



Pearson

Examiners' Report
June 2017

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 www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_31_1706_ER

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

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with the new A-Level paper 31: 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. Examiners did note that more scripts than has been usual posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

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

Candidates are more familiar with the Section B essay section of Paper 3 and most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates often wanted to engage in a main factor/ other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counterargument within their answer; many candidates lacked any counterargument at all. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, most candidates were well prepared in terms of their contextual knowledge of individual elements within the period, but not all candidates fully engaged with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. Candidates do need to be aware that this is a breadth question and that the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. This has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access Level 5 candidates are expected to have responded ‘fully’ to the demands of the question.

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

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

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

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

Question 1

Overall, most candidates engaged with the source and demonstrated a fairly detailed knowledge of the 1569 Northern Rebellion. Many candidates indicated an understanding of the demands of the question although some candidates focused heavily on the attitudes enquiry. Stronger candidates used contextual knowledge of the arrival of Mary Queen of Scots and the issues of power and influence affecting the Earls in the North very well to develop their reasoning and also evaluated the source with a combination of knowledge and provenance. The strongest answers also contributed detail about northern affairs and resentment at southern/ Cecilian interference. Less strong answers placed contextual knowledge alongside quotes with little attempt to develop them. Many candidates did have a good understanding of the issues raised by the source. Quality of evaluation was variable with some students taking the Earls' protestations of loyalty at face value whereas stronger candidates were able to explore the purpose of the source. They then applied this to consider the relative weight that could be attached to different claims that could be made from the source. Weaker candidates credited the source with value as it is contemporary but were unable to justify their arguments. Many candidates split their answer into three sections; a paragraph per enquiry and a paragraph on the value of provenance, before concluding. This meant that provenance was stated rather than linked to the specific terms of the two enquiries, and did not allow candidates to assess whether the source was more valid for one enquiry than the other.

8.40 → 9.25

Answer Question 1.

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

- 1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the attitudes of the northern earls (1) towards Queen Elizabeth and their reasons for revolt in 1569. (2)

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

(20)

PLAN

<p>① "Queen's most true & lawful subjects" → "abused the Queen"</p> <p>"God save the Queen" → represented as loyal subjects - previous rebellions - avoid treason → like POG → also religious motivations</p>	<p>② "evil persons" → "to set down true & ..."</p> <p>"misused queen majesty's ..."</p> <p>"foreigners enter realm" → "all be made slaves"</p> <p>"Do as your duty to God does command you" → religion. EI = Protestant - break from Rome</p>
---	---

Limitation → no mention of M&OS
↳ Tutbury → Coventry

NOP

↳ Proclamation → already [↑] rebelled

after being called to Court

Bigger picture

TIMING

• Judgement

OK

marriage plot → Norfolk & M&OS

↳ marginalisation → Protestant
outsider → Ratcliffe → COIN

Real essay

It is evident that the source is ~~highly~~ ^{not} valuable for revealing ~~both~~ the attitudes of the northern lords towards Queen Elizabeth, ^{but is valuable in} and their reasons for revolt in 1569. Despite ~~this point~~ ^{Therefore} ~~significance~~, one may argue strongly that the source is more valuable at revealing the lords' reasons for revolt in 1569 since it highlights ^{*} religious motivations, hatred of the Queen's councillors and the threat of foreign invasions as contributing factors. However, it is limited by the neglect to mention Mary, Queen of Scots which may be ^{strategic} ~~because~~ since it would alarm ~~the~~ Elizabeth I. On the other hand, while there is a sense of the attitudes towards the Queen, with a patriotic tone, it is unclear whether

this is genuine because it may have been a way of attempting to escape charges of treason.

Consider Firstly, considering the attitudes of the northern earls towards Queen Elizabeth, the source suggests that they support her rule in England. For example the phrase, the "Queen's most true and lawful subjects" implies that the earls do not see themselves as rebels but actually working to protect the Queen from "evil persons" in her Council, notably William Cecil. This is supported by the fact there was a Court-based plot by the Conservative faction, including the Duke of Norfolk to remove Cecil from his powerful position. Moreover, the source presents ~~a~~ ^{the} ~~Queen~~ ^{the Queen} as being "abused" by the advisors; ~~and~~ potentially suggesting a ~~sense~~ ^{cautious} ~~of~~ ^{nature} care of their ~~behalf~~ for her safety. In contrast, the ~~use~~ ^{use} of the word "abused" may be used due to the direct and strong tone of the Proclamation, which would have been intended by the ~~early~~ earls to whip up support for their cause. The earls close their proclamation ~~it~~ with the phrase "God Save the Queen" which presents a clear sense of patriotism. Furthermore, like previous rebellions the earls have portrayed themselves as "loyal"

subjects of the monarch, appearing to condone the actions of their closest advisers, like in the 1536 Pilgrimage of Grace. This suggests a desire to avoid treasonous charges but also the ^{indication} ~~show~~ that their true attitudes towards Queen Elizabeth are kept hidden.

In contrast, the source is ~~very~~ limited to ^{large} ~~an~~ extent about the northern earls' attitudes towards ~~the~~ Queen Elizabeth because it is unclear as to whether their words are of a genuine nature. For instance, while they present themselves as being loyal subjects, ~~with~~ their court-based plot for the Duke of Norfolk to marry Mary, Queen of Scots suggests a desire to depose Elizabeth and replace her with a Catholic, legitimate ruler. Therefore, this would imply a more critical and cynical attitude towards the Queen. Moreover, since the source is a Proclamation, the apparent positive attitude towards Elizabeth I may have been a way to secure additional rebels in Durham because ~~they~~ ^{they} they would have no felt to be rebelling against the Queen. For instance, Durham alone provided the rebellion with ~~to~~ approximately 800 rebels, largely because of huge resentment towards the Protestant radical, James Pilkington, the bishop of Durham.

On the other hand, the source is hugely valuable for revealing the reasons why the Northern earls revolted in 1569. Since the source was written on 16th November 1569, this was after the earls had rose up in rebellion, therefore allowing the source's content to illuminate their shared grievances. For example, there is a clear contempt for the "evil persons" advising the Queen, with William Cecil being the most significant target of rebel demands. They present these advisors as having "dishonoured the realm", therefore implying one of their motivations as being to restore the ~~EA~~ ^{country} and government to prior years. In addition, there are evident religious motivations behind their decision to rebel. For example, the phrase, "overthrew the truce and Catholic religion," and "to as your duty to God does command you" suggests a desire to restore England to Catholicism, as it was under Mary I. At the time, ~~around~~ 75% of leading Yorkshire families were Catholic, demonstrating that Elizabeth I's religious settlement was not effective in the religiously - conservative North, with Church papists emerging as a group who outwardly conformed but

in reality maintained their strong Catholic faith. There is also the mention of the threat of ~~East~~ foreign invasion, which is likely to be linked to Elizabeth's move to Protestantism. It is therefore ironic that the earls present themselves as ^{acting to} defend the country from invasion when from the Queen's perspective, their action increased the threat of intervention from ~~the~~ Catholic Spain, under Philip II.

Despite the source's strengths in addressing the reasons behind the 1569 rebellion, it is limited due to ~~the~~ ^{its} failure to mention the role of Mary, Queen of Scots, or the strong feelings of marginalisation, the latter also relevant to the attitude of the earls toward Queen Elizabeth. For example, the arrival of Mary, Queen of ~~Scots~~ Scots in May strengthened Catholic resentment since she represented a potential figurehead with a legitimate claim to the throne. The belief Elizabeth was illegitimate weakened her rule further, in the eyes of ~~the~~ northern Catholics. Moreover, the ^{rebels'} march south suggested they were aiming to free Mary from imprisonment in Tutbury castle, although this was prevented when she was swiftly moved further south to Coventry, thus making her out of rebel reach. Considering

the source originates from the earls themselves, they may have neglected to mention Mary out of fear of it sparking a repressive response from Elizabeth I. Aside from this, there is also no mention of the earls feeling resentful at their apparent marginalisation by Elizabeth, with southern being appointed to roles traditionally held by them. For example, Thomas Ratchiffe, the Queen's cousin, was made President of the Council of the North, despite having no ~~and~~ other appointment connections to the region. This ^{and} definitely heightened feelings of resentment by for the northern nobility.

To conclude, while there is some evidence of the attitudes of the earls towards Queen Elizabeth, ultimately the source is more valuable for revealing the reasons for their revolt in 1569. This is because their several grievances are used in the proclamation to try and persuade others to join the rebel cause as ~~many~~ numerous areas of resentment were shared by many. The source is limited with respect to this issue however, due to the neglect to acknowledge the role of Mary, Queen of Scots or feelings of marginalisation, largely caused by Elizabeth's northern appointments.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

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



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

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

Question 2

This question was marginally more popular than Question 3 and was one that seemed to cause some candidates problems in its use of the term 'Yorkist faction'. This was then further complicated by the failure to see the Yorkist links of notable figures such as Margaret of Burgundy who were added in some cases as a foreign policy factor. Stronger candidates dealt with this very well and constructed a response that saw the early threat after Bosworth and then made judgements as to the way Henry VII dealt with them and the impact of other elements. Many answers discussed the threats of Simnel and Warbeck with stronger answers able to discuss the nature of their threat. Alternative arguments varied with many recognising the importance of the marriage to Elizabeth of York. However, some candidates' work was characterised by long descriptive passages rather than analysing the impact of these events on 'Henry VII's efforts to secure and hold on to his throne'. The criteria for judgements were also often not established as clearly as they might have been and very few candidates seemed to pay much attention to the word 'severely' in the question.

Henry VII's claim to the English throne was weak; it came through his mother Margaret, and succession through females was not desirable at the time. Furthermore, his line had been declared illegitimate and only legitimated with the condition that no offspring of the line had claim to the throne. Henry had to go through immense efforts to secure his position on the throne. ~~Getting~~ ~~onto~~ ~~the~~ ~~throne~~ proved to be almost as challenging as securing it. However, to say that his efforts were severely undermined by the Yorkist faction is to imply that the challenges from the imposters Perkin Warbeck and Lambert Simnel were severe as these were ~~are~~ comparatively the most serious challenges to Henry after defeating Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth; and although I do agree that to Henry the challenges would have ~~been~~ seemed serious, from a revisionist point of view I

do not consider 'them' "severely undermining". Henry was a wise monarch and was able to secure this position on the throne through a number of ways such as marrying Elizabeth of York, rewards and punishment, acts of parliament and command of foreign affairs.

First and foremost, we must address the challenges to Henry's claim to the throne before assessing his actions of securing it. After defeating the Yorkist king Richard III at the Battle of Bosworth on 22 August, 1485, ~~the~~ Henry had to secure his weak claim to and position at the throne. ~~His~~ His efforts were quite often undermined by the Yorkist faction. John de la Pole, who was the cousin of Richard III and Edward IV, had sworn allegiance to Henry, but broke his oath by supporting Lambert Simnel, an imposter claiming to be Edward, the Duke of Warwick. Though Lambert did gather support from Ireland, and other Yorkists such as Francis Lovell and Margaret of Burgundy, the rebellion soon fell and lost to the royal army at the Battle of Stoke. This was still by far the most serious threat to Henry's claim to the throne (on a comparative level). The efforts of the other imposter, from 1491-97, ~~was~~ although always looming in the background, never gathered momentum. Those supporting Perkin Warbeck, who claimed to be the

younger of the Princes in the Tower, did not even come close to ~~the~~ seriously threatening Henry's position on the throne. Most were executed to make an example of. Thus, although Yorkists plotting was always a threat to Henry, it did not manage to severely undermine his position on the throne.

To win over Yorkist supporters, Henry married Elizabeth of York. He used Parliament to revoke Titulus Regius, an act passed by Richard III to declare all of Edward IV's children illegitimate. Thus he was able to marry Elizabeth who was a representative of the Yorkist ~~idea~~ faction. He himself being a Lancastrian, through his marriage, Henry united the two enemy houses, thus creating the House of Tudor, a major stepping stone in ending the War of the Roses. Henry's reasoning behind this was that even though Yorkists did not follow him, they would do so to his heirs as they would be descendants of the Yorkist faction. In doing so, Henry won over many Yorkists, thus undermining the plots of the remaining ones.

Another way in which Henry was ~~was~~ able to secure his position on the throne was through

rewards and 'punishments. He punished those who rebelled against him by taking away their lands. Those who served him loyally, he rewarded through granting titles and land. Henry was clever not to give away crown land, but land which he had taken away from unfaithful nobles. By doing so, Henry was able to increase the crown's prestige and influence through amassing wealth. Furthermore, through his refusal to engage in unnecessary wars and unwillingness to order ~~un~~whimsical executions, Henry was seen as a monarch who provided stability; in the previous 50 years, England had been torn apart by rival factions (Yorkists vs Lancastrians), whereby two kings, Henry VI and Edward IV both claimed to be king. Through his stability, tactics and fairness, Henry was able to portray himself as a just monarch and secure his position on the throne.

Furthermore, once he won the Battle of Bosworth, Henry used Parliament to officially declare him as king, although he was cautious not to make it look like as if the parliament had granted him the throne. Henry ordered the Parliament to declare the start of his reign as 21 August 1485, the day before the Battle of Bosworth. By doing so, he automatically declared all those who supported Richard III as

traitors. Henry was also smart to impose the idea that he was a monarch anointed by God, a concept very much valued at the time. He organised a lavish coronation ceremony, an event which is strongly linked with the process of executing God's will in crowning his anointed one. So it is thus that I conclude that although the Yorkists did their best to undermine Henry's position on the throne, and compared to the other threats to Henry, presented the most substantial ones, they were still unable to severely undermine his claim to the throne.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

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



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Try to engage with every term in the question when making your judgements – in this question you would need to assess whether the Yorkist faction 'severely' undermined Henry's rule, both at Bosworth and later in his reign.

Question 3

The majority of candidates had a good grasp of the nature of Kett's rebellion and were able to provide an analysis of what level of threat the rebellion posed. Many answers were able to provide clear criteria although most candidates seemed to avoid referring to the word 'significant' in the question.

However, weaker answers showed inaccurate knowledge and were very descriptive. The coverage of causes and the blow by blow sequence of events clearly deflected from the question focus and allowed the weaker candidates less time to get to the issue of the significance of threat. There was also a tendency to refer to a 'Royal Army' and implied some confusion as to the existence of a standing army. Several candidates also confused the geography of the rebellion, claiming it took place in the 'North'. Similarly there were references to Britain rather than England. The strongest candidates were able to set the rebellion in the context of what was happening with a wider reflection.

Other rebellions, foreign threats and the politics of the Council were referenced by more aware candidates. There were some very well detailed answers and a good understanding of issues of social hierarchy in Tudor England.

The Norfolk rebellion led by Robert Kett in 1536 was, in the words of one historian, 'the closest thing Tudor England saw to a class revolt'; it was an insurrection of predominantly common people becoming so alien to and so incensed by the inherent inequality and unfairness of the Tudor hierarchical system that they rose up in revolt. It was unique among the 6 rebellions studied in this course, in as much as it operated entirely and deliberately independent of gentry or noble supports; as such, one must consider Kett's to be the rebellion of the period which posed the most threat to a personally unfair social system, even if its threat towards the monarchy itself, and the young king Edward, was very limited.

To begin with, one must recognise the way in which Kett's rebellion established itself in direct and potent opposition to the societal injustices of the time, manifest most clearly in the agricultural practices of enclosure, engrossing and villeinage that so riled the

East-Anglian commons'. The rebellion began with the unlawful tearing down of Sir John Flowerden's enclosure in Wymondham, in what one might consider a symbol of the desire to strip away the boundaries hedging the wealthy against the harsh life they forced upon their poorer tenants.

From Kett's family would go on to tear down his own enclosures, suggesting the potential of the rebellion to threaten the Tudor status-quo by influencing the decisions of the landed, which his subsequent decision to attack and capture Norwich might be taken as a retribution against societal inequality itself. Norwich was England's second city, in which 60% of the wealth was owned by 6% of the population, and as such its capture exemplifies the real desire of the rebels to target and tackle the most inequalities of the time, in a manner that fundamentally threatened the a Tudor society based upon those inequalities.

Furthermore, Kett's decision not to petition for gentry support, and to run his rebel camp at Mousehold Heath in the style of the government, was indicative of the threatening ambition of the rebels to demonstrate the possibility of a society founded or at least run by the commons. Rather than attempt to persuade captured gentry members to publicly support the rebellion, Kett's rebels tried these gentry members at the 'Oak of Reformation', absolving all the while by the official

justice system of the time; meanwhile, Kett made a point to requisition supplies and men by issuing writs, in the style of the central government. What this amounted to was a parody of the central government system designed very deliberately to prove that common people could organise and govern themselves without royal support; what this amounted to, in short, was a significant threat to the status and position of the gentry, encapsulated brutally by the bludgeoning to death of Lord Southampton in a skirmish where the rebels attempted to defend Norwich against the Marquis of Northampton's forces.

And indeed it should be remembered that Kett's rebellion enjoyed some significant and significantly threatening military successes: quite apart from capturing Norwich to begin with, they successfully repelled Northampton and his men using highly effective guerrilla tactics on the way. This defeat for the royal forces came just as England and France had begun warring in Boulogne, posing the Duke of Somerset, Edward's protector, with a serious dilemma: he had to commit forces to France, but this risked exposing London itself to an attack by Kett's rebels, which would indeed have posed a significant and almost literal threat to Edward's position on the throne.

Briefly one might also consider the role which Somerset himself played in heightening the threat of the rebellion: his enclosure commissions of 1548, and most

particularly his order to dig up illegal enclosures on 1569, seemed to signal to the rebels that he was on their side, as indeed he had indeed letter of response to the rebels, in which he described their demands as being 'for the most part just'. This placed the government in the very difficult position of joining a rebellion which seemed to be implementing its own policy, a tension which surely threatened its capacity to respond to the rebellion adequately.

And yet, one must recognise that the response was ultimately adequate and more, nullifying the threat which the rebellion posed quite brutally: after the failure of Nottingham, the Earl of Warwick was sent on with some 12 or 16,000 men, and his military prowess ensured a crushing victory for the royal forces at the battle of Dringdale, as many as 6,000 of the rebel forces were killed at the battle, whilst up to 300 captured rebels were hung from the Oak of Reformation, in a gesture clearly designed to reverse the threat which that tree symbolically posed to the social order. Kett himself was tried in London, but sent back to Norwich to be hung on chains, in another powerful message to an East-England people particularly susceptible to rebellion and evidence that such defiance would not resolve itself happily.

Of course, Kett must take some of the burden of responsibility for reducing the threat of the rebellion too, since his inexperience as a military leader ultimately cost the rebels dearly. The decision to move his men from their fortified hilltop position on Mousehold Heath to the open fields of Diss and take played heavily decisively into the hands of Warwick and his cavalry, whilst Kett's reluctance to seize the moment and march on London after defeating Northampton was significant in reducing the overall scope of the threat the rebellion posed.

In fact, one might also question the scope of that threat with reference to the rebels' demands: in their list of grievances, they made clear that gentry members should keep their households and houses, complaining instead that these privileges of the ~~privilege~~ privileged were being replicated lower down the social hierarchy; as such, some of the rebels' demands must be said not to threaten but indeed to uphold the traditions of society, in a manner which seems to ironically undermine the key threat to those structures which the rebellion posed.

In conclusion, therefore, Kett's rebellion would indeed prove itself not to be such a threat as first it seemed, through a combination of inexperienced leadership and strong repression; but, that said, it was and ought to

be remembered as a rebellion concerned with social issues in a ~~more~~ more juster and fairer way, and in raising awareness of the injustices of those issues, as well as in proving that the hierarchy of Tudor society was superfluous. The fundamental idea of Kett's rebellion must be considered very threatening indeed.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Key issues are identified throughout the response and are clearly related back to the question. This candidate has excellent, detailed knowledge which demonstrates a clear and focused understanding of the question. Valid criteria by which to assess the significance of the rebellion are identified in the introduction and referred to throughout the response, before being weighed up fully in the conclusion. This is well structured and well organised – a Level 5 response.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure you are engaging with the actual question asked – is it about cause or consequence, change or continuity, similarity or difference. This is key to ensuring that your essay is well focused and your conclusion reaches a sustained judgement.

Question 4

The issues of the Privy Council reforms were generally recognised by the majority of candidates although knowledge of the changes varied significantly. There was confusion between the Privy Council, the Grand Council and the Privy Chamber and confusion as to whether Cromwell carried out the Reforms or whether they happened after his death. Many candidates were able to recognise alternative turning points although many answers focused on the early parts of the period. Few were able to extend their understanding beyond general assertions and weaker answers did not address the turning point element of the question. These candidates tended to address each monarch in turn rather than considering themes across the period as a whole. In many cases, responses would have been stronger if candidates had analysed more carefully how to assess whether a change was a 'key turning point in the development of royal government'. Only the strongest candidates offered a counter argument that suggested continuity or extended across the period considering post 1540 developments such as the Secretaryship, the Lord Lieutenants and some sense of cooperation with Parliament.

Responses seemed to fall into one of two categories: the essays either focused exclusively on the Privy Council or examined a range of alternatives, barely mentioning the Privy Council.

This clearly caused issues for some in planning and how to judge the significance of the Privy Council.

The variety in the quality of response was considerable.

Privy council	Parliament - precedents +
After 1536 - smaller privy council. 1540 this was officially done, reducing the size to 20. Important - privy council had undermined the monarch before.	extensive power - made a difference throughout period.
(important → Chamber + council were merged under Elizabeth.	Secretary Cromwell - unparalleled.
	1549! WILL!

The reform of the privy council could be seen as the key turning point in the development of

royal government in the given years, because it added to the monarch's authority, limiting the number of influencers who had access to the monarch and decreasing the influence of ~~outside people~~ single individuals over the monarch's power. However, the extent to which one could argue that this was the turning point in the development of royal government, is limited by the fact that the Privy Council was the site of challenges to the authority of the monarch, and sent the development backwards to a certain extent, as the role of the council had declined by the end of the period. It would be more accurate to argue that other factors, such as the development of the role of secretaries, and Parliaments that allowed royal government to develop hugely in this time, as it was through these institutions that the monarchs were able to assert their authority over the Catholic church, and ~~the~~ use taxation in peacetime. Therefore, one could disagree to a great extent.

The privy council's reform in 1540 could be seen as a key turning point in the development of royal government, because it showed that discussions between

a smaller number of nobles was more effective than discussion in Parliament, or among larger groups of 40-50 in previous royal councils. Indeed, the reform was brought about by the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536: in a response to this threat, a smaller council met to discuss how Henry VIII should respond, which proved effective in putting down the rebellion. The reform that came about in ~~184~~ 1540 was as a result of the fall of Cromwell, who had previously taken on a huge role as Secretary, and therefore the central institution needed to take on his role and act as the 'first minister'. This demonstrated a movement away from the dominance of individuals such as Wolsey and Cromwell, ~~other~~ as was needed, as they had caused so much resentment. Therefore, some might argue that this was a key turning point in the development of royal government.

However, this argument could be seen as significantly limited when considering that the council was easily dominated by individuals after Henry's death, due to the Duke of Somerset's control over Edward VI, due to his role as

Lord Protector. The Council couldn't stop Somerset, ~~then~~ Seymour from gaining access to the privy chamber and using the dry stamp to alter Henry's will, and as a result, he had somewhat unlimited power, ~~beca~~ and didn't use the council as much as he should, leading to him being overthrown by the Duke of Northumberland after ~~1546~~ Kett's rebellion of 1549. Furthermore, the council undermined the authority of Elizabeth I significantly, because they sent the death warrant of Mary, Queen of Scots, to without Elizabeth's permission, resulting in her execution. When considering this, one can see that the argument that the reform of the privy council was the key turning point in the development of local government, is severely limited, because where other institutions helped to extend royal authority, the council after 1540 was a key access point for factions and challenges to the monarch's authority.

As different institutions ^{that} could be seen as a key factor in the ~~etc~~ development of royal government in these years, was the development of the role of Parliament. The key turning point in the role of Parliament,

was the 1534 Act of Supremacy, to a certain extent, because the use of Parliamentary statute to enforce religious changes at this point meant that Parliament had to be consulted for any further religious changes throughout the period, extremely enhancing the power of Parliament, and taking the first step towards the modern system of parliamentary sovereignty. Indeed, after 1534, Parliament was used to legitimise the dissolution of the monasteries in an act allowing those with a smaller income of under £200 a year to be dissolved, and again, one allowing the ~~monaster~~ larger monasteries to be stripped of their assets in 1539. This meant that, when Mary I attempted to return Britain to the control of the Pope in 1554, she could not restore the religious state to its original glory, as the land of the monasteries had been legally sold to members of the gentry, ~~or~~ and nobility, creating a revenue of £1.3 million. Similarly, in 1559, Elizabeth I had to split the legislation regarding supremacy into two halves, in order to ensure it passed in one House of Lords. Parliament was also a key

in the development of royal government in that, in 1525, ~~the~~ an unprecedented peacetime subsidy was granted, allowing Henry VIII ~~and~~ ~~the~~ to spend more money on military expeditions. Therefore, it could be argued that the privy council's reform in 1540 ~~did not constitute a~~ was insignificant in terms of the development of royal government, because Parliament's increasing authority due to the Act of Supremacy in 1534 was much more significant.

Another ~~was~~ key turning point to consider in the development of royal government in the given period was the impact Cromwell had on the role of secretary. Indeed, Cromwell was instrumental in passing the ~~ref~~ religious reforms mentioned above, and he ~~secretly~~ orchestrated the dissolution of the monasteries, despite the fact that Henry VIII had obvious Catholic sympathies. The dominance of Cromwell's role as secretary was so significant that, after he fell in 1540, the role was divided among two men, and remained so for the rest of the period, with one secretary always being more dominant than the other. Before Cromwell was appointed as secretary in 1534,

this role had been influential, but was very limited in comparison to what Cromwell managed to do with it. Later, under Elizabeth, the role of secretary was the same level of importance, with William Cecil having a huge influence over Elizabeth's decisions. This helped royal government to develop because it allowed the monarch to have less of a role in ~~court~~ politics on the national scale, but still uphold their authority, as Henry VIII did. This was a significant factor, and, indeed, ~~from~~ Cromwell's ~~the~~ role as secretary was a more important turning point than the reform of the privy council, because the development of Cromwell's role caused this. Therefore, one could disagree with the statement, to a great extent.

In conclusion, although the development of the Privy Council was important throughout the period, the reform of the Council in 1540 cannot be seen as the key turning point, because the 1534 Act of Supremacy was more significant, in that ~~it expanded~~ it expanded the role of parliament, allowing monarchs to enforce the supremacy more effectively through

this partly elected body. The role of Secretary was also more significant, but overall Parliament's authority increasing was the main development of government in this period. **TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 20 MARKS**



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a detailed response which focuses on the turning point of the 1540 reforms of the Privy Council, comparing this to other factors and events. The answer is analytical and largely detailed – however the candidate does not cover the period sufficiently (less than 75% of the period is discussed). Valid criteria are established to make the argument and the evaluation is substantiated. This is a Level 4 response due to not covering the full range of 1485–1603.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

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

Question 5

Most candidates had some knowledge of patronage and the part it played in Tudor government and made an attempt to compare it with two or three other aspects of government, but they differed in the degree to which they could give examples of how it worked in practice. The best answers were able to explore the relationship between patronage and other aspects of government to reach a well justified conclusion. In less strong answers, there were quite a lot of sweeping claims about the effectiveness of different aspects of government, such as JPs or progresses, without much evidence to support them. Some candidates were challenged by the phrasing 'the use of patronage' and just what this meant, with some just focusing on ennobling whilst other stronger candidates recognising the use of monopolies and adding progresses.

Weaker candidates tended to draw examples primarily from Henry VII and Henry VIII with answers lacking accuracy and relevance. Stronger candidates discussed Lord Lieutenants, Council of the North and JPs with good examples. Here evaluation was often well deployed and factors were weighed up against each other. The strongest answers also considered problems associated with patronage and how it could also cause division including that because patronage was fairly exclusive, other factors had to be important for controlling the broader population.

From 1485 - 1603 Tudor monarchs were forced to use many systems to maintain control of the kingdom, especially in areas such as the North which were isolated from London as a centre of government. Patronage certainly played a part in this, as it ensured that many nobles relied on the monarchy for their power and remained loyal. ~~In addition to this were the~~ However, it is questionable whether this was the primary tactic allowing monarchical control, as the use of royal progresses, reforms in the North and Wales, as well as the growing role of the JPs were also significant - and perhaps it was only a combination of these factors that meant the Tudor rule remained largely ^{stable} ~~in authority~~ authoritative over its kingdom.

Arguably the monarch for whom patronage was most important was Henry VIII - although it continued until 1603 to be a significant method of control. Henry awarded his most trustworthy nobles with patronage, which ensured they represented his desires & authority across the Kingdom. Jasper Tudor, for example, was made Duke of Bedford, and president of the Council of Wales and the Marches in 1490. ~~He~~ Henry VIII continued this method, exemplified by Charles Brandon being made Duke of Suffolk. This placed Brandon in an occasionally unstable area, ensuring a reliable representative in a difficult region.

~~Under Edward~~ From Edward to Elizabeth's reign the use of patronage was somewhat limited, as Seymour in 1549 and Robert Cecil in 1596 ~~to~~ manipulated it to reward their own supporters - such as ~~the~~ John Dudley for Seymour, ~~and the Earl of Essex~~ ~~to~~ ~~John~~ ~~Cecil~~. The system of patronage remained ultimately under Elizabeth's control, however, and she used it to ensure control in ways such as awarding William Cecil multiple offices from 1568, because he was known to be loyal. The system of patronage was significant in maintaining Tudor control, because it ~~ensured~~ ~~the~~ ensured the nobility were reliant on the

monarchy for power and remained mostly loyal.

Patronage was not, however, the only way of governing the localities. Royal progresses were also significant, as they ensured that the monarch's presence was felt and the commons were reminded of their loyalties. It is significant, therefore, that Henry VII visited both the isolated areas of the North and South East in the early years of his reign, as this may have contributed to his facing no open rebellion. Henry VIII, however, failed to visit the North until 1541, after the Pilgrimage of Grace - the largest rebellion of the Tudor Rule. Though the tradition lapsed under Edward IV and Mary I, Elizabeth travelled on a yearly basis and visited local government members, which strengthened their loyalties to her. Once again, however, she neglected visits beyond Lincolnshire, which may have been a reason for the 1569 rebellion around Durham. Progresses, therefore, were effective when used, but were not the monarch's primary sources of control.

Instead, in isolated and distant areas of the North and Wales, significant reforms were made which allowed power to be further extended into

the localities. The 1535 and 1542 Law in Wales Acts introduced firstly English government in countries controlled by sheriffs, followed by English law. This meant that the once lawless area, a primitive and somewhat lawless Wales, where blood feuds were legal, was brought under English control and caused no instability for the rest of Tudor rule. Though the North proved less co-operative, the 1537 reforms to the Council of the North certainly extended Tudor control. The council became responsible for passing on royal proclamations and dealt with legal cases such as theft, meaning it represented the monarch and maintained a higher degree of stability. The president was to be a bishop or ~~son~~ member of the nobility from the south or midlands, which ensured unbiased leadership such as the Bishop of Llandaff from 1640 - and ultimately this reform proved a key in Tudor monarchs' control of the complex and often unstable north of England.

A method of government used throughout the kingdom and key in governing the localities was the use of JPs. County benches of JPs grew from around 10 in 1485 to up to 90 by 1603,

demonstrating how significant they were as an instrument of local government. JPs were often also ~~council~~ members of the Council of the North or ~~the~~ Privy Council, meaning they were increasingly efficient & experienced representatives of the monarch. ~~The~~ By 1601 there were 306 Acts of Parliament ~~extending~~ the powers of the JPs, so that they had roles such as administration of the 1598 ~~Act for the Relief of the Poor~~ ^{Act for the Relief of the Poor} and dealing with legal cases such as witchcraft. JPs also helped to maintain financial control through administration of the 1513 Tudor subsidy, ~~and~~ using direct assessment. All of these developments in Tudor government relied on the JPs to enforce them, which suggests their roles were enormously significant in the government of the localities.

To conclude, the use of patronage was a significant way in which ^{Tudor} monarchs retained control of the kingdom, but it was not the primary method. ~~It was a combination of targeted patronage~~ While changes to Wales and the North in local government and the use of progresses were important, it was

patronage that ensured the loyalty of the nobility and the use of JPs that ensured the control of the commons. It was, therefore, a combination of the two that provided the strong base for Tudor government of the localities.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

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



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

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

Paper Summary

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

Section A

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

Sections B and C

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

Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

