



Examiners' Report June 2022

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 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_30_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this first post-Covid set of exams with A Level paper 30 that deals with Lancastrians, Yorkists and Henry VII, 1399–1509.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that 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. In this examination series, where Advance Information had been provided, it was very disappointing to note that some candidates had a very limited pool of contextual knowledge on which to draw. In some cases, this led to incorrect assumptions being made by candidates.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question and shaped their responses appropriately to meet the demands of the question. Candidates did use the Advance Information appropriately to support their revision and many of them used wide-ranging and detailed contextual knowledge to support their arguments. 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.

Section C requires candidates to answer a breadth question. The questions in this section are set to encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded that, as has been pointed out in previous Principal Examiner reports, 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. It was observed that in some responses, candidates were trying to fit the material that was in the Advance Notice for Sections A and B to the demands of the questions in Section C. In many cases, this was not done very successfully as candidates failed to link much of the material to the question posed in a meaningful way.

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.

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

Question 1

Candidates of all levels were able to access the source and to at least reference both enquiries. Candidates considered the content of the source and applied contextual knowledge considering the reasons behind Warbeck's challenge and the wider European context. Candidates tended to be stronger on the first enquiry than on the extent of the threat posed to Henry, but most were able to link this to the weakness of Henry's claim to the throne. Candidates could have developed answers that were more closely linked to the text of the source. Although candidates did often explore the limitations of the source, 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). It is notable that some candidates still do not understand that the requirement is to work with the source that they have and comment on the limitations of the material contained within this. The most successful answers made judgements based on the value of the source but, for some, judgements regarding utility were implicit or distinct judgements were made regarding the source and the candidate's prior knowledge of Henry VII.

- 1 Assess the value of the source for revealing the reasons for Warbeck's challenge and the extent of the challenge he posed to Henry VII.

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

(20)

The source, which comes from Perkin Warbeck's proclamation, issued to the English, issued in 1496, explicitly outlines Warbeck's reasons ~~from~~ for challenging King Henry VII of England, whilst implicitly implying the extent of the challenge he posed, although to a lesser degree. Due to the source being written and proclaimed by Warbeck, although he undoubtedly was aided in this by his supporters, it gives accurate accounts of Warbeck's reasons for challenging, although this is perhaps limited by the fact that his reasons were based on a lie that he was Richard of York, making the source

also imprisoned in the Tower by Richard III. The princes had been thought dead by the general public, although speculation over their fates had risen due to Henry VII's tenuous claim to the throne, due to his weak blood relation which relied on the legitimacy of a second marriage to a mistress, one which some could feasibly argue gave Henry VII no claim to the English throne. Furthermore, by Henry VII reversing the Act of Bastardisation, allowing him to claim the throne through his marriage to Elizabeth of York, Richard of York's sister, the two princes were once again the strongest blood claimants to the throne, if they were alive. Although Perkin Warbeck was not actually Richard of York, the emphasis on the princes being the rightful heirs to the English throne demonstrate that one of the main reasons for Warbeck's challenge

was that Richard of York, alive or not, would have been the rightful king of England. This reason is slightly muddled due to the source being written in a way that presents Warbeck undoubtedly as Richard of York, which we know to be untrue, therefore limiting the source in revealing the true reasons for Warbeck's challenge as he would have known he would be unable to claim the blood right he said he did had.

The source also communicates that another reason for Warbeck's challenge was Henry VII's tyranny, claiming that, 'ever since the first moments he usurped the throne, (he) put into practice the acts of tyranny.' This explicitly communicates the fact that Henry VII's usurpation of Richard III after the Battle of Bosworth was seen by many as tyrannical, and the subsequent actions of Henry were viewed likewise.

For example, Henry's unprecedented amount of Acts of Attainder passed against those proclaimed traitors after the Battle of Bosworth, as he was able to predate his reign to the day before the battle, making those who fought against him vulnerable to being convicted of high treason. His use of bonds also made him very unpopular, as referenced in the source as 'intolerable ransoms'. This portrayal of Henry's tyranny as another reason for the Challenge of Warbeck could perhaps be limited through exaggeration, as Warbeck is trying to gain favour with the English by capitalising on and emphasising the dissonance caused by Henry VII's strict financial measures. Therefore, the source explicitly states that another reason for Warbeck's challenge was due to the injustice of Henry VII's rule, to which is perhaps limited due to Warbeck's exaggeration.

Alternatively, the source also implicitly reveals the extent of Warbeck's challenge and the threat he posed to Henry VIII. The source states that, 'we are now armed.', a possible reference to the help received by Warbeck from Margaret of Burgundy, who provided military assistance to Warbeck, as well as legitimising his claim by claiming him as her nephew. This demonstrates the extent of the threat Warbeck posed, as he had support from Henry VIII's most powerful opponents. The source chooses to omit details of the support, perhaps because Warbeck is trying to present himself as a strong leader in his own right in order to gain support from the English people. It is therefore limited in revealing the extent of the threat posed by Warbeck as it fails to reveal the details of his support and, as it is from the perspective of Warbeck, seeks to glamourise himself and portray himself as victorious regardless of the

actual threat he posed.

In conclusion, the source is useful in explicitly revealing the proclaimed reasons for Warbeck's challenge, although this is obscured by the fact that his reasons are mostly based on the lie that he is Richard of York. The source also is useful in implicitly implying the extent of the threat he posed to Henry VII by implying the support he has from Margaret of Burgundy and other nobles, however this is also limited due to the nature of the source which seeks to glorify Warbeck.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a clear level 5 answer that considers the weight and value of the source from the very beginning. Quotations are carefully selected and linked to both enquiries. They are then supported by detailed contextual knowledge. The response is well focussed throughout.



Aim to integrate the provenance of the source into your answer, using it to support your evaluation of the two enquiries.

Question 2

This was by far the most popular question in this section. Generally, these questions were answered reasonably well, and most answers covered at least some of the indicative content. Candidates tended to answer this question in a YES/NO (other factors) format and most managed to understand and analyse the conceptual focus. The very best answers were the ones that understood the links between all the reasons for Henry's success and how many features underpinned and expedited others. For example, some of the most successful answers stated that the Treaty of Troyes was the most significant success for Henry V but understood that this was dependent on the Anglo Burgundian Alliance. Conversely, some candidates argued that campaigns in Harfleur, Agincourt and the best part of Normandy were the most effective contributors to his success, which happened independently of the Burgundian Alliance, but arguably contributed to its formation. Weaker candidates dismissed, or discussed only very briefly, the stated factor, and focussed too heavily on a narrative description of various military battles without making any links to the question. Candidates are reminded that they must consider the factor stated in the question, giving it sufficient attention.

In the years 1415-1521 the most significant factor contributing to Henry V's success in France was the Burgundian alliance in 1419. This is because not only does allied power prove more influential for an increased number in troops, but also promotes security within the realm meaning that ~~the~~ England is not as vulnerable to ~~the~~ unprecedented attacks because of the fear of allied countries.

The Burgundian alliance was an alliance between Henry V in ~~eng~~ England and the Burgundians ⁱⁿ ~~Spain~~ that held Burgandy that had a large influence on power within ~~Europe~~ Europe. This alliance produced a unified force ~~within~~ between the countries that would likely result in ~~eng~~ success against France due to the force of allied nations. The Burgundians had

agreed to aid to Henry V in his ventures to regain lost land in France, such as Normandy, in return of guaranteeing English forces would not make an attack on Burgundy. However, though the Burgundian alliance was extremely influential, this was not always successful. This can be seen from how on multiple occasions when Henry V had travelled with his forces to reclaim land he had not been met with Burgundian forces which left him extremely unprepared, which led to multiple losses in France that in turn decreased the popularity of Henry V at home in England. However, when the forces were unified this was ~~a great~~ ^{powerful} force ~~and that~~ was powerful enough to regain some lost land in France. So it could be argued that the positives outweigh the negatives, meaning that the Burgundian alliance was the most significant factor in contributing to ~~the~~ Henry V's success as fr

in France within this period.

However, it could be argued that Henry V's use of taxation was a more significant factor for his success in France within the period of 1415-21. This is because without the heavy taxation imposed by Henry V and his government he would not have been able to afford a large troop, especially the archers that he wished to have in his troops. Henry V went through multiple bouts of taxation within this period, with one form of forced taxation known as an amercable grant was placed upon the nation to raise $\frac{1}{10^{\text{th}}}$ of all earnings to grow his troops. ~~However~~ But, taxation for troops did not always spare success. As previously mentioned Henry had to ask government to allow multiple bouts of taxation within this period; suggesting that taxation was not always successful in its aim. Furthermore, taxation couldn't necessarily grant you all the

troops that you require to be successful in battle, which can clearly be seen by Henry's multitude of losses in France before the Burgundian alliance. Therefore, the Burgundian alliance still persists to be the most significant factor contributing to Henry V's success in France within this period.

Furthermore, it must be considered that nobles and gentry had ~~considerable~~ considerable influence on the outcome of the king's wars in France. For example, different nobles have different power and influence throughout the realm. This meant that if the king was to grant them something as a favour, such as an increased position of power, then the noble would be much more likely to lend troops in support of the king's ventures. An example of this can be seen from either Warwick, Somerset or Suffolk, who all were relatively close to the

King and provided aid to him partly because of favour. This suggests that allegiances within the country of the King to his nobles and subjects is a much more significant point to explain Henry V's successes in France. However, it could be argued that even if ~~you~~ you have a strong allied country, international alliances are ~~&~~ still more of a significant factor. This is because international alliances, such as the Burgundian alliance in 1419 promote security on more of a widespread scale than national alliances. By allying with figures such as Margaret of Burgundy, Henry VII ensured that England could have victories in France. This is because Margaret of Burgundy is a very influential figure in Europe, not only because of her husband but also because her strong views and ~~close ties to~~ ~~Paris~~

Therefore, the most significant factor contributing to ~~Henry VII~~ Henry V's success in France was the

Burgundian alliance. This is because even though other factors prove to be influential in ~~gained~~ gaining power, the international security provided through the alliance promoted safety for ~~England~~ England and allowed HV to secure victories in France ~~and~~ and gain ^{some of} the lost English land back.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

In this level 5 response the candidate has written a well focussed answer with a range of focussed supporting evidence. The candidate considers the factor in the question first, and in detail, before comparing other factors back to this factor, which is a successful technique. The candidate then clearly attempts to weigh up the Burgundian Alliance in their conclusion.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Aim to link each factor back to the one in the question; this will help you weigh up the various factors and assess their relative significance.

Question 3

This was the less popular question in the section. Most answers covered at least some of the indicative content. 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 and instead of setting out the answer Yes – economic, No – social, political for example, with candidates integrating examples that they felt comfortable with, rather than that which was directly relevant, which meant their analysis was weak. There were some outstanding answers to this question, where candidates understood the synthesis between the factors and analysed further by looking at the longer term and shorter-term causes of the Rebellion. The best candidates looked at the importance of locality (Kent) and successfully argued for the importance of short term local factors. Weaker candidates gave a narrative account of the Rebellion or misunderstood what was meant by the term ‘economic’. Similarly, some candidates missed an opportunity to link the political and social turmoil to the economic difficulties in the country, making it more important or certainly a symptomatic feature of the problems of Henry VI’s kingship. Candidates are reminded that they should engage sufficiently with the stated factor before moving on to a counter argument.

The rebellion led by Jack Cade in 1450 is known for having many contributing causes, which highlighted the instability of Henry VI's reign. Some of these causes are economic, due to anger over the losses in France, but there were other causes such as resentment at the unlawfulness ~~of~~ of law enforcers and members of government at the time, and the washing up of the duke of Suffolk's body on the shores of Kent undoubtedly provided a huge spur for the ~~rebels~~ rebels.

Arguably economic factors did contribute to ~~the~~ Cade's rebellion in 1450. ~~However, in the~~ The huge losses in France such as Gascony and Harfleur meant that nobles could receive less patronage, increasing their hostility to the regime of Henry VI. On top of this, the

continuous fighting between England and France over land, throughout the Hundred Years War, meant that citizens were being taxed ~~so~~ excessively in order to fund defence against French forces. There was also widespread discontent with the general management of finances at the time, with the crown being over £300,000 in debt. However whilst these economic factors did help contribute to the general discontent with the regime, they don't explain what directly triggered Cade's rebellion. Nevertheless economic factors are useful in explaining why the insurrection that spread across the country after Cade's rebellion took place, such as many people being willing to support an uprising against Henry VI's government and their poor financial mismanagement. However, there were some more direct causes of Cade's rebellion

that may be more useful in explaining why it occurred. The rebellion started in Kent, where at time there was widespread resentment towards two local officials, Lord Jaye and William Crowmer, who the citizens of Kent regarded to be unlawful and violent, with many people living in fear of them. Lord Jaye was the king's chamberlain, which obviously does provide more evidence for economic factors being a trigger of the rebellion, and William Crowmer was the local sheriff, who ~~was~~ local perceived to be violent and unlawful. The disliking of these two figures by locals in Kent is a cohesive explanation of ~~why~~ what caused Cade's rebellion because it ~~is~~ puts into context why specifically in Kent the rebellion surged. The discontent of these two characters causing the rebellion is further strengthened by the fact

that when the Duke of Suffolk's body washed up on the shores of Kent in 1450, Jane and Crowmer threatened widespread violence in revenge for the attack, which ~~was~~ scared many people in Kent at the time. ~~That~~ This occurred in 1450, the same year as the rebellion, therefore suggesting that this was a key cause of the uprising. The argument of discontent with Henry's regime and fear or resentment of local and government officials is also a viable ~~new~~ argument for the cause of Cade's rebellion because this is what led to insurrection spreading to other parts of the country such as Surrey, Middlesex and the Midlands. This is evident in the brutal murder of Bishop Ayscough who was attacked by an angry mob. Overall, the discontent with local and national

government officials, and the regime as a whole is also a contributing cause of Cade's rebellion in 1450.

In conclusion, whilst economic factors such as anger over taxes to defend ~~the kingdom~~ ~~the kingdom~~ ~~the kingdom~~ the ongoing and ~~ongoing~~ ~~economic~~ economically damaging losses in France ~~the kingdom~~ did contribute to the start of Cade's rebellion, to an extent, ~~the fear of~~ the fear of Lord Jaffe and Cromer combined with the body of Suffolk waiting up on the shores of Kent, provide an explanation as to what caused the rebellion to occur specifically in 1450 and in Kent, considering the fact that there was general discontent for many reasons, such as economic ones, throughout the entire reign of Henry VI. Economic causes, combined with general dissatisfaction with the regime and local officials may instead explain why Cade's rebellion led to ~~the~~

further insurgence across the
country, ~~as a result of~~ ~~the~~ ~~rebellion~~
with Cade's rebellion
being the spur of this.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a largely successful level 5 response where the candidate considers the stated factor with detailed supporting evidence, before weighing this up against other possible causes of the Rebellion. The candidate has a well-developed conclusion where the factors are clearly assessed against each other before reaching a final judgement.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Detailed supporting evidence is needed throughout your answer. This needs to be carefully selected and clearly linked to the question.

Question 4

This was the less popular answer in the section, and a number of responses mixed up noble rivalries with general rebellions without clearly pointing out areas of overlap. For the most part, the knowledge deployed was detailed, accurate and relevant and was used to meet the conceptual demands of the question, though not the full breadth of the course. The majority of answers did understand that this question required a YES (local rivalries caused the biggest problems) NO (They did not, it was something else and/ or that nobles could enhance the power of the monarchy). In the best answers links were well explored in this question to a weak monarch for example. Some candidates argued that poor kingship was the main reason that local rivalries occurred and were not effectively controlled and therefore this was a bigger factor in success. Successful answers also placed focus on wider issues (i.e.) noble threats across the whole period and the impact of factions. Weaker candidates focussed heavily on the reign of Henry IV without always making it clear that this conflict had earlier origins. Many candidates attempted to include all opposition to the king rather than focusing on the local rivalries or gave a narrative account of, for example, Bonville versus Courtenay. Several candidates struggled to cover the 100 year period and candidates are reminded that coverage across the period is a requirement of the breadth questions. However, this does not always mean that a chronological approach is necessary.

In the period 1399-1509 the power of the monarchy greatly fluctuated, as did the level of local politics.

On one hand, local politics clearly posed problems for the monarchy, given the way that they either caused conflict or exacerbated existing problems.

For example under Henry IV, the Glyndwr Uprising which plagued the king both personally and politically was largely instigated due to a property dispute between Glyndwr and local lord Hugh Perkin.

This property dispute escalated into a countrywide rebellion ~~that~~ lasting a number of years and leading Henry IV's treasury as he tried to balance Glyndwr's threat with issues from Scotland and France. As such, this weakened his position, supporting the judgement.

However, the clearest examples of local politics causing problems for the monarchy were under Henry VI's reign. The disorder both due to his minority (but even more so after his dependent attempt to ~~take~~ come into his power) resulted in the worst local disputes in the entirety of the period. Key examples include the Boscville and Cassary disputes involving the estates and influence of the earls of Devon and the Pastors'

territorial disputes with the Duke of Northumberland (such as over Caister Castle). These local rivalries resulted in general discontent and put a perpetual element of bloodshed, weakening the monarch due to their failing in their highly duty of maintaining order and justice across the land.

However, monarchs were weakened to an even greater extent when local rivalries escalated to major national conflicts due to the proximity of overseas powers. Most notably, the dispute between the Percies and the Nevilles over spheres of power in the North greatly influenced the Wars of the Roses until 1465, as each supported the opposing Richard of York and Anjou/Somerset factions. As such local rivalries posed a greater threat to a monarch's position the more powerful the people involved were. This is further exemplified when taking into account the strength of families.

For example, a 'local dispute' between two sheep farmers over a ewe would have little practical significance on the power of the monarch. However, when the local dispute occurred between two powerful overmighty families (such as the Percies assassination attempt after the Henry Beville and Maud Spalding marriage), this often granted the ability to amplify disorder and bloodshed exponentially, as what started as a disagreement or jealousy escalated to full on battles between relatives.

As such disputes greatly weakened the monarchy
when coming between powerful people or close
to the throne.

However, in the 1550-1560 period, local matters
were by no means the most significant factor in
weakening the monarchy. Rather, it was Henry VIII's
absolute ineptitude and stupidity that enabled
such a rise in disorder and growing local
anarchy. As such, it could be argued that rather
than local matters weakening the monarchy, the
weak personality and ability of a poor monarch
enabled such local ~~anarchy~~ ^{anarchy} matters to occur and
cause significant damage, due to the monarchy's
inability to control ~~its~~ this rising.

However, a later example of local matters weakening
the monarchy despite a more competent king was
the dispute between George Duke of Clarence and
Richard Duke of Gloucester under Edward IV.

Both a political and personal rivalry between the
two brothers weakened Edward's position as
king to deal with it drew his attention away
from other matters, such as ~~the~~ ^{his} ~~power~~ ^{duchy}
international relations over marrying Elizabeth
Woodville rather than the French Princess
Margaret had been negotiating for. This weakened
his ~~power~~ ^{position} as rather than Gloucester and
Clarence providing a united support of force for his

reign, he was forced to deal with their messianic squabbling, ~~and~~ exacerbated by both their 'overconfidence' and considerable wealth. As such, local rivalry clearly weakened (whilst not the monarchy itself) a monarch's position 1399-1509.

However, there were arguably more pressing matters that determined a monarch's power, for example, their personality and financial situation.

A monarch's financial state greatly affected their level of independence (mainly from parliament). The contrast can clearly be drawn between Henry IV and Richard II, whose (for different reasons) experienced strained relations with parliament due to financial difficulties (though for easily different causes), and Edward IV and Henry VII, who due to the treaties of Brétigny and Etaples were not obliged to guard independence, but an element of liberty. The impact of pressure on parliamentary relations can clearly be seen when comparing the Wars of the Roses and long parliaments. For the part that Edward and Henry VII called, the rift between finance ~~and~~ parliament's ^{and independence} interference can be seen throughout the entire period, as even Henry V's popularity with them began to wane given his expenditure in France and prolonged conflict. As such, the monarch's financial state can be considered a more significant factor in determining the power

The monarchy from local rivalries

Evidence for local rivalries influencing the power of the monarchy can be drawn from the end half of the 14th century. Although his use of laws and regulations, and the new ~~Act of~~ Statute Against Retaliation in 1504, he was able to express the feeling the nobles worried that they were not able to fight against each other, nor rise up against him. As a result, there were remarkably few local dynasties and law and order improved when compared to previous kings such as Henry VI. This supports the linkage of a monarch's power and level of local rivalry as Henry VII left the crown solvent, with his heir (Duke of York) the spare) secured in power and acknowledged by all the regional kings. As such there is evidence to suggest that local disorder weakened the monarchy 1399-1509, but also that the reverse was true, and that a weak monarch created high levels of local disorder.

Overall I agree with the statement to ~~the~~ a large extent as while it was certainly not the most significant factor in determining the power of the monarch 1399-1506, it was not the most important factor.

As such whilst the statement ~~is~~ undoubtedly ~~the~~ has elements of truth, its significance should not be overstated in comparison to other factors such as the personal situation of the monarch, their religiosity, and personality.



This candidate is clearly aware of the impact of local rivalries on the power of monarchs across the period. The candidate considers the relative significance of these locally rivalries compared to other factors such as royal finances or the personality of monarchs, developing a clear set of criteria against which to make a judgement. This is a level 5 response.



Remember to include examples from across the period to support your arguments.

Question 5

This was clearly the more popular of the two breadth questions, however the term 'exploited' confused many candidates who did not address it properly. They tended to take the word as having a negative connotation for the use (or for these candidates abuse) of royal income. The most successful answers structured this thematically and dealt with sources of income rather than chronological – monarch by monarch. The more successful candidates answered this question in a YES/NO format (YES the monarchs did exploit sources of income effectively – NO, they did not, though many misinterpreted the question to mean – what was their financial record like?). The most successful candidates drew clear comparisons between monarchs' respective uses of revenue streams such as tax, land and diplomatic incomes in order to reach supported judgements regarding how well they maximised revenue. Some candidates took a chronological approach, which is acceptable, but quite demanding time wise. These candidates tended to run out of time or were only able to discuss weaknesses. Weaker candidates only focused on two monarchs – one example agreeing with the hypothesis and on disagreeing. Candidates are reminded that coverage across the period is a requirement of the breadth questions. However, this does not always mean that a chronological approach is necessary and a thematic approach can often work more successfully.

The years 1399 to 1509 see the reign of Henry III ~~and~~ to Henry VII. Each monarch in this period had a ~~at~~ changing relationship with their finances. ~~At Monarchs~~ Whilst some monarchs did not successfully exploit income ~~from~~ from Parliament, it is in my view that monarchs in the period mostly ~~the~~ successful exploited other areas of income.

One area of income ~~successfully~~ successfully exploited was from diplomacy and war. In particular, King Henry II gained from increased land to use as royal land. Following the successful conquest of Normandy, ~~Henry II~~ in 1420, Henry V ~~could~~ had lots of more land and wealth. Eventhough he mostly granted land away through patronage so did not ~~of~~ benefit directly from these gains, feudal dues would still need to be paid by the nobles to Henry V which shows he ~~the~~ used his successes in France to increase his royal income. Later in the period of 1399-1509 is the signing of two treaties which provided income from France. King Edward III signed the Treaty of Picquigny in 1475 which was an agreement with France declaring the

King of France had to pay a £10000 annual pension to Edward IV. Similarly, King Henry VII signed the Treaty of Etaples in an attempt to reduce the Perkin Warbeck threat but ~~in this~~ through this treaty, gained an annual pension of £5000 from the King of France to Henry VII if he promised to remove the English Army from French lands. This demonstrates that multiple monarchs manipulated ~~diplomacy~~ foreign policy to increase their royal income, and were successful.

~~Even~~ Despite this, some ^{sources} ~~are~~ were not successfully exploited by monarchs - in particular the finance from parliament. Parliament had the ability to grant funding to monarchs should they need it but sometimes withheld this finance. King Henry IV is the first monarch seen to face this treatment from parliament in the period 1399-1509. Due to his precarious finances and deteriorating health, Long Parliament ~~or~~ in 1406 was called. ~~at this~~ This ~~parliament~~ parliament ~~with~~ declared 31 articles to control Henry IV's spending so that they would have to fund his endeavours less. Similarly, ~~the~~ Edward IV was declined funding until clear financial plans had been made in ~~the~~ the 1460s. Richard III was granted little funding from parliament partly because he didn't request. Therefore Richard III was too preoccupied with maintaining his throne following ~~the~~ ~~assumption~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~king~~ his controversial

succession ~~to~~ ~~from~~ in 1483 to be able to successfully exploit parliament as a source of income. Furthermore, there is evidence to show, ~~rather than exploiting parliament for income~~, Henry VI was manipulated and granted overgenerous amounts to some nobles such as Suffolk and Somerset. This was in an attempt to gain support in parliament, but, in doing so, Henry VI limited his ~~royal~~ income from parliament. ~~¶~~ Whilst it is clear that monarchs did not successfully ~~exploit~~ ~~¶~~ parliament as a source of income because they needed to prove their skills as a monarch and didn't want to anger nobles, most nobles did not necessarily need income from parliament. Income from parliament was less significant in the reign of Edward IV who relied on ~~the~~ treaties and lands instead therefore this could suggest a smaller income ~~para~~ from parliament enabled monarchs to exploit other sources of income.

Another source of income which was mostly successfully exploited in the period 1399-1509 was royal lands, otherwise known as Royal Demesne. The Duchy of Lancaster ~~of~~ lands were exploited throughout the Lancastrian reign of Henry IV and Henry V. Henry V in particular encouraged more efficient farming and plans to be made which increased his Duchy Lands income to £13000 ~~per~~ per year. Upon the ascension of ~~the~~ Edward IV, a declaration ^{in 1461} was made

that the lands of the Duchy of Lancaster would belong to the king at the time. This demonstrates that Edward IV ~~not only~~ increased the royal lands available to him which would, in turn increase income. King Henry VIII's defeat of the Yorkists at the Battle of Bosworth led to the forfeiture of ~~key land~~ the wealth of Richard III, and other key Yorkists. Through this, he increased his income by £42,000 a year and contributed to his extremely high total annual income. Therefore, royal lands and how a monarch could gain more lands was exploited by many monarchs throughout the period and was one of the most significant contributions to royal income.

To conclude, whilst some sources were less successfully exploited (parliament) by ~~monarchs~~ monarchs in the period 1399-1509, ~~these sources still enabled the state~~ monarchs attempted to, instead, rely on parliament for stability ~~and~~ and administration which in turn led to the even more successful exploitation of other sources such as land and foreign policy. Across the period, the monarchs became more successful in exploiting sources of income as the later monarchs provided more opportunities to increase royal income. This is not to say, however, that ^{the} earlier monarchs, including Henry IV and Henry V, were not successful. Therefore, it is for these reasons that I believe it is mostly accurate to say that monarchs successfully exploited

the sources of royal income in the years 1399-1509.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate takes a thematic approach considering various sources of royal income including those issued by Parliament and from royal lands. The candidate establishes a valid set of criteria in order to weigh up each source of royal income which allows the candidate to make a judgement, linking back to the question at the end of each paragraph. The conclusion then weighs up these judgements, making this a level 5 response.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Consider a thematic approach to the breadth questions – when planning check that you have reference to each monarch.

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; there will be material in the Sources to support 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 read the caption carefully so they do not mistake its intent
- Candidates should make use of relevant contextual knowledge to support inferences and evaluation.

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:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

