

Examiners' Report
June 2018

GCE History 9HI0 30

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2018

Publications Code 9HI0_30_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

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

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

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It should be reiterated 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 its meaning or to 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, comments on all the things that the source might have contained, but failed to do so, is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. However, as was noted in last summer's report, weaker candidates often wanted to turn questions into a main factor/other factors approach, even where this was not appropriate to the focus of the question. 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 should 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, candidates were better prepared this year to engage with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. This is a breadth question and the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded that, as pointed out in last summer's report, this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at level 4 candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology.

In both Sections B and C when dealing with AO1, not all candidates demonstrated a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on

which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

Overall there continues to be challenging handwriting, poor spelling and errors in grammar and punctuation. Paragraphing was missing from some responses. The last bullet point in the mark scheme for sections B & C includes 'communicated with clarity' and 'well organised' so the structure of the response is key here. Very few answers included a plan and this was reflected in the unstructured way that some questions were answered.

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

Question 1

Overall candidates engaged with the source and were able to focus on at least one line of the enquiry. At the higher levels candidates were able to focus on both enquiries and were aware of the origin of the source. At the top level candidates were able to confidently assess the reasons for victory and interlink this to support. Most candidates knew something about Polydore Vergil and therefore could make general points about limitations due to provenance. Few candidates though were able to link inferences with meaningful comments about provenance and contextual own knowledge. A few excellent answers “dug into” the source and pulled out valid inferences, integrating examination of the source’s attributes to test the value of the source for what it could reveal about the specific enquiries. Some candidates failed to allow the source to drive the answer in terms of analysis and concentrated on superficial comments regarding provenance. There was a greater tendency to write huge swathes of information without direct quotation from the source. Historical context was provided though on occasion knowledge drove the answer and the source was incidental, which held answers back. Another issue was that often when limitations were explored, there were misconceptions around what qualified as a limitation that could impact upon the weight of the source. These answers focused on what was missing, which often led to listing of events that had been omitted. It was common for candidates to apportion weight based on what the source had omitted, without qualifying why this was missing (propaganda or a leading source). In higher level answers, weight was often apportioned according to provenance – though often stereotypical judgements about the Tudors /Henry VII were made. More nuanced judgements about the provenance were rarer, but some insightful comments were made. Some answers did not offer a judgement on the value of the source, though they had noted characteristics which would suggest a value or limitation, but failed to link it back to the question. Therefore judgements regarding utility were implicit in many cases or distinct judgements were made regarding the source and the candidate’s prior knowledge of Richard III rather than being specifically linked to the question. Candidates should aim to do this in their conclusions.

1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the nature of support for Henry Tudor and the reasons for his victory at Bosworth in 1485.

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

(20)

The source I was written by Polydore Vergil. This immediately makes the source valuable as Vergil was one of the most noted chroniclers of Henry VII's reign. The source's value is further increased by the fact that Vergil used interviews from eye-witness accounts to build a coherent picture. However, this does pose slight limitations in the sense that the source is not from the writer's own eye-witness account and this may have led to some discrepancies, particularly as those interviewed would almost certainly have come from the victor Henry VII's side meaning that they would have an agenda of justifying Henry's usurpation of the throne in 1485. The fact that Henry himself commissioned the writings would indicate that he had a certain interest in the writings, which most probably would have been to legitimise his shaky claim to the throne and this certainly was a priority to

Henry as he is although he had descended ~~through~~ from Edward III it was through John of Gaunt's illegitimate affair with his long standing mistress Katherine Swinford and although the later Beaufort line was legitimated, the situation was far from ideal. Therefore the value of the source is slightly limited by Henry VII's involvement in its creation. However the source is also valuable from the point of view discussing the reasons for Henry's victory at Bosworth and one of the principal reasons was that Henry was able to gather significant support due to the failings of Richard III. The fact that Polydore Vergil wrote the source, therefore makes it extremely valuable as although Vergil wrote at the time of Henry VII⁽¹⁵¹³⁾, has a large proportion of his work focus on Richard III making the source ~~or~~ ~~then~~ valuable. Therefore despite slight problems in the agenda of the source, the provenance of the source, ~~was~~ ~~it~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~the~~ ~~author~~ of the source and his analytical methods make the source's provenance significantly useful.

The source's content makes the source valuable in the sense that it reveals that the nature of support for Henry was diverse as well as from popular support of nobility and commoners alike.

Almost a third of the source is dedicated to the aftermath of the battle of Bosworth and the focus on 'eternal thanks' to Henry's captain as well as 'the soldiers' saluted him' are all in place to allow the reader upon inference that Henry VII received ~~popular~~ significant proportion of support to allow him to overcome the exiled Richard and replace him on the throne. Whilst the primary purpose of these two phrases may have been to justify Henry's usurpation, they still makes the source significant in revealing the surprising levels of support Henry gained. Henry Tudor had been exiled for much of his life spending time in France as tending the world on pilgrimage and other noble activities, therefore the fact that he had been able to return and conjure up an army able to defeat the king's forces shows that a primary reason for Henry's victory was the dislike of Richard which was certainly widespread due to the accusations that Richard had murdered the Prince in the tower as a way of strengthening his own claim to the throne. Another aspect

in Henry's victory according to Vergil was the divine ruling that he should be victorious. Religion was a key part of medieval politics and the reference to Henry 'immediately' giving thanks to almighty God is a clear reference to the fact that God had clearly decided that he should be ruler. ~~That~~ Although this is less useful now in terms of reasons for Henry's victory, it does provide very useful evidence that one of the main justifications Henry gave at the time for his usurpation was that it was the will of God and this focus on religion was highlighted by Henry's pleasure at the Pope's papal dispensation allowing him to marry Elizabeth of York, uniting the two houses and effectively ending the Wars of the Roses. Therefore the support Henry received is well highlighted in the source making it valuable in revealing the nature of Henry's support, ~~as well as reasons for~~

The source is also useful in depicting the reasons of the victory of Henry in 1513 as it makes clear mention of the role William Stanley played and this was the most significant factor in Henry's victory.

at Bosworth making the source valuable in depicting the reasons for Henry's victory. The source accurately refers to William Stanley and his 3000 men interceding at a pivotal stage of battle and allowing Henry to claim victory. This increases the value of the source as it shows clearly one of the most significant factors and the role it played in 'men taking to their heels' which did occur and led to a massacre as the bad weather combined with fast rivers meant many died in attempting to escape. Lord Stanley was a very influential noble and his large number of sons increased the family's wealth and land holdings. Richard required the support of Stanley and so held his son Thomas Stanley hostage in an attempt at forcing William Stanley's support. However, the Stanleys were reluctant to fight as they wanted to protect their considerable wealth and holdings and did not want to lose them by choosing the wrong side. Therefore William Stanley waited until the tide of Henry began to win and then interceded allowing a resound victory to be won. The fact that the source makes clear reference

to the role played by William Stanley makes it significantly valuable in revealing reasons for Henry VII's victory at the battle of Bosworth. However, the source is very slightly limited by its failure to mention Stanley rather cowardice choosing instead to focus on how great he was, no doubt a ploy to avoid embarrassing the king and taking away from the resounding military victory in which he used to justify his kingship. Nonetheless the in revealing the reasons for the victory of Henry VII at the battle of Bosworth the source is valuable and does well.

Overall despite slight limitations in the provenance and portrayal of the events of the battle of Bosworth the source is significantly valuable to a historian as it accurately highlights the nature of support for Henry as well as the reasons for his military victory by mentioning the role of God, his address as well as the role of William Stanley and his role in the battle of Bosworth.



In this response the candidate focuses clearly on the source throughout. The candidate considers provenance and the nature of the source and uses this to reach a supported judgement. Contextual knowledge is used to develop the ideas presented in the source. This response has a particularly strong introduction which considers the provenance and the two enquiries - this is a level 5 response.



Make sure that you link provenance to the content of the source and that the knowledge applied is used as contextual knowledge to assess the source.

Question 2

This was by far the most popular question in Section B. At the lower levels, candidates described the foreign campaign of Henry V. At the higher levels, candidates were able to offer an analytical focus showing balance. The strongest responses were able to discuss thematic successes and focused on the short and long term judgement. A significant number of candidates wrote at length about Agincourt and on occasion these answers tended to drift off the focus of the question or focused too much on description rather than analysis. Fewer candidates considered Henry V's later campaigns. The majority of candidates made some sort of evaluation based mostly on military, diplomatic and economic criteria. However links between events were not always noted or fully explored in this question and this hindered some of the arguments made. This was surprising given the clear correlation between some of the events. The best answers explicitly set out criteria for "complete" success at the outset and following a line of argument. Engagement with the term 'complete' was a discriminator between mid and top level answers and candidates are advised to consider every word in the question. The most able candidates were able to say whether it was a success in personal, political or financial terms and discuss within those terms, while weaker candidates tended to focus on the military successes only. A significant number of candidates did not write about Scrope's Rebellion at all, which was important in creating unrest and providing a stumbling block to the stability much needed by Henry IV and his government. A common error was to extend answers beyond 1521.

Henry V's campaigns in France were a great although not complete success in the years 1415-21. During the period 1415-21 HV was deemed to be highly successful and won the support of England but by the end of the period it was starting to become clear that the campaigns were not bringing just success but also deep long term issues with legacy and peace that would be a burden on the crown for the coming decades. *(at the end)

Henry V's campaigns in France have played a huge part in British perceptions. His success in 1415 was especially significant as England was to have the 'underdogs'. After settling such internal matters such as the Southampton Plot and Oldcastle's rebellion in 1414, Henry V felt stable and strong enough to invade France. His campaign started with Harfleur in 1415 and three weeks later he was met by the French King's forces at Agincourt. England was definitely

admired in the battle, contemporaries in their pride tend to exaggerate the numbers though are fairly reliable since suggest 9000 to 12000. With the use of longbows and Henry V's great military tactics England was able to defeat the French. The win at the battle of Agincourt was a complete success for Henry V's time, pride as he had achieved what he had wanted to with very few fatalities on the English side. Once returning home his victories were also viewed as a success by Parliament who in 1416 granted Henry V 'pardonage and livery' for life which was unheard of. They were immensely proud of him and were initially very keen to offer him all the taxes he wanted. In London there was processions to welcome him when he was rewarded lavishly. Contemporaries viewed him very highly and believed him to be blessed by God for his achievements in defeating the French.

However Henry V did not stop there and planned to go further to fulfil his pride. He was helped greatly by seeing etc

Anglo-Burgundian alliance in 1419 after the Armagnacs had murdered John the Fearless in 1419 also. The Armagnacs tended to support the dauphin so the Burgundians allied with the English in spite of trying to remove the dauphin from heir to the throne. With the help of the Burgundians in 1419 Henry V besieged Rouen the capital of Normandy. Henry V used his great military tactics to drive them out until they surrendered. After seeing Rouen a few days later Charles in 1420 offered Henry V the Treaty of Troyes which made the marriage to Catherine of Valois but also the date in which designated the dauphin as made Henry V's heir the heir of both the French and English throne. This was a huge personal success for Henry V who felt he had achieved great things for the English monarchy and drove back what they had lost since 1360 Treaty of Brétigny.

However despite being a personal success for Henry V, his campaigns in France were not a complete success in the late year. The campaigns were extremely expensive

and led the country to bankruptcy. Despite their earlier enthusiasm by the 1420's Parliament was coming to realise that this could not go on for much longer. This is evident in the fact that they may have rejected his requests for tax in the late stages. The debt incurred by Henry V was so bad that by his death, his jewels and ships had to be sold to pay for his funeral. Therefore in Parliament's opinion Henry V's campaigns were not a success financially.

Furthermore Henry V's campaigns were not a success as it was unsustainable.

Henry V was an undeniably great leader and warrior but at his death his only heir was 9 months old Henry VI who even by his magnificence could not live up to the legacy of his father. Desiring the dauphin had made his eagerness to get back what was his what was not just easy when the king is only 9 months old. As historian Jerris said Henry V had the Janus Deas effect. He died at the prime time at his peak for his campaigns to be viewed as successful in the

history of England and the Monarchy. However had he lived any longer his extreme debt would have been added to contemporary and his father would have absconded with success.

To conclude Henry V's campaign in France was a great personal success - the years 1415-21. To himself and many contemporaries he had made England a place to be reckoned with and revitalised the monarchy. He had done back what had once been lost in 1360 and for him that was a matter of pride. However for Parliament Henry V's campaign was only a success at the start when his victories and pride he provided for the country were overshadowing the financial issues. Furthermore the nobles were very pleased with all the land they were receiving from what Henry V had obtained so they did not complain. However by the end of the period Parliament realised that Henry V's success for personal and country pride had also brought financial failures that would not be recovered.

for many decades after. Furthermore unbeknownst to Henry V he had created an unsustainable legacy for his heir Henry VI which would never be fulfilled making it a long term failure.

* Henry V's campaign in France was a complete success for himself. He had asserted himself in France and had made his heir the next in line to the French throne. However for ~~the~~ ^{Henry VI} not later Kings ~~the~~ Henry V's campaigns were not a complete success and actually lead to the downfall as he created an unsustainable legacy and created huge amounts of debt. Finally for England it was a success in terms of legacy however for the negative impact it had post Henry V's reign it wasn't that successful.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is an excellent answer that is focused and detailed throughout with clear links to the question. The response is clearly organised with supporting evidence, reaching a substantiated conclusion - a strong level 5 response.



Make sure that you refer back to the terms used in the question frequently so that your answer is focused and you reach a clear judgement.

Question 3

This was not as popular as question 2. At lower levels, candidates looked only at one element within the question either 'growing ambitions of York' or 'Henry VI's hold on the throne'. At other levels, candidates were able to discuss threats to Henry's hold on power – not always focusing on significance. At the higher levels, candidates were able to analytically determine the validity of the question. For the most part, the knowledge deployed was detailed, accurate and relevant and was used to meet the conceptual demands of the question, however many missed the conceptual focus or the date range. Some candidates did not focus on the Duke of York and a significant number did but the depth on the stated factor in the hypothesis impeded the overall argument. The majority of candidates wrote a far stronger counter argument than argument. Surprisingly few approached the question by discussing whether Richard actually did always have ambitions – this is hinted by the word "growing" in the question - and this inhibited answers somewhat. Consequently, many candidates resorted to gathering all of their knowledge about York into one paragraph after the introduction, before commencing a counter argument that was not always linked back to the factor in the question. Few candidates were aware of York's dynastic threat to Henry VI and many appeared unaware of the actions taken by others that led to York's actions. Weaker candidates were able to tell the story of the rise and fall of the Duke of York, but did not compare him to other factors. Most candidates were able to say that either York, or Henry's mental illness, was the biggest problem in Henry's reign, but were not able to delve into further detail - such as the Parliament of Devils, and analysis of the role of Margaret of Anjou was limited. The strongest candidates were able to evaluate numerous factors, York, Henry's illness, Margaret of Anjou, the crown's finances, with confidence and reach a sustained and well argued conclusion.

The role of Richard duke of York can be viewed as a significant threat to Henry VI held on the throne in the years 1454 to 1460, however other significant factors can also be viewed as significant in the threat to Henry VI held on the throne, for example Henry VI own mental stability as well as the manipulation of his wife Margaret of Anjou and the development of the role of the 16th earl of Warwick also caused problems.

There is a lot of debate as to how far Richard duke of York wanted to protect the kingship or whether through his two protectorates he wanted to establish a personal ambition for the throne. There is no doubt that Richard duke of York was unhappy with the kingship and this can be seen as in his first protectorate of the realm in 1454 he imprisoned a former favourite of Henry VI, Somerset. Actions such as these provide evidence to possibly suggest that these were early warning signs of the threat that Richard duke of York faced. In 1455, the first battle of St Albans resulted in a

win for the Yorkists, showing both the power that York had personally as well as through his military. The battle in 1455 shows that a threat was never far away in terms of Henry VI's kingship. There is also further evidence to show that growing ambitions were a threat during his Second Protectorate of the realm. It must be mentioned that the protector of the realm was a huge responsibility and the way that this was governed provides a snapshot of how possibly Henry Richard Duke of York would manage the country. During Richard Duke of York's Second Protectorate in 1455 Richard Neville was appointed the captain of Calais, this responsibility gave more control and suggested that possibly York's ambitions were growing. All of this evidence provides reasoning that in the years 1454 to 1460 there was definitely a growth in ambition that challenged Henry VI's throne, however there are also other factors that need to be considered such as the manipulation of Margaret of Anjou and the downfall of Henry VI's mental capability.

It can be argued that the marriage between Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou through the treaty of Tours in 1444 created a lot of negative backlash firstly in

the treaty the area of Maine was to be given up, which enraged the people of England. As well as this the marriage brought no dowry which can be seen as very damaging in financial terms. The role of Margaret of Anjou can be seen as a threat to Henry VI as she wanted to implement her own agenda. For example pro peace with France therefore allied with people such as Somerset and Suffolk in a pro peace faction. This can be seen as a threat as many people didn't like this idea of a pro peace stance. These actions at large can be seen as influential and as well as this her character and personality can be seen as very damaging. She was very unhelpful and did not act in the norms of a wife of a king. These characteristics meant that more people wanted to align with the Yorkist faction and endeavor land that had been lost to the French. Previous to Henry VI, his father Henry V had been very successful in operations in France and it can be seen that because of the manipulation times had changed. When describing the manipulation of Margaret of Anjou it must also be discussed about how the role of Henry VI mental state created a significant threat to how long he could hold the throne for. It can be argued that because of the mental

State of Henry VI Margaret of Anjou could develop her own personal agenda. The role of Henry VI's mental state deteriorating meant that Richard duke of York was given the role of protector. It can be argued by many contemporaries that if Henry VI mental state had not deteriorated Richard duke of York would not have been given those positions, thus reducing the threat. There are also other ways that the mental state of Henry VI affected the throne, the sign of a weak king meant more people were willing to contest for the throne. These factors show that there were other threats to the throne although this is the case there is also evidence to show that from 1456 to 1460 the role of Richard duke of York should not be overestimated.

There is evidence to show that the role Richard duke of York played from 1456 to 1460 was not to challenge the throne. For example after the battle of St Alban in 1455, the result showed that Richard possibly didn't want the crown. He described how he wanted to get rid of evil councillors and how he plead allegiance to Henry VI. As well as this the role of both protectors should not be overestimated as after both protectors many decisions he had made were

outwitted by Henry VI, for example he released Somerset from prison and at the 'parliament of devils' where all Yorkists were disinherited. In the time 1454-1460 although there is a large debate that there was a threat from the duke of York many decisions from York and others showed that there was not a "Personal ambition" that many perceived. Those actions show that Henry VI was in fact not at a huge threat. As well as this Richard duke of York was killed in 1460 showing the threat was stopped, Richard duke of York died at the battle of Wakefield. Although it is known that support shifted then to his son who caused massive problems for Henry VI when assessing the role of Richard duke of York many actions suggest it was not as significant.

When assessing the factor of significance, it can be seen that actions from both his first and second protector and the battle of Tewkesbury showed that the duke of York could definitely pose a threat to Henry VI, although this was the case there are also other significant factors that played a role in the threat to Henry VI reign, for example the manipulation of Margaret of Anjou combined with the deterioration of Henry

VI. Mental State Caused Problems, as well as this the level of significance has to be analysed as there were certain actions that reduced the threat for example the recalcitrant of de Witt, all these factors contribute to threats to Henry VI held on the throne from 1454-1460.

Overall the role of the Duke of York can be seen as significant in posing a threat to the throne, however factors such as the manipulation of Margaret of Anjou and Henry VI mental state can be seen as significant, and limitations that Duke of York had from 1454-1460.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good answer which just gets into level 5 - the candidate sets out the criteria for judgement in the introduction and follows this up throughout the essay. The points made are well reasoned although there could be slightly more depth and development in parts and the conclusion could be developed further. Overall a well argued response.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you leave enough time to write a developed conclusion which directly answers the question and is backed up with evidence.

Question 4

For the most part, the knowledge deployed was detailed, accurate and relevant and was used to meet the conceptual demands of the question. At lower levels, candidates had a very shaky awareness of what retaining was and described some elements of the king losing hold on power. At mid level, candidates were able to discuss some of the periods where retaining decreased along with other influences. A majority focused on the use of maintained men by nobles and, mostly implicitly, set a criteria for importance around the threat to the crown. At higher levels, candidates were able to assess the accuracy of the question. The best answers attempted to set criteria at the outset and looked at how the importance of retaining fluctuated. Weaker candidates did not know what a retinue was, and the stronger ones were able to describe how each monarch was able to raise an army. A number of candidates only discussed one or two monarchs and were unsure of attempts to curtail retaining. These candidates struggled to provide the necessary range for a breadth question. Many candidates made the mistake of stating that Henry V proved that retaining was no longer important because of his successes in France. Here a number of candidates found difficulties with the term 'decreased' in a period where the importance of retaining fluctuated. Stronger candidates were able to compare monarchs successfully, highlighting how it reaches its zenith during the reign of Henry VI before Edward IV and Henry VII restrict it greatly; at this stage some candidates made statements like "this shows it was no longer important by the reign of Edward IV" whilst stronger candidates were able to link Edward and Henry's actions with the importance of retaining, i.e., action had to be taken because it had become too significant to ignore. The highest scored candidates were able to do this successfully and convincingly.

Chosen question number: **Question 4** ☒

Important

~~Yes~~ King

· Over-mighty subjects eg; York HV1

· easier to ~~decide who was~~ ~~pay~~ in retinue

· raise an army
~~HVII act not relevant~~

Not important

~~No~~ King

· EIV act

· HVII act

Question 5 ☒

Important

~~Yes~~ Nobles

· Boling broke : Duchy of Lancaster

· increased loyalty to them

· livery = show strength and unity

Not important

~~No~~ Nobles

· families such as the Yorks already powerful

· Peacocks, no retinue but still caused local disputes

Retaining was a feature of the Middle Ages

in which Nobles could earn the loyalty of a ~~retent~~

retinue by giving them a form of maintenance. To

say that the importance of retaining decreased from

1399-1509 ~~was~~ it must have had less of an

effect on the power of the King and ~~the power~~ ^{less of an}

effect on the power of the Nobility. Therefore, to

discover how accurate it is to say that retaining

decrease it's importance you must assess times when

it was important to the King and Nobles and times when

the importance was lessened for both the King and Nobles.

Firstly, there is evidence to suggest that there was a

heavy importance to the king. For example, retaining would have been a key issue for someone like Henry IV. Henry usurped in 1399 and as a usurper, needed to ensure that he could justify his claim to the throne. One way he did this was by retaining. He kept hold of his retinue within the Duchy of Lancaster which would also mean that if he was usurped also, he would still have large levels of loyalty from his affinity. Secondly, it was important to kings as it often caused a case of an 'over-mighty' subject' to arise. The Duke of York is an example of an 'over-mighty subject' as after he was removed from his second Protectorate, he increased his retinue significantly in order to raise an army against Henry VI. Thirdly, retaining was also important to kings as it allowed them to have an army in case of ~~the~~ national and international disputes. For example, Henry VII used his nobles' retinues to fight in the Yorkshire and Cornish rebellions of 1489 and 1497. This meant that he could easily put them down and continue as a strong king. Overall, this suggests that retaining's importance didn't change as even in 1497, it was used largely by kings.

On the other hand, there is also evidence to suggest that retaining wasn't important for king's. Firstly, Edward IV introduced an act against retaining in 1464 where he only allowed the retaining of servants and members of the

household. This made it less important as it meant that King's thereafter should have to worry less about being overthrown by an 'over-mighty subject'. Nevertheless the term 'member of household' acted as a sort of loophole so in reality the threat was still there. Secondly, Henry VII also introduced a retaining legislation. He made it so that all retainers had to be approved by the king and that ~~anyone~~ they had to have signed documentation in the form of a license. This decreased the importance of retaining as it meant that they were less likely to challenge the stability of the throne. Overall, retaining's importance did change for kings as there was legislation introduced which made it more restricted and therefore less harmful. However, people found loopholes in these acts so the extent to which the importance decreased is limited.

Secondly, there is also evidence to suggest that retaining was important for Nobles. For example, Henry Bolingbroke, without the Duchy of Lancaster he may not have been able to usurp the throne and therefore retaining an affinity was very important to him. Secondly, retaining increased the amount of loyalty they had. Warwick had a large retinue in the 1460s which allowed him to get Henry VI reinstated on the throne. This can be further supported as livery showed their strength and unity. Under Richard III, Nobles used livery extensively on Tudor and Lancastrian Roses which effectively separated the two sides of the Wars of the Roses. This was

important to Nobles as it meant that they were highly involved in the rose disputes. Overall, retaining was very important to Nobles as it increased peoples loyalty to them and meant they had power or didn't.

On the other hand, retaining was also unimportant for Nobles in some ways. Firstly, many Noble families had support without a retinue. For example, the title of Duke of York gave someone large levels of authority or power even without a large affinity. Secondly, some families caused issues without a retinue. For example, the Paston family were from a gentry class and, as unexpected as it was from members of the gentry, caused a significant local dispute. Therefore, retaining's importance is lessened. However, on the whole there are more examples of retinues being vital, particularly in the later years of the 15th century, implying that the importance of retaining, for Nobles at least, did not change.

In conclusion, ~~it is mostly a~~ it is partly accurate to say that retaining's importance decreased. For Kings, legislation was introduced in the second half of the century which meant that the extent to which retaining was used was decreased. However, there were loopholes and so Kings such as Richard III and Henry VII still had to face issues with retaining. For Nobles, although their ability to retain was slightly limited, the importance to them hardly increased as a large retinue still increased their power. By 1509,

Henry VII still suffered with rebellions fuelled by the military forces of retinues and Nobles continued to supply them. Therefore, on the whole, it is mostly inaccurate to say that retaining decreased in importance in the years 1399-1509.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Overall this answer is focused and has a balanced argument. There is sufficient knowledge although there is a slight lack of depth in parts. The criteria used for judgement are valid but slightly lacking in depth and the argument is largely coherent - a level 4 response.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you have a plan to ensure your answer is focused and covers the date range of the question.

Question 5

This was the more popular of the breadth questions. At lower levels, candidates simply described the Parliament of 1406. These candidates described Parliament and how they attempted to control the monarch. For example, many candidates answered an essay describing a series of turning points and included the Long Parliament as one of them. Narrative accounts were common in this question for weaker candidates and some answered in a story format, describing the differing relationships between monarchs and their parliaments of the period. This meant that knowledge was detailed and accurate, but a number of answers were lacking in explanation and analysis. Alternatively candidates working at the lower levels did not know what the Long Parliament was or did not have enough knowledge to write anything of substance. A significant number lacked the most important part of the essay, therefore lacking depth. Candidates working at the higher levels were able to determine areas of turning points/significance and especially focus on the given factor. The more successful answers attempted to set meaningful criteria – this time around the idea of what constitutes a turning point comparing the stated turning point to other potential points in the chronology where the power of Parliament saw a marked change. Knowledge deployed was generally good, though there were some chronological misconceptions. A number of candidates struggled with the idea of 1406 as a "turning point". Weaker candidates only focused on that one Parliament, with perhaps some fleeting mention of other parliaments. Candidates also struggled with how to assess the Parliament of Devils, many accurately stated it had been "packed" with Lancastrian supporters, but then wrongly stated that this showed the power of the King was greatly diminished. Stronger candidates were able to compare Parliaments across the time period, but still struggled with the idea of 1406 as a turning point - with many bringing in the Parliaments of Richard II to show how Parliament's power had changed, whilst technically correct it would be outside the time frame of the question.

During the years 1344 - 1509 it can be argued that the power of the parliament increased, and gradually became so great it rivaled, or at times, even dominated the power of the King. I would argue that the power of parliament did increase between 1344 and 1509, although this was dependant upon the personality of the king in charge. I would further argue that in the period of 1344 - 1509, the Long Parliament of 1406 was a turning point in the power of parliament, as it set a precedent for the period, and in the sense it was the first parliament to directly challenge the king's authority and prerogatives between 1344 - 1509, which many parliament's after also did.

During the reign of Richard II, parliamentary powers had increased due to the Wonderful Parliament in 1386 and the Merciless Parliament in 1388. However the Long Parliament of 1406, during the reign of Henry IV, was crucial in the increasing parliamentary power during the 15th and early 16th century. The central concern of

this parliament was surrounding the use of the royal finances by the King, which the parliament perceived as being mismanaged and excessive royal spending as occurring. At the time the King was ill, meaning the parliament acted without him due to his absence via illness (this is also the cause of it being labelled the 'Long' Parliament as it lasted nearly all of 1406). This in itself shows the significance of this parliament in increasing parliamentary power, as it laid down that a parliament could act without the King. Furthermore, the results that came of it mark an increase in parliamentary power, that can be seen reflected in parliaments across the period 1344 - 1509. It produced committees to keep track and ~~track financial issues~~ royal finances, something Henry IV wasn't doing and a clear example of increased parliamentary power, and these successfully reduced royal expenditure.

During 1344 - 1509, ensuring royal finances were maintained correctly and not spent excessively was a central parliamentary concern, and their power to ensure this came as a result of the Long Parliament in 1406. For example, during the reign of Henry VI, the parliament of 1453

expressed financial concerns about royal expenditures similar to those expressed in 1406. This in itself demonstrates how 1406 was a turning point, as in 1453 the parliament felt powerful enough to challenge Henry VI financial management. Henry VI was also renowned for having favorites who he granted vast amounts of land and wealth to. This led to parliament passing an act of assumption in 1455 to reclaim all crown lands granted away under Henry. This clearly demonstrates an increase in parliamentary power due to the 1406 parliament, as parliament under Henry VI checked his power to grant wealth and land patronage, similar to the way they checked Henry IV's financial power in 1406. Furthermore it demonstrates an increase in ^{the} power of parliament following on from that of 1406, as parliament now felt powerful to directly challenge the king's favorite nobility and ~~advisors~~ advisors, for example the Duke of Suffolk who was banished for 5 years or the Duke of Somerset capture him.

A similar increase in parliamentary power can be seen during the reign of Edward IV, another monarch ~~known~~ known for excessive spending, as parliament here too also had increased power

to monitor royal expenditure, as ~~had~~ started by the parliament of 1406.

However, under Henry VII, it could be argued that the parliament of 1406 had no impact upon increasing parliamentary power, particularly in terms of royal finance, as during ~~the~~ the reign of Henry VII the king himself had more power and parliament's was reduced. For example, Henry's policy of tying nobles to the crown financially via bonds and recognisances required the king's approval rather than parliamentary approval. Furthermore the king imposed the level of payment in response to poor noble behaviour (bonds and recognisances were used to connect the nobles' good behaviour with financial threat), and not the parliament, showing that by 1509 the 1406 parliament had very little influence upon increasing parliamentary power.

Overall I would argue that despite the decrease in parliamentary power under the reign of King Henry VII, overall during the period of 1394-1509, the 1406 parliament can be seen as a turning point in the increase of parliamentary power. This parliament set a

precedent for the period in terms of increasing parliamentary powers to check / control the power of the king, financially and in terms of his patronage, and its influence can be seen during reigns of excessive royal spending as with Henry VI and Edward IV, and even during the reign of Henry VII as parliament often lowered the imposed fines ~~from the~~ ^{on the} king set. Despite slight decreases in parliamentary power from 1485 onwards, I would argue that ^{the} 1406 parliament ~~but~~ was a ~~was~~ turning point in the increase of parliamentary power 1349 - 1504.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The key issues related to the question are identified and considered here. Knowledge is in depth and has range across the time period. Valid criteria are used to make the judgements and the answer is well organised - a level 5 response.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

If you use a chronological structure then you need to check that you are referring back to the turning point identified in the question throughout your answer

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should ensure that they deal with both enquiries
- Candidates should not simply paraphrase the content of the source; they should develop valid inferences supported by the arguments raised in the source
- Candidates should avoid stock evaluation, e.g. it is a newspaper report so it is exaggerated because it is designed to sell papers
- There is no requirement to argue that the source is better suited to one enquiry than the other; any comments made in relation to this will be rewarded according to how they fit with the three strands of the mark scheme.

Sections B and C

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

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>

