidates can produce two well structured answers, with little evidence of mismanagement of their time. Interestingly, most candidates answer the questions in the order in which they appear on the question paper even if they are less confident with the first topic covered. However, there are some areas (discussed below) that centres should consider when preparing their candidates for the Unit 1 examination.

The first two examination sessions of this new unit were complicated by the fact that a minority of students did not write their answers on the pages allocated in the answer booklet. A minor redesign of the booklet has, thankfully, eliminated this problem completely.

It is perhaps worth reminding centres that Unit 1 tests AO1(a) and AO1(b). AO1(a) is concerned with the recall, selection and deployment of historical knowledge, and the communication of knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner. AO1(b) tests the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and making judgements (the objectives are printed in full on page 10 of the specification). Examiners reported that candidates are becoming increasingly expert in developing some form of explanation or analysis and can, with varying degrees of effectiveness, frame their answer on the question. This skill alone, however, is not in itself sufficient to allow access to Levels 3 and above. The explanation must be supported and developed with a range of relevant and accurate material which allows the points made to stand up effectively. While some candidates still rely on extended passages of free-standing narrative, there were many whose limited or generalised knowledge, or even a considerable amount of incorrect information, affected the quality of their answers overall.

A welcome development is that planning of answers was much more apparent during this session than previously. Candidates should be encouraged to write brief but focused plans; some covered two pages and reduced the amount of time available for the answer itself. Planning will not be effective, however, unless candidates have studied the question and have understood precisely what is being asked of them. Answers at Level 4 require the response to relate well to the focus of the question and to show understanding of the key issues, and must be supported with a range of accurate relevant information. Once again, an appreciation of the time span set in the question is vital, but this links with an understanding of the whole question. This matter will be dealt with in greater detail in the reports on each question, but three examples highlight this point. Question D6 asked 'How far was Lenin responsible for the Bolsheviks' growing hold on power in the years 1917-24?' The phrase 'growing hold on power' suggests that the period under discussion is from the October/November coup of 1917 to Lenin's death in January 1924, since Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not exercise state power before this time. Several candidates, however, apparently saw the key words 'Lenin' and '1917' and wrote extensively on the Provisional Government before ending up, briefly, on the years to 1924. A few did not get beyond October/November. Many of the answers to C6 selected supporting evidence more relevant to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 than the abolition of slavery in 1833. As indicated in 2009 there are also still many answers to F7 that confuse the hyper-inflation of 1923 with the Wall St. Crash of 1929.

Some of the most effective answers are those which produce a succinct introduction clearly focused on the question asked and four or more well focused, analytical and evaluative paragraphs, with a clear conclusion answering the question asked. The long contextual introduction of the 45 minute essay is not necessary for the extended answers of a 35-40 minute response. Introductions which show an understanding of the contribution of the highlighted factor/event/individual/concept and refer to its relative importance compared to other factors or relative success/significance give some indication as to whether the candidate

has understood the focus of the question; as does some indication of the time span involved. The questions require a judgement to be made but it is important that the conclusion sums up the argument made in the body of the essay.

Several questions invited a consideration of economic factors in determining an outcome. It was clear, across all six options, that many candidates are not comfortable addressing economic issues, and seemed uncertain of just what constituted an economic factor or economic conditions. In some cases, notably Questions B1 and C6, many simply ignored the given factor in the question in favour of other material with which they were familiar.

As always, the quality of written communication can have a marginal effect on candidates' attainment. Written communication is an assessed element of Unit 1 and this is clearly outlined in the mark schemes. Effective communication depends on a number of skills being deployed, and it is regrettable to record once again that very many candidates do not use capital letters appropriately, fail to spell common historical terms correctly, and do not shape their answer into appropriate and coherent paragraphs. Some only use capitals for inappropriate abbreviations. Naturally, developed literacy skills are a whole centre issue, but it might be worth pointing out to candidates that their communication will be taken into account, however marginally, in determining their final mark.

Questions 1 and 2

There was only a handful of answers on Alfred the Great, mostly for Question 2. These tended to be quite strong overall, with a good range of detailed information underpinning an analytical framework.

Question 3

Many answers operated through the use of free-standing narrative. There was a wide range of material on Hardrada's intervention in the north, the battles of Gate Fulford and Stamford Bridge, and Harold's swift march back to London and from there to Hastings. The battle itself was often described at length, followed by a brief comment which suggested that William's victory demonstrated his military skills. Better answers included contextual material on William's rule in Normandy before 1066 (though this was not essential for accessing any levels) and noted the successful logistical operation involved in transporting men, equipment and supplies across the Channel. Much was made of the Norman use of cavalry, and the feigned retreat was used to confirm the duke's military ability. A number of other factors were often addressed, including the papal banner. A few contrasted William's abilities with Godwinson's. The latter was considered to be reckless in allowing the fyrd to disband, and in forcing his exhausted men into battle without good reason. Many assumed that Harold's army was much weaker than William's; the length of the battle and the use of housecarls might have suggested otherwise. It is important to note that the question asked about William's securing of the English throne. For most candidates, this meant winning the battle of Hastings, and there was only scant reference to the march to London, the submission of the English nobility and the Christmas day coronation.

(This page is for your first answer.) How far do you agree that

William's military skills were the main reason for his success in securing the throne?

yes

✓ knights → trained from young
✓ confidence

abundance → blocked groups strategic attack.

NO ✓ demystified God.

✓ God's Will - papal banner

✓ previous battles - Stamford + Fulford

✓ time of year - 3 battles in 6 weeks

✓ already asserting power pervasively

- castles

- other associates eg HRE

(This page is for your first answer.) 3. Although of course, military skills were a necessity for William to secure the throne, there were also many other factors to be taken into consideration for it was not only his strength that gained him the crown, but also others weaknesses, such as Harold Godwinson.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The introduction notes two factors, William's strengths and Harold's weaknesses.

Harold was one of the main contenders for the throne and was well liked amongst the English, he was known as the 'curia regis'. So when he was crowned by Stigand after Edwards death William was out raged, as he Harold had sworn himself as his vassal, ^{to William.} when sending

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

A narrative section on Harold's coronation and William's response to it.

ambassadors to Rome for Papal approval of an invasion, he also said he was doing it under 'God's will' because Stigand was uncanonical and therefore ^{Harold} he was not rightfully King, as well as the fact that he was a perjurer. Having the Papal banner at Hastings would have been intimidating for Harold, which ~~would have~~ which was probably Williams intention.

At Yet, Hastings was not Harold's first

(This page is for your first answer.) battle, he ~~had~~ and his men were completely worn out when it came to Hastings due to the two previous battles he had just come from. Firstly there was the Battle of Gate Fulford where Tostig and his men had defeated them in a quick battle. Then there was the battle of Stamford bridge where ~~Foot~~ Sweyn and Tostig landed

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Further narrative on the northern invasion, Gate Fulford and Stamford Bridge..

where Tostig and Swein landed
up North and started ravaging York
so to many's ~~surprise~~ surprise Harold marched
his troops 200 miles in 5 days. The men
were so surprised that they were
supposedly caught unawares and ^{some} were
bathing in the river. After a long
and bloody ^{battle} day both Swein and
Tostig were killed, leaving a mere 12
ships to surrender home. At this
point William was getting restless waiting
for battle, as it was coming up for
winter and supplies would be difficult.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

No reference to William's landing in England and establishing his position.

So to spark Harold off he began ravaging
the near by towns such as the Sussex
Rapes. This left Harold in a dilemma,
should he march fast such as last
time, or potentially weakening his

(This page is for your first answer.) political position, and not gain reinforcements? Or should he wait so that Williams troops begin to suffer in the winter? He decided to march, this was a bad idea as he did not come by surprise and as William was waiting for him. So here it shows that although Williams military skills were



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

There is a brief reference to the given factor here, that William showed military skill in tempting Harold to meet him in battle.

although Williams military skills were good in knowing how to anger Harold by ravaging in Sussex, the exhaustion of Harold's troops would have of course made an impact. It was not only their exhausting, but also their attire as although there were some housecarls in chainmail coats with swords, ^{yet} there were also some peasants with anything weaponry they could find, meaning sometimes stones.

One of the main ways of William to assert his power and military control was the use of castles. They were seen

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Reference to castles is not very clear, and might refer to the period after 1066.

was the use of castles. They were seen as 'weapons of Terror' and also made it easier for him to assert his authority, considering that the Normans hadn't really had many before, and his sudden arrival along with a looming castle

(This page is for your first answer.) would have certainly intimidated the ordinary people.

Although this Perency had created him a base, when it came to ^{the} Battle ~~and~~ he was much more strategic

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Refers to the battle tactics of both sides.

and he was much more strategic in his actions. The had 3 blocks of mounted knights surrounding Harold's men as well as foot soldiers. Whereas the English only had what was left of the fyrd amongst some nobles and peasants. William's knights were trained from a young age and were therefore highly skilled and confident. I therefore conclude that although there is no doubting that William was indeed a very highly skilled military leader with a very skilled military, there were a vast amount of other factors contributing to Harold's failure, such as time, if Harold had had more time to reorganise his troops from previous battles, then things could have undoubtedly been different.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer includes a range of descriptive material which has some relevance to the question. However, the given factor of William's military skills is almost completely ignored, and other factors are not offered in any depth. While there is some attempt to analyse the situation in 1066, material overall is narrative in form. Mid Level 3.

Question 4

There were too few answers to allow for a meaningful report

Question 5

Many saw the crisis in Church-state relations as simply a personality clash between two powerful individuals. Accordingly there was a wide range of material offered on Henry's early friendship with Becket, which turned sour as soon as the latter became Archbishop of Canterbury. Their subsequent stormy relationship was known, and some focused at unnecessary length on Becket's murder in December 1170. Those who went beyond personalities were able to demonstrate that the crisis was so bitter because so much was at stake on both sides. For Becket, the maintenance of the ancient rights of the church was essential, which led to inevitable conflict with a king determined to restore and reform both church and state.

(This page is for your second answer.) why was the relations so bitter in the years 1162-70?

PLAN

1155 - Chancellor - Theobald

1162 - MBOC - friend most trusted advisor

1163 - sheriffs aid - hadn't paid before
acote - canon law

1164 - Clarendon

COURT ✓ EXCOMMUNICATION ✓
FENAL BISHOPS ✓

prison → exile feared life

1166 - York coronates Henry

1169 - reconciliation

1170 - death.

(This page is for your second answer.) The relations between the Church-State were so bitter between these years because there was so much rivalry



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Sees the conflict in terms of personalities alone.

years because there was so much rivalry for power between Thomas à Becket and King Henry II. It was made more bitter by the fact that they were initially friends which was why Henry had placed him as the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162.

However, putting Becket as the Archbishop was not only a friendly favour, they both were well aware of Henry's agenda's to gain further power over the church. For



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Notes Henry's intentions to increase his power over the Church, and Becket's early opposition.

gain further power over the church. For
 He began to try and do this in 1163 when
 the items of sheriffs aid and the 'ancient
 customs of the realm' were brought up.
 Henry at this point would have believed
 that he would easily gain these merical
 parts of authority ^{over} of the church, yet it
 was here when the drift in relation
 began. For ^{Becket} Henry put his foot down questi
 why they should pay the sheriffs aid
 when they never had done previously?
 And with the 'ancient customs of the realm'
 he said he would only agree to it if the
 it didn't interfere with canon law. The
 fact that before Henry made him Chancellor
 (This page is for your second answer.) he hadn't ever been ordained
 raised ~~one~~ vast questions of loyalty. Yet
 Becket was known to be a stubborn man,
 so surely Henry would have expected
 something like this from him?
 In 1164 was the ^{Constitution} ~~Case~~ of Clarendon
 when Henry really tried to put ~~these~~
 the things he wished across to ^{Becket} ~~Henry~~
~~such as~~ and the church such as
 making sure that no excommunication

would be able to happen without royal consent. Yet why would he ever agree to this when this was their biggest threat?



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Considers the Constitutions of Clarendon and Church courts, but some unclear points and weak development.

For at this time the worst possible thing was to be excommunicated and surrender yourself to a ~~life~~^{eternity} of hell. He also wished for ~~there~~ to him to be able to choose his own senior bishops. This would have entitled him to gain more power throughout the church as he ~~would~~ initially thought he was doing with Becket. The churches were also privileged enough to have their own courts meaning they were exempt from certain aspects of normal court, yet Henry didn't agree to this extra power they had so he wished

(This page is for your second answer.) for them to re-join the secular courts. Again there was no appeal for the clerics to agree to this. Finally he wanted them to pay feudal dues, which again they didn't have to do so why should

they weaken themselves for no reason?' Yet reluctantly ~~Willel~~ Becket agreed to this making his bishops swear oaths. However instead of creating a sense of unity which Henry wanted it only alienated them from ~~his~~ Becket.

Henry didn't like the way in which Becket had not been agreeing with him on everything, therefore helping him

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Henry's opposition to his Archbishop and Becket's subsequent flight. Narrative form.

him on everything, therefore helping him further his power across state-church, so he had him put on trial. Although because he was well liked as a Bishop he had it done for something he did as Chancellor. Which was not properly ~~adhering~~ adhering to the 'ancient customs of the realm'. He was found guilty. Becket feared for his life and fled into Exile under the wing of Pope Alexander, who too was in Exile.

After 5 years in exile Becket finally readies himself for return when
 (This page is for your second answer.) when the pair reconcile in 1169. However Henry only does this so as to avoid excommunication himself.

Yet upon his return Becket is already planning to excommunicate more of his enemies, he had already ~~pr~~ excommunicated Richard de Lucy. ~~so~~ Yet when the knights heard this they were apparently so outraged by his intentions that in 1170 4 knights (from Henry's household) made their way to Canterbury to murder Thomas à Becket.



ResultsPlus
 Examiner Comments

Brief point on Becket's murder.

So in conclusion, ~~of~~ the bitterness was caused for a number of reasons but it mainly lay in the personality of the 2. ~~# Becket~~ 1. Becket wasn't so stubborn then maybe he wouldn't have begun the

initial drift of bitterness between church-state. Yet if Henry didn't have such an overpowering personality he wouldn't have plotted in this way at the beginning.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Understands the role of personalities, highlighting the problems which these caused throughout the answer. However, relies to a great extent on narrative information which is not always very extensive. Some explanatory focus: high Level 3.

Question 6

Several candidates failed to get an effective grip on the given factor, or on the question as a whole. Many assumed that Richard was absent on the crusade at this time, and his sole contribution to the collapse of English power was the excessive taxation he levied on the English. Better answers noted that, after his release from imperial custody, the king spent the rest of his reign in France, where he found it increasingly difficult to resist the growing power of Philip Augustus. Candidates were more assured on the role of John in the loss of French territory. Few candidates had a good word to say about the king, and thus failed to note that in 1200 Philip recognized John's accession to the Angevin lands. Some noted that the loss of Normandy was as much due to the strength of Philip's military forces as it was to John's misgovernment and the growing alienation and hostility of his nobility.

Kings Richard I and John are often touted as being 'good' and 'bad' kings respectively. However, both kings had large roles to play in the collapse of English power in France.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Simple introduction which does not compare the roles of the two kings.

King John had two contemporary epithets - "lackland" and "softener", referring to his loss of land in France and also his military incompetence that led to the loss of his lands.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Suggests that John's military incompetence and poor judgement explain the loss of Normandy.

incompetence that led to the loss of his lands.

The whole conflict that led to the loss of Normandy and thus English power in France was down to John's inability to rule and his poor judgement. He married Isabelle of Angoulême, who had already been betrothed to Hugh de Lusignan, a powerful lord. Once John had done so, he offered no compensation for the loss of the lands of Angoulême, causing Hugh to call upon King Philip of France to resolve the issue. John created a very hostile environment by 'stealing' Isabelle of Angoulême and by not compensating Hugh, he had made many strong enemies and even made some of his own barons distrustful of him. This was the first step towards conflict and it was all created by John. Upon being called to court in Paris by King Philip, John refused, instead stating that he only had to go to the border of Normandy. John had failed to



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Aware of the importance of John's refusal to do homage to Philip Augustus for Normandy.

only had to go to the border of Normandy. John had failed to realise that or ignored that he had become a vassal of the King in 1200. As a result, King Philip stripped him of his southern lands and set about taking Normandy by force.

Richard I is seen as a hero for going on crusade, but the cost had crippled England - taxes were raised & massively and the crusade had left a large hole in the King's pocket, which John inherited. A lack of funds made it hard for John to



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Blames John's lack of money to finance the wars in France on Richard.

John inherited. A lack of funds made it hard for John to combat King Philip and eventually, the time John was forced out of Normandy. Richard's excessive spending had a profound effect on the ability of John to fight off King Philip and his army. This, coupled with the lack of military ability of John meant that Philip was never going to be anything other than victorious.

John's unpopularity also had a part to play in the loss of lands - his cheating incident with Isabelle of Angoulême ^{in France} meant allies defected from him, leaving ^{Normandy} him surrounded.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Notes John's unpopularity, which was of his own making.

~~left~~ meant allies, defected from him, leaving him surrounded with little outside help. His unpopularity was compounded by the murder of his nephew, who he saw as a threat to his throne - many French barons felt this a despicable act and would have been to join sides with the King of France to defeat John. Again, both of these problems are manufactured, entirely by John, who managed to create problems for himself through poor acts of judgement.

One factor that was outside of Richard and John's control was the wealth and power of King Philip of France. His income

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Other factor considered: the growing power of the French monarchy.

was the wealth and power of King Philip of France. His income was said to be up to three or four times as much as that of John, which allowed him to buy alliances and many more men. This was due to the development of the King's power in France and does show that John was up against a formidable opponent. However, this does throw up another point about John's judgement - why would he anger and then go to war against someone with such large resources and such great power?

Whilst Richard's crusades made him highly thought of by the church, it did not do much for his reputation in England.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Aware of the lack of support given to John by the English nobility, who lost confidence in him following his attempt to usurp the throne.

The church, it did not do much for his reputation in England. He was only in the country for 6 months of his 10 year reign, which led to the ~~rebellion~~ ^{rebellious} problems with John; John tried to usurp the throne whilst Richard was on crusade, but as Richard was well liked as a hero of the ~~same~~ crusade, John met strong resistance and many barons in England that were loyal to Richard became distrustful of John. This carried on through



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Aware of the lack of support given to John by the English nobility, who lost confidence in him following his attempt to usurp the throne.

to Richard became distrustful of John. This carried on through John's reign and the excessive taxing of the English barons for a foreign war, as well as John's generally unpleasant demeanour led to an almost complete lack of support for John in England as well as in France. It was this lack of support that ~~as well as~~ gave the King of France the ability to wage war upon him once he had disengaged Philip as his vassal. If John had not had so many enemies

and so little support in France, it is possible that he would not have been invaded and thus lost his lands.

Despite John's ability to stir up trouble, some of the upheavals in England were not his doing - the Northern earls don't



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A passage of unclear relevance on the northern earls and on Richard's absence on the crusade.

upheavals in England were not his doing - the Northern earls don't
 dislike the ~~Norman~~ Anglo-Norman Kings so it is unfair to say that
 John was purely to blame for ^{all} the lack of support in England
 that caused such problems for him. Also, whilst I criticised
 Richard for going on Crusade due to its massive cost, it was
 seen as being of the highest importance, and few, if any,
 would have ~~even~~ had an issue with it at the time. Religion
 was very important at the time and Richard was 'doing God's
 work', which was the most ~~top~~ honourable work of all.

* Thus, whilst Richard and John did face adversity and other
 problems in keeping French territories, their actions had a large
 part to play in the loss of said territories and the
 resultant loss of power in the region. It definitely says
 a lot that the Angevin empire that was left behind upon the
 death of Henry II, went from a powerful, stable and respected
 nation to one of turmoil, distrust and debt in less than a
 quarter of a century.

* Henry II had left Richard and John with a rich and stable land, returned to the laws of Henry I after the accession of King Stephen's reign; but there was a great deal of conflict with the church during the reign of Henry II, namely as a result of the murder of Thomas Becket. With several bishops having been excommunicated by Becket before his death, it may well have left England in uncertain terms with the Papacy at the end of Henry's reign. Richard's relationship would have certainly improved with the piety of Richard, who died on crusade doing God's work. This shows that Richard did have a very positive effect on England's relationship with the papacy.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer is lacking in balance. John's contribution to the loss of French territories is considered in some detail, though there are some weaker passages and points of little relevance. Importantly, Richard's part in the loss of France is barely touched on. The candidate does not mention any of the king's campaigning in France, and appears to believe that Richard was always on the crusade. The answer is well written and has secure range. However, so little is offered on one of the two kings in the question that the answer cannot get beyond a mark at high Level 3.

Questions 7 and 8

There was a small entry for these two questions. Examiners noted that candidates had a fair amount of detailed knowledge to deploy in their answers, but that this knowledge was not often used in an analytical way. Some struggled with identifying the structure of English society in the fourteenth century for Question 7, and few covered the growing mobility of the peasants or the effects of the plague on towns. Question 8 was handled slightly better, with candidates able to deploy a range of information on several factors. However, few appeared to know just what demands were made in 1381 beyond a cursory reference to the poll taxes. Centres might like to discuss these demands in more detail with their students, noting how they ranged from the relatively uncontroversial demand for an end to the poll taxes to revolutionary programmes for restructuring society.


Questions 9 and 10

There was only a handful of answers to these questions, almost exclusively on Question 9. Candidates were diverted from the given factor of effective leadership by the more attractive description of the victories at Harfleur and Agincourt, which were then attributed in a fairly simple way to Henry V's leadership. Some answers were self-limiting because some candidates were unable to get beyond 1422, apart from mentioning that Henry VI's minority made strong leadership impossible. Better answers, however, noted the significance of both Henry and Bedford, while at the highest levels were those who could compare the two. Most could bring in a further factor, the systemic weakness of the French monarchy at the time, but there were few who made effective use of the Burgundian alliance, which proved so essential to the English while it lasted.

Question 11

Many candidates appeared to be unsure of the demands of the question. Some finished their answers in 1455, while others chose either 1461 or 1471 as their finishing point. A few even assumed that Yorkist victory extended through to 1483. 1461 is generally taken as the year of final Yorkist triumph, though those who noted the final defeat of the Lancastrians after the readeption of Henry VI also gained credit. Some were unable to define political mistakes, failing to refer to Margaret of Anjou's use of the 'Parliament of Devils' in 1459, or that the queen felt more comfortable in the midlands rather than in London. Many realized that her hostility towards York contributed to the conflict, suggesting that her ineptness and her husband's incapacity were important factors in Yorkist success. Military mistakes were sometimes exemplified with reference to St. Albans in 1455 and Northampton in 1460, and that the Lancastrians did not capitalize on their victories in 1460 and 1461. A wide range of answers were offered, and some very strong responses covered much of the indicative content in the mark scheme while offering strong, individual analysis.

In 1461, Edward IV was crowned King of England after overthrowing Henry VI. There are many different reasons and arguments as to why this happened. However, a popular view is that it was the weakness of the Lancastrians that caused the Yorkist victory.



One major factor was the weaknesses of the Lancastrian King Henry VI. His lack of military skill and lack of interest in politics or war meant that the Lancastrians had no strong leader and were therefore weak as a whole, allowing the Yorkists to overthrow them. Henry VI's tendency

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Aware of some of the personal defects of Henry VI, including his poor military skills.

the Yorkists to overthrow them. Henry VI's tendency to take favourites added to this as it ^{caused} ~~fulfilled~~ the nobles who were not in favour, particularly Richard, Duke of York, to want to rebel. In addition Henry suffered a mental collapse, lasting a number of years, meaning that he was unable to speak, let alone defend his claim to the throne. This allowed for Yorkist intervention and eventually the overthrow of this incapable King.

Although Henry VI seemed to have no political ambitions, his wife Margaret of

(This page is for your first answer.)

Anjou had many political ambitions, particularly for her son, Edward, Prince of Wales. It could be argued that Margaret's aggressive policies, for example the Parliament in Coventry at which Richard, Duke of York was declared a traitor and condemned to death, urged and pushed York to rebel as it left him no other choice. This therefore suggests that, as a Lancastrian, Margaret brought the rebellion upon herself and family and perhaps even encouraged it.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Notes that some political weaknesses can be ascribed to Margaret of Anjou.

Another mistake of Margaret or Anjou was her late arrival in England in 1471 after the readeption of her husband. This late arrival



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Notes Margaret's mistakes after the readeption of Henry VI, and the defeat at Tewkesbury.

readeption of her husband. This late arrival meant that Edward IV did not have to fight his two enemies, Margaret and Warwick, at the same time, and to therefore win a battle that he would surely have lost otherwise. This defeat of Margaret of Anjou's forces at Tewkesbury allowed for the recently deposed Edward IV to regain the throne and led to the deaths of Henry VI and Edward, Prince of Wales, the last two serious Lancastrian claimants. Without doubt this shows the Lancastrian weaknesses as the main cause for Edward IV's success and readeption.


However, it can also be seen that Edward IV was a great warrior. Edward was formidable in battle showing his strength as a king. This suggests that it may have been Yorkist strength, ~~not~~ as opposed to Lancastrian weaknesses and mistakes, that lead to a Yorkist victory.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Another relevant factor: the military skills of Edward IV - but this point is not expanded on.

Moreover, it could be argued that the initial conflict was due to overmighty subjects. As these nobles, or sometimes referred to as 'super' nobles, were so powerful and rich, allowing for retaining, it could be argued that it was not surprising that they rebelled. On the other hand, this again could be the case of an undermighty king rather than ~~an~~ overmighty subjects.



Origins of the conflict: unclear relevance.

It can be seen that there were many weaknesses and mistakes surrounding the Lancastrians and that these were the main reasons for a Yorkist takeover and the overthrow of the Lancastrian ~~regime~~ regime.

However, in hindsight we can see that Lancaster did eventually succeed in the form of Henry Tudor who overthrew Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth in 1485, then went on to rule until 1509.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer shows some awareness of the weaknesses of Henry VI and the political mistakes made by Margaret of Anjou; and there is some attempt to contrast these with Edward IV's own abilities. There is some focus on the question, and there are attempts at analysis, but the answer lacks balance. In particular, military activity is almost entirely ignored. The analytical framework and supporting material allows for low Level 4.

Question 12

Candidates tend to treat Richard III with the same disdain which they show for king John. Several apparently prepared answers were seen this session, focusing strongly on the usurpation and with unnecessarily extended references to the princes in the Tower. Richard's unpopularity was accepted by most, with only a few noting that many nobles welcomed the king's accession because they did not want a repetition of the difficulties which the country had experienced during the minority of Henry VI. Few were able to comment on the king's domestic policies, and seemed unaware that there was much to commend in Richard's governance of the country. More might have been made of the introduction into government of so many of Richard's northern allies. Bosworth dominated many answers, but some were uncertain of the role of leading nobles, notably the Stanley family, in determining the outcome of the battle. Other relevant factors that were discussed included the significant level of support given to Henry Tudor, not only by disaffected Yorkists but also by the French monarchy, which was concerned about Richard's intentions towards them. Several candidates misunderstood Henry Tudor; a few claimed that he could not speak English, while others discounted him as a person of no significance at all before 1485. However, there were many fine answers to the question, with candidates aware of the issues surrounding the question, and producing clear and analytical responses which weighed up the importance of various factors in contributing to the end of the Yorkist monarchy in 1485.

The reign of Richard III was ended at the Battle of Bosworth by the triumph of Henry VII, a relatively unknown exile who was not considered to have

great chances of success. The unpopularity of Richard III was surrounded by the disappearance of his two small nephews.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Weak opening statement

The most significant ^{event} in Henry's success at the battle field could be argued as his ability to gain French support. As a penniless exile, the chances of him funding an expedition such as this one would have been slim to none. Louis XII, who is considered by some revisionist historians as being a 'universal spider' was key to Henry's

(This page is for your first answer.) challenge in 1485, supplying him with ships, money & men. This is clearly an example of Richards unpopularity as Louis XII was only willing to throw




ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Some categorisation here: the most important reason for Henry's success was French support.


as Louis XII was only willing to throw his military weight behind Henry because Richard had made a truce with Louis XII's enemy Brittany. When Henry touched down on English soil after being in exile for most of his life, he was backed by a French army. England was not a key player in foreign policy at this time so Louis's support of Henry would have been an attempt to undermine the policies of Richard III. Henry's foreign support is therefore an example of how Richard III's unpopularity earned Henry the military footing to which he could advance in his challenge to the English throne.



A securely made comment.


More evidence to support the view Richards unpopularity lost him the throne was the nobilities lukewarm support & lack of intervention of

Henry from the start. Henry entered
~~London~~ via the Welsh marches & was able



Weak noble support for Richard.

~~London~~ via the Welsh marches & was able
 (This page is for your first answer.) to gain support with his
 uncle Jasper Tudor. Unstopped by Richards
 own nobles shows that they were not
 completely loyal to Richard III's regime.
 This was made even more apparent
 on the battle field itself, where many
 nobles did not engage in fighting
 at all. Nobles were more inclined to



Role of the nobles at Bosworth: little specific detail.

at all. Nobles were more inclined to
 support their own interests & with
 an unclear victor many nobles withstared
 from any fighting at all. This is
 to a great extent down to Richards

unpopularity as king because truly loyal subjects would stick by their monarch no matter the outcome. William Stanley's betrayal in Richard III's crucial hour shows just how lukewarm his support was. Richard held Stanley's son



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The role of the Stanley family.

capture on the battlefield, it was his strategies which lost him support with the nobles, perhaps had Richard felt his subjects were truly loyal he would not need to blackmail them into loyalty, a tactic which ultimately caused his death and lost his crown. Which raises the issue of Richard's

(This page is for your first answer.) patronage of nobles. It is questionable as to whether Richard had truly learned from his predecessors




ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Further development on the limited support which Richard had among the English nobility.


had truly learned from his predecessors mistakes. He entrusted only four great magnates of whom only one fought with Richard right until the end. He knew of Lord Stanleys relationship with Margaret Beaufort & was aware that her influence could potentially sway his loyalties but instead of reducing his power Richard granted him more with his new post as Chancellor of the exchequer. Overall Richard's unpopularity lead him to eventual demise, when he lacked enough support to crush Tudors forces but this had alot to do with his own weaknesses as king. His unwise patronage & failure to restrain the leading nobilities powers gave them the power to betray him.

The other important factor which cannot be overlooked is Richards strategic mistakes on the battlefield. Richard who was angry at Henry Tudors advances charged through his




Tudors advances charged through his own protection to make a personal attack on Henry Tudor, thus allowing him to be hacked down by William Stanley. Richards very nature of being ~~was~~ unable to keep his composure when his ~~pos~~position is under attack left him vulnerable in battle, despite Richard ~~to~~ have having more military experience than Henry. His actions were completely rash & cannot be down to Richards unpopularity, however this example of his fury in battle does offer a view as to what may or may not have drove Richard to murder his two nephews in the tower, this jealous angry view of Richard was of course the roots of his unpopularity.

In conclusion the unpopularity were at the root of many events leading to his eventual murder at the Battle of Bosworth. Richard did however decide his own fate in his final strategic mistake. The ^{humiliating} way his body



strategic mistake. The ^{humiliating} way his body was dragged naked & paraded through the streets does however support that Richard was indeed highly unpopular!



The answer considers four relevant factors: French support for Henry Tudor; the lukewarm attitude of the English nobility towards Richard; Richard's errors at Bosworth; and the role of the Stanleys. There is thus an analytical approach, which suggests Level 4; however, in places the quality and range of support is not extensive, and there are some unbalanced passages overall. Low Level 4.

Question 13

Candidates were clearly more comfortable in dealing with the nobility than with the commoners in answering the question. Most were aware of the measures against retaining and the use of bonds, recognisances and attainders in order to ensure that the nobility stayed within the law. Specific examples of dissident nobles were given, but overall numerical evidence on such matters would have added much to the evaluation of this policy. Some took Henry's actions to be evidence of a sustained anti-noble policy, and failed to note that the king relied on both the nobility and the gentry to maintain the peace in the provinces; while few saw the significance of the Council of the North and the Council of Wales. In considering the commoners many were aware of the increased powers given to Justices of the Peace, but few mentioned the operation of the law courts, especially the assizes and the quarter sessions and the centralized courts established in London. At a high level were those candidates who evaluated the extent of Henry's success, noting that the usurper of 1485 had been transformed by 1509 into a king who passed on the throne peacefully and without opposition to his son.

Question 14

At lower levels of attainment were candidates who described some features of Henry's foreign policy and stated simply that these features increased his power in England. Better answers came from those who considered the four countries named in the clarification of content and tried to assess the significance of each one. Most noted Henry's relationship with Spain, though for many Medina del Campo was concerned solely with the marriage of Arthur and Catherine. A few did not go beyond 1489, and thus failed to appreciate the significance of Arthur's death and the deterioration of Anglo-Spanish relations in the early

16th century. Relations with France were well known, with effective links to Henry's power assumed by the granting of the royal pension. Several dealt with Burgundy exclusively through the trade war and failed to notice the importance of Margaret of Burgundy's support for the pretenders Simnel and Warbeck. Most answers considered Scotland, usually through the dynastic marriage of 1504. Only a few appreciated that


Many historians argue that Henry VII chose the wrong alliance when allying himself and England with Spain and Burgundy over France. Although this may be the case, it is partly due to deaths within all three countries that these alliances did not stay strong and therefore weakened Henry VII's power in England.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Suggests that Henry's foreign policy weakened his power in England.


One alliance that Henry VII made to secure his power in England was with Queen Isabella and King Ferdinand of Aragon and Castille, secured with the Treaty of Medina del Campo. This was a strong alliance as, with Castille and Aragon united, Ferdinand and Isabella ruled over a large area and were therefore a powerful alliance to gain. The alliance was sealed with the marriage of their daughter, Catherine of Aragon, to Prince Arthur. However, as Arthur and Isabella's



On Medina del Campo, the answer refers only to the marriage alliance. The final sentence in the paragraph is unconvincing.

Arthur. However, as on Arthur and Isabelle's deaths the alliance was strained and internal turmoil in Spain weakened them as an ally and therefore weakened Henry's position of power in England.

In addition, by allying with Spain Henry isolated France, who would have been his natural ally after they supported him in his campaigns to England in 1485. By doing this Henry invited the French to support pretenders to his throne, namely Perkin Warbeck, which could have been disastrous to his power and position as king. As well as this, France encouraged



Notes Henry's difficulties with both France and Scotland over Warbeck - again, with a poor final sentence.

as king. As well as this, France encouraged Scotland to support Warbeck, resulting in an invasion of England by the Scots, leading

to the Cornish Revolt, again weakening Henry, particularly in popular support of his reign within his own country.

On the other hand, the French support for Warbeck could have been seen to strengthen Henry's position. This is because Henry's invasion of France, in reaction to their support for Warbeck, led to the renewal of the French pension, started in Edward IV's reign. This therefore increased Henry's financial

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Discusses the French invasion of 1492 and its significance in financial terms.

reign. This therefore increased Henry's financial power, bringing in over £30,000 in his reign, and hence increasing his position of power within England.

Although Scotland invaded England during Henry VIII's reign, Henry also managed to secure an alliance with them. Henry married his daughter, Margaret, to ~~Henry~~ King James IV of Scotland in exchange for them ceasing to support pretenders to the throne.



Relations with Scotland. The marriage alliance is noted, but not the treaties of 1497 and 1502.

This greatly increased Henry's security, and therefore increased his power, as Scotland were the traditional "old enemy" of England.

Another country that Henry made a great effort to ally himself with was Burgundy. However, although much time effort and particularly money went into an alliance with Burgundy, ~~admittedly~~ the result was not very substantial, as the death of Phillip the Fair of Burgundy reversed all of these efforts. ~~This could~~ At a result this could



Burgundy: some relevance, but not well developed overall.

efforts. ~~This could~~ At a result this could have weakened Henry's position as money had been spent with no positive outcome meaning weakened royal finances. The lack of support

weakened royal finances. The lack of support from Burgundy can also be highlighted by the fact that it took a ^{war} considerable effort, the a storm that caused Phillip to land in England, for Burgundy to land over Edmund de la Pde, a Yorkist claimant. This shows that Henry did not have the support of Burgundy, therefore weakening his power, particularly concerning a serious threat to his position.

Although Henry seemed to operate a strong, and partly successful, foreign policy, factors such as death hindered his efforts, partially weakening his position of power. It could also be considered

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The conclusion makes some attempts to address questions of power.

his position of power. It could also be considered that Henry in fact chose the wrong alliance as France may have been a more natural, and useful, ally against not helping Henry's own power in England.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer sustains a focus on the question, considering the four countries mentioned in the clarification of content. There is some range here, and an attempt in places to assess the impact of foreign policy on domestic power, though the points made vary in quality. Analytical approach with sufficient supporting material for mid Level 4.

6HI01/A Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	40.2	8.4

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	42	37	33	29
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		20.8	47.1	68.5	83.2	92

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US022863 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

